Leadership module

Theories of leadership and others are all assumptions. Means guess, not truth, everybody will apply it in a context and tries to find truth.

What is strategic leadership?

* 2 critical responsibilities of strategic leaders:
  + Monitor the external environment to identify threats and opportunities.
  + Formulating strategy for the future survival and prosperity of the organisation. Yukl, G. Gardiner, W. L. (2020) Leadership in Organisations 9th Ed. Harrow, Pearson. P. 337.
    - Strategy takes you where you are at the moment to where yow anna be in future.

What is strategy?

* Strategy- used without a generally agreed definition.
* “There was a consensus that strategy had something to do with the supreme commander and that it was about linking military means to the objects of war.” Freedman, L. (2013) Strategy A History. Oxford, Oxford University Press. p.74
  + Word-greek, way of general, military background
  + Following industrial revolution: industry was looking for a way to plan, they borrowed military concept of strategy. Before only government, military and church has had strategic view. Others my small view or curvival. When companies become huge like Ford, they needed a big plan. Business schools first one in USA, after civil war, leader of confederates, Robert Lee, they look to military concept of strategy, head of school ex-militay, they borrowed from military strategy to form ideas like business strategy.
  + Original idea was military, it evolve to businee strategy.
* “A good strategy honestly acknowledges the challenges being faced and provides an approach to overcome them. And the greater the challenge, the more a good strategy focuses and coordinates efforts to achieve a powerful competitive punch or problem solving effect.”(Rumelt, R. (2011) Good Strategy Bad Strategy. London, Profile Books Ltd. P.4)

Leadership theories and philosophies:

* Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other. Kenedy
  + Socrates: the more you know the more you realize how I little know.
  + Bryan- I practice it but my theoretical framework was limited. My master on leadership make sense military practice and challenges. Especially in strategic level where the tactical clear cut algorithms doesnt provide answers.
* **Concept of command**: Differentiate military from civilian, Commander, authority is written by law. They have legal authority to impose their will on other people which you don’t get in the private sector. You thought you were leading, peers do it because otherwise there will be legal consequences. So you either inspiring them to do or threatining them with consequences.
* Rupert Smith’s utility of force: Syllabus of command and leadership: civil war\_troubles, in counter terrorism, general rupert inspirational leader.
  + **Are Commanders Leaders?** when describing the difference between leaders and Commanders argued: “the difference between the two is that the leader says come on, whilst the Commander says go on” ***“Commanders are not leaders*”!**
    - Provoking to think! Commanders are not leaders when they exercise only authority and positional power. They are leaders when they exercise personal power in a transformational sense. So, commanders can be leaders. Commanders use authority for discipline as well as take after personal well.
    - Underpinned by legal status of commander. Commanders don’t have followers, they have subordinates, and those subordinates have accepted through an oath of allegiance or sign the legal status. Leaders aren’t underpinned by that. Leaders inspire people to follow.
    - **Lead**, old Saxon word, ***laden***, means to **go on a journey**. To convince and inspire people to follow you on a journey. So, it is not about having legal authority.
    - So military connotation there is a conflict between your ability to impose your will legally on people and your ability to inspire.
* Conflict between commanding and leading
  + **British Military Doctrine: The Nature of Leadership**
    - UK Army Leadership Doctrine defines *Leadership Styles*(2021, pp. 5–10). One of them is ‘The Directive Style’ or “*Do what I tell you*”. Doctrine says that *overuse of this style can have a negative impact.* 
      * Bryan-This ‘directive style’ is enabled by the legal status of the leader/commander, hence it being easy to fall back on. The overuse of the ‘Directive Style’ is an enabler, indeed a symptom of toxic military leadership.
    - The new Army Leadership Doctrine (2021, p.2-10), building on the Army Leadership Code (2016) explains the attributes an army leader is expected to have listing them as: knowledge, skills and behaviours. It states that defining these and their relative importance is ‘not easy’, some of the most prominent ones being:
      * humility,
      * emotional intelligence,
      * the ability to know your people,
      * mental agility,
      * confidence,
      * robustness,
      * a sense of humour.
* **British Military Doctrine: The Nature of Command**
  + In British army doctrinal publications (Army Land Operations, 2017) the ‘nature of command’ is described as command authority which has a legal and constitutional status (Armed Forces Act 2006). Command is codified for the British Army in Queen’s Regulations (1975) and is vested in commanders by a higher Army authority that gives direction and assigns forces for them to accomplish missions. The exercise of command is the process by which commanders make decisions, impress their will on and transmit their intentions to subordinates. With this authority comes responsibility and accountability, doctrine explains how these components of command must be correctly aligned for command to be effective. (ADP - Army Land Operations, 6-04)
  + In the British Army command is described as having three interdependent functions, decision-making, leadership, and control. Army doctrine states that “*commanders must be strong leaders, capable of adapting their leadership style to the requirements of the operation and force. Different circumstances demand varying degrees of* ***regulation****,* ***delegation****,* ***inspiration*** *and* ***coercion***”. (ADP- Land Operations, (2017) 6-06).
* **Command, Leadership and Management a Topical Debate**
  + Etymologoly is even different
  + Leadership in Defence (2004) Defence Leadership Centre. Shrivenham. P.7.
    - Command – the whole complex business and a position enshrined in law.
      * French word *commandaire*, means giving direction and authority.
    - Leadership – people and turbulence
      * You lead people in turbulent times. In turbulent times people look for leadership. Someone to follow. In ordinary times most people know what to do.
      * Saxon word, *laden*, go on ajourney.
      * Leading is influencing, guiding in direction, course, action, opinion(Bennis & Nanus, 2003, p. 20).
    - Management - stuff and numbers
      * Stuff may be process. Numbers, calculating rational numbers.
      * Latin *manos*, to handle.
      * To manage means to bring about, to accomplish, to have charge of or responsibility for, to conduct (Bennis & Nanus, 2003, p. 20).
  + *Differences between management and leadership*.
    - Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing. Activities of leadership are vision and judgement -*effectiveness*- versus activities of management are mastering routines -*efficiency* (Bennis & Nanus, 2003, p. 20).
    - Leaders stimulate *thinking* to know-why with *organizing meaning* to guide action, managers tend to emphasize “know-how”. This is one of the key differences between leaders and managers(Bennis & Nanus, 2003, p. 38).
    - Managers are problem solvers. Problem solving involves a problem and method. Solution comes after these two. Creative mental processes (leaders) occur when neither problem nor the method, let alone the solution exists. Leaders are problem finders (Bennis & Nanus, 2003, pp. 38–39).
* Command: Development from: UK MOD: Leadership in Defence 2004, heavily influenced by rupert smith’s speech in 2001.
  + **First effort**: command is exercised by leadership and management. Pride comes before a fall.

Diagram, venn diagram
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* + Feedback from John Carter, harvard university
    - Like it but they must not overlap. Leadership and management don’t overlap. They are fundementally different concepts.
    - But they thought there are some similarities, that’s why they touch (2 circles)
    - Mission not worth risking life situation: still command. Do it! I will be prisoner of conscience. How do you get people risk their lives? You can’t order. Persuade and convince them. Diagram changed.

Diagram, venn diagram
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* + Put leadership on both side of the authority circle. Leadership done through authority versus done through by other means (outside). Management is always in circle. Outside circle you request smtg from people normally you cant force them to do. Doing risky thing for ribbon in military, in banking I would request million, how bizarre. In military we have to do in another way
  + Literature describes these 2 approaches:
    - Exercising the positional power in a **transactional relationship**. It is exchange. You did it or trouble.
    - Exercising personal power.**Transformational leadership**:
  + Full model of leadership, management and command:
  + Lead through authority-->effortless vs. Personality--->effort needed.
    - Limitation of leading through authority: Positional power only valid while people are willing to accept it.
    - Most cases cost of not obeying is greater than cost of doing, so you think you got the power.
    - When cost becomes greater in obedience then they do not obey.
  + Transform them from subordinate to follower. Follower becomes collaborator and leader is in their own right. You exercise different powers: referent power, expert, informational power.

**Bernard bass transformational leadership**

* **Idealised Influence:** lead by example and set expectations
* **Intellectual Stimulation:** Encourage learning and growth
* **Inspirational Motivation:** Inspiring to go to new heights
* **Individual Consideration:** coaching and empowering success
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* + The definition of *command* in *Leadership in Defence* (2004, p.6) encapsulated the “commanders are not leaders” argument.
    - “Command is a position of authority and responsibility to which (military) men and women *are legally appointed. Leadership and Management are the key components to the successful exercise of command. Successful management is readily measured against objective criteria, but commanders are not leaders until their position has been ratified in the hearts and minds of those they command”.*
  + The doctrine goes on to explain that:
    - *“Some commanders are poor leaders but are able to function in the role by exercising managerial tools and positional power to get people to do the job. Their personal authority is not necessarily compromised during stable times. Yet in time of crisis, their shortcomings as leaders will be exposed by their inability to draw on the trust of their people and exercise influence”.* (DLC Leadership in Defence 2004 p.7)
* **The concept of followership**
  + The concept of followership and its relationship to leadership was popularized by the business professor and management consultant Robert Kelley in his 1988 *Harvard Business Review article* “In Praise of Followers” and his 1992 book *The Power of Followership.*
  + *Kelley’s Four grids to understand 4 types of fellowship*
    - *Examplary followers is needed by every org. UK tries to Institutionalize the rights of subordinates to question. In a polite way.*
    - *Conformist followers don’t challenge.*
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* Barbara Kellerman, Followership: How Followers Are Creating Change and Changing Leaders. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press, 2008. (End of leadership, another book of her)
  + - Barbara Kellerman, has described a typology of followership based on the level of engagement. She sees good followers as actively supporting effective and ethical leaders and responding appropriately to bad leaders. Bad followers are seen as making no contribution and supporting the wrong types of leader.
* Important thing is to transform subordinates to followers.
* Books:
  + the courageous follower, ira chaleff
  + Leadership is half the story, Marc hurwitz, samantha hurwitz
  + Authentic leadership and fellowship, doranne cotter
* **Concept of Gender in leadership** 
  + **half of population is female but half is not leader. Where s the problem**
  + Uk-%11-14 female armed services
  + Gender studies look at the different perspectives of gender. The discipline examines the ways in which historical, cultural, and social events shape the role of gender in different societies. The field of gender studies, while focusing on the differences between men and women, also looks at sexual differences and less binary definitions of gender categorization
  + Most studies held by man, and man paradigm dominated the field. Delivered male model instead of gender neutral model.
  + Research reveals small but significant differences in the way men and women are perceived in leadership roles, their effectiveness in such positions, and their leadership styles. Studies conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s found that **women adopt participative styles of leadership and were more often transformational leaders than men**, who more commonly adopted directive, transactional styles. Women in management positions tend to demonstrate the importance of **communication, cooperation, affiliation, and nurturing** more than do men in the same positions. The studies also showed men as more goal- and task-oriented and less relationship- and process-focused than women.  
    Source: Boundless. “Leadership and Gender.” *Boundless Management*. Boundless, 26 May. 2016.
  + **Explaining the Glass Ceiling**
    - Explains why women are in fewi ni management and leadership
    - Human capital: most cultures see women as home builder, child keeper
    - Women breaks through this ceiling in US, UK, AUS army,
    - Later literature using analogy of labyrinth, rather than a glass ceiling.
  + Diagram, text
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* Once you broke the ceiling how you navigate?
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Gender equality is not good, and defence and security is lagging behind. Benefits of females interpersonal styles is lacked.

* **Four major themes of leadership behavior-1985** (Bennis & Nanus, 2003, pp. 24–63)
  + Uniformities or kernels of truth about leadership came from 90 interviews. Method: Going over interviews notes and trying out one concept to see how much of the data it could hold.
  + Results were 4 managements.
  + ***Management of attention through vision:*** 
    - Leaders are result-oriented, but they don’t coerce people they draw others in. Leaders draw others in by vision. Vision brings about confidence, animates purpose into action. Lincoln’s preservation of federal union.
  + ***Management of meaning:***
    - Leaders *organize meanings* by models or by metaphors. They communicate this with the organization. Conveyed meanings creates a common interpretation of reality, which facilitate coordinated action.
    - The ways of organizing meanings differ (let the sunshine in, models of newspaper boss, missile idea to lead newspaper).
    - “Meaning” means stimulate to “thinking”. Not imposing facts or knowing. Thinking prepares one for what is to be done. Know-why is ahead of know-how in volatile context. Leaders stimulate *thinking* to know-why with *organizing meaning* to guide action, managers tend to emphasize “know-how”. This is one of the key differences between leaders and managers.
* **Toxic Leadership**:
  + Started in USA, then UK.
  + There is still resistance to confronting it in some military cultures.
  + Kicked off by Americans because of crises. In general, change in theory in leadership is kicked by crises. The previous leading approach doesn’t work because of change.
  + Crises was beginning of 2nd gulf war. Some colonels and lieutenant colonels turned down promotions. They didn’t accept the command associated with promotion. Because they wouldn’t serve under the command of the same person, he served in the first gulf war. The same happened in the unionist army in the Civil War. They do it because they don’t want to be part of incompetent officers they knew before. The secretary went to the US Army war college in 2003 to explain the situation of having a generation of officers some of whom are as admired from above, as they are reviled from bottom. Ripple effect to other forces. Ripple effect of examining what was described as the dark side of leadership. Or toxic or poisonous leadership.
  + Books:
    - **Transforming toxic leaders, Alan Goldman:** Einstein and Steve jobs has eccentricity and toxicity, try to gain them. Or draw them in. Not exclude them because of their unorthodox approaches. Correlation between creativity, and their orientations. Neurodiversity is going through this.
    - Surviving toxic leaders, Kenneth o. Gangel
    - The allure of toxic leaders, jean Lipman-blumen
  + Marcia Whicker coined the phrase and linked it to ***three dysfunctional leadership styles***. She researched how organizations fail due to the nature of a leader. If they are trustworthy (very few), they give the green light. They are not trustworthy. “Toxic leaders when organizations go bad”, Marcia Lynn Whicker, 1996.
    - **Trustworthy:** puts goals of organization and well-being of followers first. Green light.
    - **Transitional: self**-absorbed, egotistical – focused on the approval of others and concerned with their personal role as leaders. Yellow light.
    - **Toxic:** enforcers, streetfighters, and bullies, all of whom are dangerous to their organizations. Toxic leaders are maladjusted, malcontent, and often malevolent and malicious. Red light.
    - *“A toxic leader is someone who has responsibility over a group of people or an organization, and …..who abuses the leader-follower relationship by leaving the group or organisation in a worse-off condition than when she or he first found them.”*
    - Hitler by this definition was a toxic leader, he left the country with horrible situation. Russia under Stalin, rather difficult to draw a line whether inept or toxic.
    - Just a framework to discuss to analyze.
    - Basic idea of toxic leadership is *leader poisoning the organization*.
      * *Poison: “The degree to which a substance (a toxin or poison) can harm humans or animals. Usually upon repeated or continuous exposure.”*
    - **Toxicity:** As with one rotten apple, one toxic leadership can have a damaging effect on individuals, groups, organisations and even countries. One rotten apple affects others, one toxic leader may cause other to become toxic.
  + **Toxic Leaders – Academic Foundation,**
  + **Barbara Kelleman, Bad Leadership, 2004, Harvard**

Seven types of bad leaders / traits of toxicity: Her approach to Marcia’s term of toxic leadership, again this is another useful framework to think about

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ineffective | **Incompetent** | lack the will or skill (or both). |
| **Rigid** | stiff and unyielding, and unable to adapt to new ideas. |
| **Intemperate** | lacks self-control and unable to effectively intervene. |
| Unethical | **Callous** | uncaring or unkind, ignoring wishes of group. |
| **Corrupt** | dishonest: lie, cheat, or steal. Self-interest above team interest. |
| **Insular** | minimize or disregard the health and welfare of others. |
| **Evil** | use physical / psychological pain as an instrument of power. |

* + The allure of toxic leaders, jean Lipman-blumen, 2006
    - *“Toxic leadership”: leaders "dysfunctional personal characteristics" and "destructive behaviours“, "inflict serious and enduring harm" on followers and organisations – leaving them in worse state.*
    - Leaders have “effect of poison”.
    - It is the followers’ consent that allow the leader to flourish.
    - Explains why followers follow:
      * Seek authoritative leaders because of people's own personal psychosocial needs ie security.
      * Followers believe leaders ‘know more’.
      * Outside influences (ie economic recession) increases anxiety and need for charismatic leaders.
  + **Toxic Triangle,** Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser (Leadership Quarterly, 2007): toxic leadership is a function of Leaders, Followers and Environments: “*The Toxic Triangle*”.
    - In order to toxic leader to flourish there needs to be a context that enables them. And toxic triangle explains this context.
    - If you have those 3 things, toxic leader can flourish.
    - If you break this triangle there will be no toxic leaders. With challenging followers and less conducive env. Military is naturally conducive environment.
    - Explanations:
    - Diagram
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  + Ideology of hate: they put people against each other. Divide and conquer idea.
  + Colluders are baby toxic leaders. More dangerous.
  + **Toxic leadership, US Army War College Class of 2003**
    - “Destructive leaders are focused on short-term mission accomplishment. They provide superiors with impressive articulate presentations and enthusiastic responses to missions. But they are unconcerned about, or oblivious to, staff or troop morale and/or climate. They are seen as self serving”
  + **Toxic Leadership in the military, Col George Reed, Prof, Colorado, 2015**
    - 2003: Secretary of Army asked Army to assess, identify and deal with disruptive leaders.  Published in US Military Review July 2004.
    - A survey **(of 22,630 US soldiers (E5 – O6):**
    - 20% felt superior as “toxic and unethical”, and
    - only 27% felt their organization allowed free and frank flow of ideas.
    - **US Military Review November 2010 questioned U.S. Army Command and General Staff College:**
    - 61% considered leaving military over how treated by superior.
    - Then he presented 360 degree appraisal to promote.
  + **(US National Defence University Press, Oct 2017), In 2016: Toxicity in US military cost the US taxpayer $4.7 Billion (8% of annual defence budget).** US culture of giving the cost in dollars to get something done about problem.
  + **Toxic Leadership in the military:**
    - ***“…the risks of poor or toxic leadership are much greater in the military than they are in civilian organisations” ,* Maj Gen Craig W Orme Australian Army, 2013**
      * **Reasons: Top down evaluation, Uncertainty and instability - need decisive action.**
      * **Balanced by: Values and standard, Governance.**
    - ***Army Leadership Review: Army Division Response 2015: 90% of respondents had observed personnel displaying toxic leadership traits in more than one rank.***
    - ***MOD, ‘UK Regular Armed Forces Continues Attitude Survey 2019: 11% subject to bullying, harassment or discrimination (in last 12 months).***
  + **Toxic subordinate:** McCrystal, obama think he is. He leaked to media, he disagreed. He request more force, pres said no. Rolling stone magazine reporters account of bad mouth of mccrystal on president. On 2010, locked up by cloud in paris. Maybe he is standing for his position and he is authentic subordinate. Didnt care about career. He put his command before career by formally complaining about. Some says he is asymmetric thinker intentionaly enable reporter to leak his thoughts.
  + Toxic Leadership – A framework for a solution
  + Diagram
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  + **Antidote to Toxic Leadership**
    - Identify the issue and discuss it.
    - Develop appropriate leadership style.
    - Not only short-term effectiveness focus.
    - Hold supervisors to account for style of their subordinates.
    - Implement climate assessments / 360 degree reporting.
    - **Term limits & respectable departure options:** do not stay too long. Cons:lack continuity
    - Open and democratic leadership selection process.
    - **Regular accountability forums:** everybody can ask respectfully challenging questions
    - Protective mechanisms for whistle-blowers.
    - Service complaints / Ombudsman
  + **The elephant in the boardroom, Adrian Furnham, 2010**
    - Enablers of toxic leaders to progress, be careful in all those stages. Create systems to spot them.
      * on recruitment
      * At selection
      * On boarding
      * Planning development
      * Performance managing
      * Career pathing
  + UK, after behaviour surveys critical of leadership, query this, result was **Wigston report** in 2019. (report on inappropriate behaviours)
    - Preventative Opportunities, Tackling Inappropriate Behaviours
      * “*It is ultimately about leadership at every level in the organisation, setting the culture and standards and ensuring people meet those standards consistently*.”
      * Identify **‘Reverent Others’**: those who exert a social influence regardless of rank.
      * **Active Bystander training**: trains and empowers all ranks to intervene. Naturally people doesn’t care. Moral courage to intervene if they see inappropriate behaviours.
      * **Introducing an anonymous reporting tool** to help reduce perceived risk in confronting inappropriate behaviour.
      * Creating a positive environment
      * Service complain ombdusman is created in 2021, you just send an email to this ombdusman of any mis behaviour and she investigate.
* **TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**
  + **Bass and Avolio’s MLQ Leadership Factors ‘ The Full Range of Leadership’**
    - Downton was the first to mention “transformational” in Rebel Leadership, 1973.
    - Transformational and transactional leadership is useful in differentiating command and leadership. These terms are of James MacGregor Burns, political scientist. 1978, “Leadership”. American leaders, there two types, Transactional and transforming leaders.
      * Those enter into transaction with their electorate. Vote for me and I will for you. I will give you this and that style. Trump, make America great again. Vote for me I will make America great again.
      * Another style doesn’t promise at all. They appeal to people’s higher sense of values. These are transforming leaders.
        + “Think not what America can do for you. Think what you can do for America” Kennedy
        + “Yes, we can”, Obama
    - Bennis and Nanus, 1985, refer transformative leadership as the new leader who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change (2003, p. 3).
    - Bernard Bass, 1985, Leadership and performance beyond the expectations. This book changed the way people think. He developed 7-factor model of leadership one of which was transformational leadership the term he borrowed from Downton.
    - Bass looked to terms in terms of research, questionnaire from business, military, he developed a factor model, or factor analysis (data reduction system, comes up with factors). Multi-leadership questionnaire, full range of leadership
    - **Seven Factor Model of Bass**
    - **Transformational** 
      * Factor 1: Idealised influence (charisma)
      * Factor 2: Inspirational Motivation
      * Factor 3: Intellectual Stimulation
      * Factor 4: Individualised Consideration
    - **Transactional**
      * Factor 5: Contingent Reward, Constructive transactions
      * Factor 6: Management by exception, Active and Passive, Corrective transactions
    - **Laissez faire**
      * Factor 7: Laissez faire, Non transactional or transformational, almost absence of leadership
  + Making sense of Bass Factor analysis diagrammatically (Bryan in modelling to conceptualize the theories)
    - Transactional bad, transformational good is not the case,
    - Leaders still need authority they some degree behave in this way. They need authority to allocate funds to do.
    - If you do only transactional leadership, it delivers outcome.
    - If you want to go beyond expected outcomes this is where the transformational leadership comes in.
    - In command, leadership, management model the point was to go beyond contract, risking lives maybe. Inside the authority circle there is transactional bit, we get results but not beyond.
  + Diagram
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    - **Bringing the management** to diagram: It still gives the outcome. Boots to fit, planes to fly etc.
  + Diagram
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* **Concept of authentic leadership**
* Comes to literature after 2008 financial crises. When many of transformational leaders delivering amazing outcomes for these global financial companies, discovered to be toxic. They were more focused on reality, on building up these amazing companies for their own cells, sense of fullfillment, their own ego, they overromised with financial models, like immoral mortgages, they know people never can pay back. They sell them on as packages of poorly performing mortgages, and this became currency. Bizarre but true. One problem with these transformational leaders, they were charismatic, influential, and appeared so much to care about the people that work for them. But they were ultimately driven by selfish ends. It was about their own wealth through the wealth of organization. As they were given bonuses in share they wanted to boost share value. So their shares worth more money. So their shares worth more money over the short term. Until they’re allowed to sell them and redeem the cash. So they were inflating the shareholder value of the company for their own ends by these nefarious financial deals.
  + - So Bass and Burns, transformational leaders have ethical foundation, if they dont they are not transformational leaders .So there is a misinterpretation of the term transformational leaders. This leave a gap in the academic leader descriptor market for a new type of leadership. Transformational but instead of being implicitly moral explicitly moral. And this is called authentic leadership.
    - Started with Bill Georges in 2003, later he wrote book in 2007. After crash he gained credibility. Authentic leadership,
      * rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value, 2003
      * Discover your true north
    - The desire and search for leaders who are psychologically self-aware and philosophically ethical goes back thousands of years and is evident across cultural boundaries. (Fiona Beddoes-Jones, 2009): leaders needed to be trusted who are authentic. They walk the talk.
    - This theory arches back to antiquity. Marcus Aurelius (121-180 AD) Emperor of Rome, General of the Roman legions and Stoic philosopher is arguably one of the first historical figures who could be considered to be an authentic leader.
    - His daily reflections and writings to himself; his ‘Meditations’ are still used in leadership development today.
      * *Everything we hear is an opinion, not a fact. Everything we see is a perspective, not the truth.*
    - Requirement for authentic leaders go back antiquity. Trustable.
  + Balance of psychological and philosophical self of Novicievic et. al., 2006.
    - What authentic leadership is emerging the boundary, the overlapping of psychological and philosophical self. Thoughts and values equate to self-awareness and moral virtue. And actions and behaviours are about self-regulation and moral action.
  + Diagram
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  + Moral Compass of Vogelgesang, Leroy and Avolio (2013)
    - Factor analysis, quan research, four factors of authentic leadership.
    - Balanced processing: don’t rush to decision, don’t bomb cuba, lets think a bit more. Looking to implications, so what?
    - Transparent: Be honest in talking.
  + Diagram
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  + Contemporary Leadership: University of Exeter
    - **Leadership and complexity, the systemic approach:** ideas like adaptive leadership
    - **Gender and leadership**
    - **Diversity, inclusion, and participation:** used to be gender, now broader, different orientaitons normal
    - **Corporate Social Responsibility:**
    - **Leadership and the challenge of Sustainability:** like food security, global warming
    - **Ethical dilemmas in leadership:** world of unknowns creates dilemmas, like currency, airplane or wellbeing of people decision of strategic leader, bombing the building in it also kids.
    - **Critical perspectives on power:** Power and influence theory
    - **Leadership in peace and conflict:** sometimes in conflict we need more transactional style initially.
    - **Stress and well being:** Especially for str leaders burn out syndrome.
    - **Leadership on social movements**
    - **Leadership, change, and continuity**
    - **Culture, context, and leadership**
  + **The Four Journeys of a Leader: Jillian Stamp,** 2002, Winsdor Leadership Trust, church leader in UK and duke of edinburg, discuss leadership with business, gov, mil etc. This one one self analytical tool,
    - **The underlying journey is the journey of the self**: what unfolds for us over the years. An important element of this journey is the growth of our capacity to make decisions, particularly decisions in circumstances where we do not – and cannot – *know* what to do.
    - **The second journey is our public journey**, where we apply our capacity to make decisions to the world of work.
    - **The third is our private journey**, based in our habitat – the place we leave and return to each day. We might share this journey with close friends, a partner, children, each of whom is on their own journeys.We have to reconcile these 3 journeys.
    - **The fourth is our personal journey**, in which we look after ourselves and weave the four journeys together
    - <http://www.gillianstamp.com/?page_id=7>
    - If we don’t reconcile these 4 journey as a leaders it causes stress.
  + **Leadership as a relationship**
    - RAF General: Strategic leaders are enough intelligence, what differentiate is their ability to build relationships through emotional intelligence.
    - Senior leaders and their subordinates in chain, transactional relationship, they do to promote, obey, you own their careers.
    - When you come strategic level and work across civil and military service, you don’t own their careers. If you build relationship, mutual trust and respect you can enable them to do something.
    - Maker and breaker of leadership at strategic level is about relationship.
    - ILO: Examine relational leadership through a theoretical lens
    - Topics
      * Leaders and Followers
      * Leadership and Followership relationship
      * Vertical Dyad Linkage Model (VDL)
      * Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX)
      * LMX in a post industrial world
* **Relationship between leaders and followers:**
  + Leaders and followers are more similar than different and would do well to act that way.
  + Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) described followership as the mirror image of leadership.
    - Critical attributes of good follower are similar with attributes of good leader.
  + Raelin (2003) cited a number of studies that point to a false dichotomy between leaders and followers.
    - They have independent but related relationship.
  + Amar (2001) described leadership and followership as intertwined concepts that cannot be separated from one another. In fact, the practice of Japanese business schools is to teach leadership and followership as two integrated facets (Amar, 2001).
  + <https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue_6/pdf/grayson_speckhart.pdf>
  + So Literature says leaders and followers are in a relationship.
  + What is this relationship?
* **Leader Follower Relationship**
  + Leadership exists only within the context of a relationship. It is an intensely personal process of relating to another person who, if influenced, becomes a follower. If there are no followers, there is no need for a leader. It makes sense, then, that leadership is accomplished most effectively from the base of a positive and healthy relationship with others. And, in fact, without positive relationship and people skills, it is very hard to be an effective leader.
  + Manion, J. (2015) The leadership Relationship. Part 1, Understanding Trust.
  + The Journal of PeriAnesthisia Nursing. April 2015, Vol 20, 2, pp.153-156
  + Afghan proverb: if you are a leader and you set forward, and nobody follows you walk alone.
  + **Short definition of leadership**: If there is no follower there is no leader. Leadership is having followership.
* R**elational Approach to Leadership**
  + The relational approach shifts the focus from characteristics of leaders and followers (traits and situational) and leadership behaviour (functional and skills) to the relationships between leaders and followers.
  + The relational approach progressed from an early phase focussed on vertical dyadic linkage (VDL)model to the notion of leader member exchange (LMX).
  + **Graen, G.B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995), “Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective”, Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 219-47**
  + Diagram, text
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  + **Stage 1. Vertical Dyad Linkage Model- Differentiated Dyads.**
    - The most significant early relational model was Vertical Dyad Linkage model (Dansereau, Graen and Haga, 1975).
    - Leaders treat individual followers differently, they do not treat them with the same ‘style’. Followers offered different descriptions of the same leader. So they **categorize** the followers.
    - Some followers reported a positive relationship, high levels of trust and respect. Other followers perceived their relationship to be strained, lower perception of the leader and the importance of the work.
    - So what? These relationships are fundamentally important to organizational success.
    - Variations in the linkage patterns resulted in two types of relationships : Members of the ‘in-group’ and members of the ‘out-group’.
  + **In and Out Groups, Leaders choice: compatibility, liking, similar values and personality- Leaders and followers negotiate their respective roles.** 
    - **The in-group:** High levels of trust, mutual influence and support characterised in group exchanges. Assistant, lieutenant or advisor to the leader. Exchanges allow for wider latitude in task development more responsibility in and influence in decision making. Work harder, be more committed, take on additional work, be loyal. Maintained by leader meeting needs of in-group followers.
    - **The out-group:** low levels of trust and support. Authoritarian and task orientated communication. Meet formal role expectations, follow SOPs, meet deadlines. This is transactional relationship.
  + **Stage 2. Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX)- Relationship and   
    outcomes**
    - LMX theory focussed on the **quality of the relationship** between individual leader and follower rather than categorising them as in or out group. Greater the quality better the outcomes.
    - Links between relational quality and individual and organisational effectiveness. Idea of categorizing is detrimental to organizational potential.
    - High LMX: More productive, higher job satisfaction, less likely to quit, enjoy better psychological health, committed, go beyond, successful, provide honest feedback, motivated, influential.
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* + **Stage 3. Leadership Making- Leadership a partnership**
    - As explained by Graen and Uhl-Bien in 1995, **leadership-making attempts** to make every subordinate feel as if he or she is a part of the ‘in-group’ and by doing so avoids the inequities and negative implications of being in an ‘out-group’.
    - Leadership making promotes the building of partnerships in which the leader tries to build effective dyads with all employees in the work unit and in addition create networks of partnerships throughout an organisation which will benefit the organisation’s goals as well as their own career progress.
    - In a revision of LMX theory in 1987 (Graen & Scandura) and 1991 and 1995 (Graen and Uhl-Bien); the development of the relationship in a leader-subordinate dyad was described in terms of the **“life cycle model”**. The life cycle had three stages:
      * **‘The stranger phase.’** The relationship begins with an initial testing phase. Leader and subordinate evaluate each others' motives, attitudes and potential recourses to be exchanged; they establish their mutual role expectations. Some relationships do not progress beyond this initial or first stage.
      * **‘The acquaintance phase.’** In the second stage the exchange arrangement is refined, and mutual trust, loyalty and respect are developed.
      * **‘The mature partnership Phase’**. In the third or ‘mature’ stage in the relationship the exchange formally based on self interest is transformed into mutual commitment to the mission and the objectives of the organisation or work unit.
    - According to Graen and Uhl-Bien writing in 1991 the first stage corresponds to transactional leadership and the third stage to transformational leadership.
    - Here leadership evolve from transactional to transformational.
    - Remember theories who argue they may co-exist.
  + **Stage 4. Team Making- Systems of interdependent dyadic relationships or network assemblies** 
    - Focused on how differentiated dyadic relationships combine to form larger systems of network assemblies or leadership structures- a network of relationships based on mutual dependencies.
  + **LMX Theory Continued** 
    - In assessing the validity of the LMX theory, the body of literature as reflected by Yukl and Northouse, would not place contemporary research interest or focus on ‘in-groups’ and ‘out-groups.’ Although as Northouse argues it does give recognisable ‘voice’ to the reality of group dynamics within an organisation, he states
    - *“We may not like this because it seems unfair, but it is a reality and the LMX theory has accurately described this situation……Some people contribute more and receive more others contribute less and get less ”*
  + Northouse highlights some other strengths of the theory summarised as; Unique in placing the dyadic relationship at the centre of the leadership process. Noteworthy as it directs attention to the importance of communication in leadership. Finally with its post 1995 evolution and link to organisational outcomes it contributes a large body of research as to how the practice of LMX theory is related to positive organisational outcomes.
  + **LMX Theory The End** 
    - The LMX theory has as its core assumption that the leader is the dominant partner in all the dyadic relationships, dyadic relationships are a combination of two vectors; could circumstances exist where the leader is not the dominant vector?
    - Take for example the contemporary knowledge-based industries where human capital is an organisation’s primary asset, to assume a rather Industrial relationship between the leadership and followership fails to recognise the shift in the influence and power of often young and ‘junior’ key income generators in the highly competitive financial or IT sectors. The role of Nick Leason for example in Bearings Bank and his part in its downfall might be a fertile research area for LMX in a post-Industrial scenario.
    - Critical vector may ship, technician advice of fly not possible. Or programmers more important than managers.
  + Einstein: there’s nothing wrong with being unsure, clever people ask the most questions.
  + Literature
    - Johnson, C, E. Kackman, M.Z. (2018) Leadership a Communication Perspective. Long Grove, Illinois. Waveland Press.
    - Uhl-Bien, M. (2006), “Relational leadership theory: exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing”, The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 654-76.
    - Uhl-Bien, M. and Maslyn, J.M. (2003), “Reciprocity in manager-subordinate relationships: components, conﬁgurations and outcomes”, Journal of Management, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 511-32.
    - Graen, G.B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995), “Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective”, Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 219-47
    - Schedlitzki, D. and Edwards G. (2014) Studying Leadership, Traditional and Critical Approaches. Sage, London. Pp. 100-119
* LMX-Which style?
  + Fundemental framework for styles was autocratic, democratic, and laissez faire came out in 1938. By American pschologist. Kurt Lewin’s Leadership
  + Autocratic will be a low LMX relationship.
  + Democratic-high LMX
  + Laissez faire-no rel
  + Other styles are variations of dem & aut styles.
  + Today there are 2 broad group of styles, as transformational and transactional.
* **Distributed Leadership**
* Main conclusion of research on strategic leadership: At the strategic level you cant do all your self. So you need to distribute decision making. You need to have a model of leaderhip that enables and empowers subordinates leaders to make decision. High LMX people have close relationship with mutual trust.
* Two broad approaches in leadership
  + All knowing, omnipotent leader
  + Distributed leadership model: within current complexity group decision needed. Distributed activity among senior group. Or board.
* Responsibility falls with leader but he still need leadership and decision making of others.
* **Distributed Leadership- The Theory-**
  + ‘*A web of leadership activities and interactions stretched across people and situations*’ (Camburn et al 2003), Spider analogy, web all sort of interactive,
  + There is a strong theoretical frame: (Harris 2008)
  + Spillane (2006, educational theorist) drawing on distributed cognition and activity theory argues that Distributed Leadership Theory is best understood as ‘practice distributed over leaders, followers and their situation and incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals’. A social distribution of leadership where the leadership function is ‘stretched over the work of a number of individuals and the task is accomplished through the interaction of multiple leaders’ (Spillane et al 2001:20). This is a much more complex world.
  + Changing structures crossing boundaries: trend towards flatter matrix rather than hierarchies, reorganisation is endemic, as Wageman et al (2008) note:
    - *‘….in the longer term the key to success lies in the ability to create and manage effective teams, to stimulate an environment in which innovation and knowledge sharing are not just given lip service and to communicate complex concepts of strategy comprehensibly to a wider stakeholder group’*
  + In the public and private sectors there is need to build broad based leadership capacity in order to survive. ‘*well executed distributed leadership is a key feature of effective models of leadership*’ (DfES, 2007:89). **Idea:** Leadership doesn’t belong to a single leader.
  + A move away from the *leader-follower* dynamic to a model of *leader interaction* at various levels within the organisation.
* **Bifurcation of leadership:Peter Gronn** 2000, two approaches
  + Bass (1985) Transformational leadership representing an apogee of individualism.
  + Jaques (1989) managerial leadership: systemic properties and role structures devoid of any sense of agency., transactional leadership
  + Agency and Structure a social reality: not ontological dualism but ontologically intertwined in how we sense of the world. 10 years ago business schools were argued they are independent.
  + Causal relationship between leadership and the outcomes of action – substitutes for leadership argument (end of leadership).Intertwined complex series of relationship.
  + Less romanticism of the concept.who is the leader? Well, group of people.
* Bolden et al., (2011, p.11) offer the following definition:
  + “…*argues for a less formalized model of leadership where leadership is dissociated from the organisational hierarchy. It is proposed that individuals at all levels in the organisation and in all roles can exert leadership influence over their colleagues and thus influence the overall direction of the organisation.”*
  + High LMX group approach reinforcing this idea.
  + Age of information brings also people’s ability to influence. A program writer in microsoft has huge effect even young. Impact of output.
  + You can not dissociate distributed leadership in its sort of idealized form from the reality of power and politics. Means there is always play of power and politics in organizations.
* **Distributed Leadership as Business–Education-Philosophy**
  + ‘…a cursory examination of its usage suggests it means different things to different people, arguing practitioners and Scholars often used shared leadership, democratic leadership and distributed leadership interchangeably…’
  + Spillane,J.P. Sherer,J.Z. (2004) *A Distributed Perspective on School Leadership: Leadership Practice As Stretched Over People and Place.* Paper presented at the American Education Association, San Diego, April. [J-spillane@nwu.edu](mailto:J-spillane@nwu.edu)
  + Even in the military we use associated term “mission command”.
  + Spillane, J. P. (2006) *Distributed Leadership.* John Wiley, And Sons. San Francisco
  + Kakabadse, K. Kakabadse, N. Lee-Davies, L. (2008), *Leading for Success*. Palgrave McMillan, Basingstoke, UK.
  + Johansen, B. (2017) The New Leadership Literacies. Berrett-Koehler. Oakland CA.
  + Grint, K. (1997) Ed. *Leadership: Classical, Contemporary, Classical and Critical Approaches.* Oxford University press, Oxford
* **Andrew Kakabadse, The Business Case,** he talks about the transition of leadership from the boss or board, in order business to survive, moving away from characteristics, ideas of prescribed roles , to a discretionary leadership, distributed throughout company. He explains it as roles, whether prescribed or discretionary.
  + No one person is likely to embody the capacity to fully appreciate the different leadership requirements of different contexts.
  + A number of viewpoints and inputs are required in order to make a powerful impact on a particular situation.
  + He examines leadership from the perspective of **role and team contribution rather than personal characteristics**. Drawing on the work of Jacqes (1951) Kakabadse explores leadership from an organisational perspective looking at the;
    - ‘***prescribed*’** roles of the leader. (defined as when 51% or more of a role requires the occupant to purse and complete tasks and objectives already pre-set) and, *tanımlı , ex: you will get %x profit margin*
    - ‘***discretionary*’** (defined as when 51% or more of the role is determined by the occupant). *İhtiyari*
  + Degree of discretionary leadership found distributed throughout contemporary businesses rather than it being the preserve of the Board. This is not an anarchic distribution of strategic direction setting, although the research showed divergence of strategic views, but how junior staff could influence strategic decisions through their usually negative effect on stakeholders specifically clients. For example losing key accounts or leaving the organisation and taking key client accounts with them. The requirement for a ‘*corporate value added perspective’* Kakabadse states can only be achieved by **individuals being replaced by teams and these teams evolving into a cadré** (Fayol 1949).
  + Senior managers are required to hold **multiple team memberships as leaders and followers** with potentially conflicting; functional, line, corporate, operating, and regional responsibilities.
    - This is the complexity level of leadership at strategic level.
  + The difference between team and cadré based leadership as degrees of complexity; complexity being context and multiplicity of stakeholders. He argues that the notion of pre-determined leadership capabilities, such as providing followers with clear direction, has little relevance in today’s business world where follower in one context can be influential stakeholder and shareholder/owner in another.
  + **Kakabadse Migration of Leadership Models**
    - Transactional and transformational leadership is outdated, when we deal with discretionary authority, critical decision role changes depend on situation. If it is about financial thing, then financial member of this cadre takes the lead. If blended maybe CEO.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics** | **Control/**  **Transactional** | **Transformational** | **Discretionary** |
| **Projected**  **image** | “Strong Man”  • Rational Man  • Omnipresent | Hero  • Superman (Ubermensch)  • “Maverick”  • Merlin  • Athlete  • Omnipotent | Professional executive  • Co-creator  • Distributed |
| **Metaphor** | Manager (individual) | Leader (individual) | Leadership cadre |

* **The Educational Case: Concertive Action Through Relationships,** Prompted by large academic organizations, that have gone from complicated to complex. They are saying distributed leadership is concertive action through relationships. So relationships have critical role at the strategic level. Educational org are classical ones, with this approach they are trying to break this.
  + A broadly accepted understanding of the term resonates with Gronn’s (2002) emphasis on distributed leadership as ‘concertive action through relationships’ Bennett et al (2003) ‘the Distributed Leadership Project’:
    - to build theory through research, leadership practice takes shape in the interaction of people, both leaders and followers and their situation, including the material artefacts, tools, and organisational structures.
  + Ongoing role of inspection in organizations: Kimber (2003), a deputy head of a small British secondary school notes; that in the five small secondary schools he visited that practised distributed leadership, leadership was in his words; ‘inclusive rather than exclusive’. The emphasis was on collaboration, teamwork and the enabling of middle managers with a clear expectation that staff had to deliver on their responsibilities. There was also the understanding that the organisation maintained the capacity for robust intervention should things go wrong.
    - If schools seems not to be performing well, often with these distributed leadership models of head team, paradoxically Brti gov parachuting a super head from outside with no relationship. In the crises educational system parachute in superhead.
  + *‘In developing a distributed perspective on leadership, we moved beyond acknowledging leadership practice as an organisational property in order to investigate how leadership might be conceptualized as a distributed practice stretched over the social and situational contexts of the school.’ (Spillane et al, 2004)*
  + Associate Professor John Diamond, Harvard Graduate School of Education
    - A **distributed perspective** serves as a new conceptual frame,
    - "It helps us understand leadership practice and how leadership practices might work more effectively in the context of schools."
    - "It is not a type of leadership or a style of leadership. It's not a model of leadership. It's not something you place on top of a school and say, 'Now you are doing distributed leadership.'"
    - A distributed perspective, "thinking about the situation as an integral part of the leadership context; it is an integrated view of leaders' thinking, their activity and behaviours, and the situation."
  + **Spillane and Diamond on Distributed Leadership**
    - We (standard definition) think of leadership as an influence relationship – the ability to influence the practices of others in ways that bring about a 'major change in form, nature, and function of some phenomenon,’ (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994 and Bennis & Nanus, 1985.)
    - Distributed leadership moves beyond trying to understand leadership through the actions and beliefs of single leaders. It is constituted through the interaction of leaders, teachers, and the situation as they influence instructional practice. Distributed leadership is a powerful way to understand leadership activity in schools in more complex and interconnected ways.
  + The appeal to schools of distributed leadership, Why?
    - individual, there is little consensus in the practitioner community or amongst scholars, as to what a model of distributed leadership should look like. It is all about inter connection, mutual but there is no absolute agreement.
    - One is the paradigm shift away from the heroic leader or “head” model, which has diminishing appeal in contemporary egalitarian attitudes. So they don’t like hierarchies, but when model fails, they bring back hierarchy.
    - Second is more practical; a view that the task is now too complex for one person to accomplish single-handedly.
    - Beyond the general recognition that leadership in schools should not be vested in one person, there’s not a really an absolute model of it.
* The Philosophical Case
  + Grint (2004) argues Distributed Leadership is both a philosophy and a method.
    - As a philosophy it is appealing when contrasted to ‘traditional’ leadership as it embodies decentralisation, social responsibility and collective learning while encouraging subordinates to lead and facilitate the growth of social capital; arguing that these appeal in contemporary terms as they appear progressive or liberal or generally beneficial.
  + Many heralds distributed leadership as the future ‘form’ of leadership when examining leadership as a process.
  + Distributed leadership is not a utopian alternative for people suffocated by bureaucracy or inhibited by idiosyncratic individualists. It is a blend of ‘*collective responsibility*’ and ‘*collective flexibility*’:
    - Collective responsibility in terms of the building of a social community by lots of uniquely skilled individuals contrasted with a private empire created by a Carlyle (1795-1881) styled heroic figure.
    - Collective flexibility contrasts ‘traditional’ hierarchies depicted as being unyielding and imposing limits on the flexibility of those appointed to office with distributed leadership implying a shift towards ‘heterarchy’; a more flexible structure that retains a necessary degree of coherence and coordination without requiring the incumbents to operate within strictly defined limits.
* **Military case: Field Marshal Helmuth Carl Bernhard Graf von Moltke, The ‘father’ of *Auftragstaktik* (**encapsulates a style of command: "tactics focused on accomplishing the task/mission**) Von moltke Elder.**
* Bryan, “military case supersedes other cases by far”. He reconstitute Prussian army after a series of defeats at the hands of French (Napoleon). Battle of Austerlitz and Yana where superior Prussian army was roundly defeated by Napoleon’s Grand Armee. This was a massive shock. Like Saddam defeats US-Allied force in Iraq. Can you imagine what would impact on US? Unexpected happened. It had strategic impact, it caused the Prussians to fundamentally re-examine not just the way they fought, but the way they lead. There was a strict hierarchy in the old Prussian Army, you cannot do anything without permission generally in writing. So if the enemy were not following your plan of battle you need permission to adopt. So while enemy were creating havoc, you had to get permission to do something different from the original plan of the battle. von Moltke said this is crazy, this is how we lost. Clausewitz was a general in these battles wrote On War. But Moltke CHOD for 30 years wrote new way of leading. He called it ***Auftragstaktik -*mission orders.**
* This hasn’t been adopted by US and Brits till 1980s. Before they followed old Prussian methodologies of very detailed orders and plans of battle.
* WW2: Germans did not practice it because of control-freak Hitler, required all plans approved by him and change it and send back. Brit also did not practice it. But Alan Turing intercept and get plans so they were defeated. 1939-1942 implemented by Germans and they were massively successful. Till big mistake to march on Moscow.
* Birt introduced this Revolution in military affairs after couple of hundred years. BMD 1989

TDN 8 (1991 draft), TDN 8 (1991)

* *“If I always appear prepared, it is because, before entering on an undertaking, I have meditated for long and have foreseen what may occur. It is not genius which reveals to me suddenly and secretly what I should do in circumstances unexpected by others; it is thought and meditation.”* Napoleon
* **Early Prussian/German Thought,** essentially promotes distributed leadership function across the organization. It is done through the developing of a new concept of discipline. Not obeying orders, but acting in accordance with the intent. Commander says this is my intent, how it happens is up to you guys. So junior leaders have huge freedom of action within the boundaries of intent. You do not follow series of tasks but you devise series of tasks achieves intent. If situation change you change the tasks.
* *Auftragstaktiker*, argued that no such recipes were possible. Tactical decisions should be left to junior leaders on the spot. Anything else would drive out the spirit of initiative. Junior leaders had to be trusted to make the right decisions. The Army had to learn to live with and exploit chaos, not seek to control it.
* The *Auftragstaktiker* of the Prussian Army, which after 1871 became the German Army, were developing a new concept of discipline. Discipline did not mean following orders but acting in accordance with intentions. The phrase ‘thinking obedience’ begins to appear.
* Distinctions were made between an ‘order’ (‘*Befehl*’) and a ‘task’ or ‘mission’ (‘*Auftrag*’).
* ‘Directives’ (‘*Weisungen*’) as an alternative to orders.
* In 1877, General Meckel wrote that a directive had two parts. The first was a description of the general situation and the commander’s overall intention. The second was the specific task. Meckel stressed the need for clarity: The intention should convey absolute clarity of purpose by focussing on the essentials and leaving out everything else. The task should not be specified in too much detail. Above all, the senior commander was not to tell his subordinate *how* he was to accomplish his task, as he would if were to issue an order. The first part of the directive was to give the subordinate freedom to act within the boundaries set by the overall intention. The intention was binding. The task was not. A German officer’s *prime* duty was to reason why. Germans were encouraged to challenge their chain of command.
* The new Field Service Regulations, the *Exerziersreglement* of 1888. It recognised that battle quickly becomes chaotic. It emphasised independence of thought and action, stating that ‘a failure to act or a delay are a more serious fault than making a mistake in the choice of means’. The responsibility of every officer was to exploit their given situation to the benefit of the whole. The guiding principle of action was to be the intent of the higher commander. Officers were to ask themselves the question: ‘What would my superior order me to do if he were in my position and knew what I know?’. An understanding of intent was the *sine qua non* of independent action.
  + - No plans stands contact when contact with the enemy
    - Working by intent: sense of mutual understanding-distributed ledearship
* **Before mission command: for USA-Brit: in between 1945-1960 or 1990:** 
  + NATO forces face Soviet. They rely on nuclear weapon. NATO were superior because US could deliver nucs anywhere in Soviet.
  + Soviets developed atom bomb and nucs but they do not have intercontinental ballistic missiles. They couldn hit USA, they could hit Europe with bombers and with short range Scud missiles.
  + So, US leading NATO dictated that doctrine for fighting was try to beat Russians on the ground, if it failed we nuke them. They can nuke us tactically but not strategically. We can destroy every city in Russia. Europe for US not so important. This approach reflected in command post exercises. Sun comes when battle ends. But we did not think afterward, strange! Bryan as cynical captain called this choreography for war. We were creating choreography, like a dance, where everything follow steps. It was sort of British way. We had a campaign plan that we would follow.
  + In 1957 a precursor to something changing. Impact Brits later. Launch of Sputnik. Worlds first satellite. It was not the Sputnik that shocked NATO it was the rocket that carry the satellite. RA 7/7A (8K71), SS-6 Sapwood. SS-6 was judged as intercontinental ballistic missile. So relying mainly to nucs makes no sense anymore.
* **Context: Forward Defence – Trip Wire- to MAD (second response),** so Americans concerned and NATO adopted flexible response. Now NATO forces required conventional forces in order not to raise the threshold to nuc war.
  + 1967 NATO’s adoption of Flexible Response: called for improved conventional NATO forces capable of holding and defeating a Soviet incursion (‘Direct Defence’) followed, if necessary, by ‘Deliberate Escalation’ (short range tactical nuclear weapons) and finally ‘General Nuclear Release’.
  + 1970/80s: capability of soviet clear, they could hit anywhere so, shift of doctrine to avoid general nuke release. Even avoid tactical nukes. They were not seen as answer to problem. USA and Brits developed more integrated capability to fight on the ground. To hold and defeat soviet incursion.
    - US Doctrine of ‘The Air Land Battle’
    - UK Doctrine of The Manoeuvrist approach
    - New Northern Army Group GDP (86)– Manoeuvre at army group level rather than series of isolated Corps battles
      * Now it becomes too complex, required German way of fighting.
* **The Bagnall Reforms:** Brian for this shift was Field Marshall Sir Nigel Bagnall 1927-2002)
  + We had allies who fought Russians, he talked a lot with Germans
  + He was thinker: Commander army group north: he convinced German government to trade space for time. Germans demanded frontline defence. Cynical officers called it dash-dig-dye doctrine. We dash from barracks in Germany to inner German border where we dig. And wait to die. We overwhelmed by Russians by soviet high manoeuvre 3th Shock army. But we weren’t allowed to defend in depth. Because Germans did not trade space.
  + He was also unconventional general: Ginger Group think tank. Ginger hair, bad tempers. Students, academics, businessman, what they know about fighting?He has diversity of thought in group.
  + He developed **maneouverist approach.** Having read Moltke and Clausewitz original, he thought best way to adopt Augh tactic of germans**.** Because germans were unstoppable, germans fighting doctrine was lightening war, blitzkrieg. It enable by aughtactic. These mission orders. **He did not say aughtactic but he named it mission command.** The British Way, A Command Philosophy Requires:
    - Timely decision making
    - Clear understanding of superior commander’s intention
    - The subordinates ability to meet the superior’s remit
    - The commander’s determination to see the plan though to a successful conclusion
    - British Defence Doctrine 2nd Edition 2001
  + 5 Key Elements:exactly same, aughtactic
    - A commander ensures subordinates understand his intentions, their own missions and the strategic, operational and tactical context
    - Subordinates are told what effect they are to achieve and the reasons why
    - Subordinates are allocated sufficient resources, commander gives means to subordinate to achieve ends. Subs may challenge and say this is not enough. Commander should allocate reserve.
    - A commander uses a minimum of control so as not to limit a subordinate’s freedom of action
    - Subordinates decide for themselves how best to achieve their missions
  + **Command style most suited to the Manoeuverist Approach in that it :**
    - encourages quick reaction to rapidly changing circumstances.
    - encourages commanders to exploit fleeting opportunities.
    - minimises the potential effects of a vulnerable communications network.
      * US move away because of their huge assets to see battleground. But cyber attacks made them return again to mission command.
    - **In essence it provides the means to generate high tempo and develop subordinates.**
    - **If juniors are not trained to decide how they become a tomorrows decision maker?**
* How do you do it military distributed leadership or mission command?
* Mission command model of Bryan
* The Command space defined by constraints and characterised by a balance of freedoms and controls.
  + 1st space: Constraints are above the ability of anyone in the chain of command to influence. Like size of the planet. GDP, size of air force. Things that we don’t control over.
  + 2nd space: Things that you have control over and grant freedoms:
    - Line to corner: there is no such thing of total control or freedom. Human being can say no!
* Diagram
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* The Commander’s Position an expression of the relationship between a commander and their superior in terms of delegated freedoms and imposed controls.
  + As a commander you were given order to do something. You do mission analysis, you look what control your boss imposed, and what freedom he has granted.
  + Then within the intent of the boss, which part of the control, you start to delegate freedoms to your subordinates. You cant delegate controls as freedoms. Control is delegated as control.
* Diagram, shape
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* **The subordinate’s command position in relation to the commander on the continuum of controls and freedoms**
* The Commanders Call – cognitive or Gut?Bryan says both. Its about personality and the acceptance of risk? Variables How to decide freedom to delegate, portion? **Mission command reality check.** 
  + **Trust in the Commander’s superior:** First you think whats relationship you have with boss?Are they really freedoms? Maybe boss pretends to be mission command actually control freak. You will also set more controls and that’s why arrow do not overlap. You always keep some responsibilities, reserve.
  + **Subordinate’s Maturity:** High LMX subodinat eor low? What degree you trust them? Then look to subordinate maturity. (Maturity term is less pejorative than trust)Term comes from Hersey and Blanchard’s situational leadership theory. Style of leadership depends on maturity of subordinate. They measured this in terms of commitment and competence. If you got high maturity ---> lots of freedom, or vice versa.
  + **Situation:** degree of control freedom may change depend on situation.
  + **Scale of effect/consequence of a mistake.** Even thought sus are competent and situation good if errors will be strategic you keep control.
  + **Ability to interject**
* Diagram
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* **Force Field Analysis** for change**:** Kurt Lewins[[1]](#footnote-1),(dem, aut, laissez faire leadership models)
  + Simple method of looking to factors support or destroy idea. Pull&push factors
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* Distributed leadership is not something ‘done’ by an individual ‘to’ others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization... [it] is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action. (Bennett et al. 2003, p. 3)
* “Distributed Leadership offers a powerful post- heroic representation of leadership well suited to complex, changing and interdependent environments. The challenge will be whether or not organisations and the holders of power will be sufficiently flexible to enable this to occur in practice.”
* Mission command is at center in Brti doctrine, and leadership doctrine.
* The starfish and the spider, Ori brafman, Rod A. Beckstrom
  + Gorilla-complete autocratic
  + Buffalo-still autocratic but a little bit distributed leadership, big guy and family groups. Indians lives with buffalo wit symbiotically. Europeans with rifles, insatiable appetite for leather. They shoot big guy first then all.
  + Geese: they lead at the front interchangeably. V shape creates incredible lift. A kind of distributed leadership
  + Flock of birdsstarling create incredible cloud for defennse. They move around. Who is in charge?change pattern instantly, how they communicate?zenith of distributed leadership.
  + Inka and Aztec, autocratic, Spanish model was to find king, threaten to death capture city
  + Apache had small groups that model didn’t work. Distributed, never created cities, lives small communities.
  + Gist of book: the more hierarchial are far more vulnerable
* Employing neurodiverse people to increase immunity. These are outliers and hard to employ but organizations need them. Dr. Robbie. If alan turing was not tolerated enigma code never broke. Because he was different, needs, personality etc. He commit suicide because these are not tolerated. LMX theory they stay out group.
* **Problem Typologies Lecture**
  + 1980, usa, describing problems by their types. They gave strange names.
  + Types of problems shape the way we addressing and categorizing these problems.
  + USA urban planner, Rittel and Webber, tamed and wicked problems
  + Keith grint, Brit: what sort of style of management or leadership would you used to deal with different types of problems? He introduced crisis problem, critical problem
  + 1970, harvard doctor, Ronald Heifetz (from medical psychiatric to leadership, shapes his way of thinking, influencer of how we think about leadership, wrote a book about adaptive leadership, “Leadership without easy answers”). Like Rittel and Webber he contrasts two broad types of problem. Adaptive and technical problem.
  + Adaptive leadership is a useful framework in the strategic context. In the context you’re dealing with complex problems. Like national security. What sort of a problem is this national security?
  + Appropriate approaches to addressing. Grint address what we mean by command, manage, and lead. Heuristic of grint.
    - Crisis problem-we need command it.
    - Tamed problem we need to manage it.
    - Wicked proble we need to lead it.
* Quotations
  + Peter principle: In hierarchies most people promoted to level of their incompetence. So, hierarchies are doomed. Normally people are need to promote to the level they do brilliantly. We tend to do that people will leave where they end up.
  + Some problems are so complex (means beyond complicated) that you have to be highly intelligent and well informed just to be undecided about them. *Dr Laurence J. Peter*
    - *We generally very decisive which may not be good.*
    - *Complex problems: where cause and effects do not align. Don’t rush a solution. Resist your temptation to rush a solution.*
    - *Good piece of advise leading at strategic level.*
  + *If I had an hour to solve a problem, I would spend 55 minutes thinking about the problem and 5 minutes thinking about solutions. Einstein*
* *Proble level: national, regional, global, they have all effects on person.*
* *‘Every problem interacts with other problems and is therefore part of a set of interrelated problems, a system of problems…. I choose to call such a system a mess.’*

Prof Russell L. Ackoff (1919-2009) Professor Emeritus of Management Science at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. Pioneer in the field of operations research, systems thinking and management science.

* **I have a Problem!!! How you approach? How you make sense of it?**
  + When faced with a problem, the kind of question we need to process at the outset are:
  + **What kind of a problem is it?** Come across before?
  + **Do I have enough information?** Don’t rush with available information.
  + Am I looking to solve it, resolve it, manage it, mitigate its consequences or something else?
* **Problem estimate, appreciation**
  + Basic assumption is there is a solution.
  + Solution reached at the end will solve the problem. That’s tactical and operational level of solving the problems. That’s why we are promoted. We are good at problem solving.
  + When we come a different level problem get being different. Defining problem is difficult. Like defining problem at national security? How you collect info? It depends on where you are. Navy, air force, army?
* Diagram
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* Introducing Problems (Rittel-Webber, 1973)
  + Defining problems is an intractable problem in itself.
  + Where in all this “mess” (Ackoff’s) the does the problem really lie?
  + Distinguishing between an observed condition and a desired condition.
    - We see what the problem is but it is not the type we may deal. We look for a problem we can handle. We reframe the problem to be the problem we like rather than the problem is.
  + Equally intractable is the problem of identifying the actions that might effectively narrow the gap between ‘what-is’ and ‘what-ought-to-be’.
* **Tame Problems** (Rittel-Webber, 1973)
  + The problems are those that follow rules. Scientists and engineers deal with "tame" or "benign" problems.
    - Because the problems follows rules, it can be solved by following the rules that solve the problem. So there is a solution.
  + Consider, for example, a problem of mathematics, such as solving an equation; or the task of an organic chemist in analyzing the structure of some unknown compound; or a chess player attempting checkmate in five moves.
  + In such problems, the mission is clear. The adherence to rules *(like sop)* makes the problem self clarifying therefore the process is clear, in turn, the result is clear and measurable. *Learn the rules* and you’ll learn problem behaviour!
  + Tame Problems may be challenging or complicated, but are *fundamentally resolvable*; (getting across the obstacle, may be tunnel, ferry, etc)
    - There is a clear end-state, or defined metrics for success.
    - This end-state can be achieved if the right solution is applied.
    - The solution, or the way of producing the solution, is (largely) known.
      * Solutions are self-evident
* **Wicked Problems** (Rittel-Webber, 1973), they don’t mean evil, although some wicked problem might be. They choose it as opposite of tame. To define a problem where there is essentially no solution.
  + The product of… complexity and uncertainty at the intersection of science, economics, politics and human behaviour… *and frequently include religion, beliefs, culture, tradition, emotions and expectations* 
    - *Example: UK National security strategy: it does not provide an answer to UK’s national security. It explains it gonna do do to minimize the effect of insecurity on the stakeholders, nation. It may be called UK national insecurity.*
    - *Cyber: each time there is solution it is defeated. So there is no solution*
    - *Climate change: we don’t even know what causes it. CO2emissions? There is a problem of formulating problem.*
  + Wicked Problems (sometimes described as ‘hard’ or ‘adaptive’ problems, as called by Heifetz) have no clear solution, and do not appear to be resolvable:
    - Often, the nature of the problem itself is a matter of perspective.
    - As soon as the issue appears settled, the problem morphs into a different one.
  + Wicked Problems are often complex, as opposed to complicated:
    - Complexity is more than the sum of its parts.
    - Complex things behave in non-linear, unpredictable ways.
    - They are not amenable to reduction or understanding through analysis of component parts alone.
    - Cause and effect has no relevance. You can not understand causality. You don’t know what cause climate change or insecurity.
  + The classical systems-approach of the military and the space programs is based on the assumption that **a planning project can be organized into distinct phases. Every textbook of systems engineering starts with an enumeration of these phases: "understand the problems or the mission," "gather information", "analyze information," "synthesize information and wait for the creative leap", "work out solution," or the like.** For wicked problems, however, this type of scheme does not work. (Rittel-Webber, 1973)
    - Syllabus, curriculum is a wicked problem, every one has a view on it. Value sets are different.
  + **Distinguishing Properties of Wicked Problems**(Rittel-Webber, 1973)
    - There is no definitive formulation of a wicked problem.
    - **Wicked problems have no stopping rule**: no understanding of whether solution is found.
    - Solutions to wicked problems are not true-or-false, but good-or-bad.
    - **There is no immediate and no ultimate test of a solution to a wicked problem**
      * With time passes you see whether it work or not.
      * Internment law to prosecute terrorists without evidence in N.Ireland in 70s. It didn’t work because relatives become terrorists out of anger. It seemed to lack national justice. Reflection on raiding houses with photographs even he realized this was a stupid plan. But at that time it makes sense.
    - Every solution to a wicked problem is a "one-shot operation"; because there is no opportunity to learn **by trial-and-error**, every attempt counts significantly.
      * Internment was trial and error, look if works. It cleared the streets but it had unintended consequences.
      * Equally you have to do something. So every attempt count significantly. But it doesn’t necessarily produce solution.
    - Wicked problems do not have an enumerable (or an exhaustively describable) set of potential solutions, nor is there a well-described set of permissible operations that may be incorporated into the plan.
      * Home secretary’s reaction to killings of IRA: Are you ready to give up freedom of movement in exchange of security? Parliament valued freedom. What degree of insecurity you withstand in order to be free?
    - Every wicked problem is essentially unique.
    - Every wicked problem can be considered to be a symptom of another problem.
      * Poverty causes crime etc. Economy is a wicked problem, crime is a wicked problem they are unique but has links. Part of the mess Ackoff called it.
    - The existence of a discrepancy representing a wicked problem can be explained in numerous ways. The choice of explanation determines the nature of the problem's resolution.
    - The planner has no right to be wrong: All solutions are hypotheses put up for challenge. They are not solutions.
  + Case study: More police-more arrested youts-become expert in crime in prison. Counter intuative
* The Clumsy Solution Space, Grint/ Productive Zone of Disequilibrium, Heifetz
  + View the problem from a multiple perspectives: We need to get into a space or zone where we can think differently. Think holistically. Youth crime is not only matter with police.
  + Understand underlying issues
    - Population growth: Crime statistically align with size of population. Maybe youth is larger than 10 years ago and the percentage is same.
    - Unemployment
    - Education
    - Poverty Gap
    - Social Justice
  + Clumsy Solutions to Wicked Problems, Grint 2005, 2008
    - Leaders need to create a “community of interest” around the problem
    - Strength comes from diversity of “opinions”; there can be no “experts”
    - Rich conversation – probably quite emotional, potentially acrimonious
    - Ensure an iterative or cyclic approach to tackling the problem
    - Pick-off tame problems as they are identified and treat independently
* Critical problem, Grint
  + Dealing with the bomb is critical but securing it doesn’t solve wicked problem of terrorism.
  + High inflation, if currency falls against dollar, crises.
  + Time: You may have tame problem with 5 days, boss request it in a day becomes critical problem.
* **Character and Nature of War: Character changes Nature enduring.**
  + Why we lost, Daniel P.Bolger
  + Harsh lessons, Ben Barry
  + What kind of a problem is war? War is generally crises. It is also part of the wicked problem. For some levels it is a tame problem. Winning is solving? We do not win wars anymore. What constitutes victory?
  + War has an enduring nature that demonstrates four continuities: political dimension, a human dimension, the existence of uncertainty, and that it is a contest of wills.
  + "War is more than a mere chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a paradoxical trinity – composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity… ; of the play of chance and probability… ; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone." – Carl von Clausewitz On War (BK 1 CH 1)
    - Being instrument to policy is the only tame portion
    - Conduct of war and afterwards is wicked problem
* How do we frame problems? **Keith Grint, 2005**
  + We can frame problems in order to think about how we tackle them.
  + 1st thing to do: assume the situation is objective and real. İf we think like that we can assume in certain way. We can understand the problem If it wicked we must lead. Build consensus, get into the clumsy solution space. Pick the tamed one and look complexity. How we reduce the impact. This is the role of leader.
  + If you have tame problem manage it. Just work out rules.
  + If it is critical problem you must command. Be affirmative. Make resolute fast decisions. Behaving like that in wicked problem is dangerous. In crisis it is must to reduce the impact of crises.
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* + Assumes the situation is objective, real & material
  + Concentrate on understanding the problem and then act accordingly:
    - a. It’s **Wicked** and we must therefore **Lead**
    - b. It’s **Tame** and we must therefore **Manage**
    - c. It’s **Critical** and we must therefore **Command**
  + Assumes the situation is socially constructed & symbolic
  + Concentrate on what we do best, what resources are available, what might work best & how to persuade the audiences?
    - a. **Leadership** - construct the problem as **Wicked**
    - b. **Management** - construct the problem as **Tame**
    - c. **Command** - Construct the problem as **Critical,** means intentionally make crises to be seen in command.
    - If the only tool you have is a hammer everything looks like a nail. Laurance J.Peter
    - Prepare to be all of them depending how real and apparent problem is.
  + **Command, Management, and Leadership Diagram, developed from Grint, 2008. ,**
  + Diagram
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    - **If you are commander you use phsical coercion**
    - **If you are maanger you calculate rational procedures.**
    - **If you are a leader it consists normative, influence to solve.**
  + Diagram, text
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    - **If the tame problem becomes crisis problem you know how to solve it so you solve it.**
    - **If the wicked problem becomes critical you twist part of it to tame problem to reduce impact. You take affirmative action, you prevent bomb for example but you cant deal with terrorism which is wicked problem.**
* Diagram
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* **We cant solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them. Einstein**
* Covid is a critical problem for its huge impact, but human health is wicked problem because everytime we struggle to be good health but there is no perfect solution.

**Adaptive Leadership**
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**Adaptive leadership** is an emergent process that occurs when people with different knowledge, beliefs, and preferences interact in an attempt to solve problems and resolve conflicts(Yukl & Gardner, 2020, p. 357)**.**

* Rittel-Webber (1973, tamed and wicked problems) and Heifetz (1994, technical and adaptive problems) are using different language on the same issue. There is a link between those two. Heifetz and Linsky took it different level after 20 years of work of Rittel-Webber.
* They argue problems are technical and adaptive. They often come together. Technical and adaptive elements intertwined. Covid:
* **Most problems are not stamped Technical or Adaptive. Most problems come mixed, with technical and adaptive elements intertwined.** Like Covid, technical aspects: combatting actual virus if we can, defeating the virus with science. it is also sits on adaptive problem of human health. Covid also damage other part of health system. Cured of virus but you have legacy in your health.
  + Leaders need **to distinguish** between technical problems and adaptive challenges.
  + **Tackle the technical problems within the organisation’s resources.** Things to do in order to reduce the impact of virus, like social distance, mask etc.
  + **Mobilise** learning and stakeholders (science) to address the adaptive challenges (virus itself). We can reduce spreading or mitigate effects of virus but we can’t stop it.
    - Recognise that some **adaptive challenges are insurmountable** and have to be lived with
    - **Minimise the impacts** of the adaptive challenges symptoms. We can’t cure covid, we are reducing the impact. Restricting travel, gatherings etc.
    - Stepping into the **unknown space** **disturbing the equilibrium** involves risk, individual and organisational can be disruptive and disorienting. Covid is a good case of it. Impacts to individuals and organizations. Policies in nature disruptive because you can’t freely travel, gather etc.
  + **Adaptive leaders learn to navigate the disequilibrium**. Not overwhelmed by it.
    - **Manage yourself.**
    - **Help people tolerate the discomfort** they are experiencing. Like working from home with partner and kids. Live with those new disequilibrium. Financial support schemes to help businesses not to close.
    - Distinguish through experimentation what is essential and what is expendable. We come to understand offices is not essential. Zoom meetings met the req to certain degree.
    - Your goal should be to maintain a Productive Zone of Disequilibrium (PDZ)
      * To much ‘heat’ and the organisation explodes.
      * To little and you lose engagement, lose attention and lose forward motion.
* Diagram
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  + Technical challenges-tamed problems, we have got solutions.
  + Technical and adaptive challenges interlocked, like covid.
* **Leader behaviour** 
  + **The Dance Floor versus The Balcony:** It is all about perspectives and diagnosis. Move between the Dance Floor and the Balcony- avoid being trapped. When dealing with adaptive problems you cant stay too long in one of those. Move between to propose better solutions. Battle space and operation room.
  + **The Dance Floor In the action**
    - See the people
    - Involved
    - Grounded in the reality around you
    - Swept up in the music
    - Make quick decisions
  + **The Balcony Above the action**
    - See the bigger Picture
    - Distanced perspective
    - Identify patterns ( organisation/ wider community)
    - Under less pressure to decide
  + **Identifying adaptive challenges**: Don’t get side lined into the technical challenges. This is not your job. Delegate those. You’re responsible, just keep an eye on them.
    - How you lead in adaptive situation? “Without urgency, difficult change becomes far less likely. But if people feel too much distress, they will fight, flee, or freeze. The art of leadership in today’s world involves orchestrating the inevitable conflict, chaos, and confusion of change so that the disturbance is productive rather than destructive”.Heifetz, Grashow and Linskey 2009 HBR
  + **Regulate distress:** People get distressed in this zone of disequilibrium, or in Grint’s term clumsy solution space. People are going to be disorientated. You need to manage, lead through this change.
    - **The Productive Zone of Disequilibrium  
       The optimal range of distress within which the urgency in the system motivates people to engage in adaptive work.**
    - Graphical user interface, application
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    - Keeping people in the zone of disequilibrium to deal with adaptive problem, otherwise disaster. Covid, if you gather disaster. If you are trained 100K soldier of Russia will destroy everything. So you got military training. You take people to this zoe. But you need not to pass to limit of tolerance. And not let people down of threshold of change. Keep on masking etc. Invasion is technical problem. But overall consequences is adaptive problem.
    - One of the feature of strategic environment, we’re living in unknown. Donald Rumsfeld three ideas of turbulence. Living in unknown unknown.
  + **Maintain disciplined attention:** **Adaptive Leaders learn to navigate the disequilibrium** Wear mask etc. Don’t be lazy, focus on it.
    - Manage yourself
    - Help people tolerate the discomfort they are experiencing
    - Distinguish through experimentation what is essential and what is expendable
    - Your goal should be to maintain a Productive Zone of Disequilibrium (PDZ)
      * To much ‘heat’ and the organisation explodes
      * To little and you lose engagement, lose attention and lose forward motion
  + **Give work back to the people:** This is teamwork, but if things go wrong, then protect comes.
    - The adaption to new possibilities and challenges has been central to the human experience through recorded and unrecorded history.
      * Bryan:Human being is evolved to live within different climates.
    - Thriving in the variation in scope, structure, governance, strategy and coordination of emergent political and commercial enterprise.
      * Bryan: Arabanın altına bakmadan binmezdik, çamaşıra asker üniforması asmazdık. We learned to adapt and thrive in the terror years of IRA.
    - ***Adaptive leadership is the practice of mobilising people to tackle tough challenges and thrive.***
* Thriving : The concept of thriving is drawn from evolutionary biology, successful adaption has three characteristics: (Heifetz is a doctor, he is using analogy of evolutionary biology to understand thriving)
  + It preserves the DNA essential for the species continued survival
  + It discards (reregulates or rearranges) the DNA that no longer serves the species current needs
  + It creates DNA arrangements that enables the species to flourish in new ways and in more challenging environments.
* Successful adaptions enable living systems to take the best from its history into the future.
  + We don’t have to do things like we do in the past. Covid tought that, working hybrid for example. We adapted to lifestyle.
* This is adaptive work of leader. Leaders and followers are working seamlessly together. In a seamless interaction.
* Adaptive leadership: enabling capacity to thrive.
  + New environments and new dreams demand new strategies, new abilities and the leadership to mobilise them orchestrating multiple stakeholder priorities to define thriving and then realise it.
  + Leadership must wrestle with normative questions of value, purpose and process.
    - What values that we thought were essential for our thriving? We changed lots of it while covid. Purpose and processes also changed. We adapted in terms of values, purpose and processes in order to continue to thrive.
  + **Define thriving**:
    - As increase in short- and long-term shareholder value.
    - Exceptional customer service
    - High workforce morale
    - Positive social and environmental impact
* Adaptive Change: build on the past rather than jettison it. %2: dna difference between chimpanzee (~primal origin of our species, bryman) and human beig (Heifetz analogy): Small difference can make big impact.
  + What is essential to preserve your organisation’s heritage?
  + What is expendable?
  + Successful adaptions are both conservative and progressive.
  + Effective change is anchored in the values, competencies and strategic orientations that should endure in the organisation
    - We have to learn new ones to adapt in covid
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* **Organisational Adaption occurs through experimentation:** we do this in covid, national security, or fighting crime.
  + Those seeking to lead adaptive change need an experimental mind set.
  + They must learn to improvise as they go, buying time and resources along the way for the next set of experiments. Working within tolerance.
  + Adaptive leadership builds a culture of diverse views relying less on central planning or the genius of the few at the top. Capture the wisdom of the microenvironments.
* **Fear of the Unknown, Climate change- shift in rainfall and temperature-** We don’t like changes, fight or run away.
* **Cognitive Biases**:
  + **Social Proof**: We want to stick with what the neighbour or other agronomists are doing because it’s “normal” or it’s safe.
  + Graphical user interface
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  + **Negative Bias:** We often remember the bad news better than we remember the good news: its about survival. Our brain hates the smell of decay. Thinking rotting flesh.
  + **Status Quo Bias** (Samuelson and Zeckhauser 1988) is a cognitive bias which leads people to prefer that things remain the same, or that things change as little as possible. “if it isn’t broke, why fix it?” just because something works, doesn’t mean it can’t be incrementally improved!
  + https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jan/11/nigeria-cattle-crisis-how-drought-and-urbanisation-led-to-deadly-land-grabs
  + Biases (systematic errors, manifestations of heuristics) of intuitive thinking in judgement (Daniel Kahneman, Thinking fast&slow)
    - System-1 (intuitive) thinking, act before thinking. Immediate muscle memory action. Effortless.
    - System 2 thinking: slower, prefrontal cortex. Effort needed when you listen lecture. Bubbling around background: what to do next week? Etc.
    - Not quickly seduced by first reaction. Intuition sometimes can be very wrong. Sometimes right. It is our survival technique. We can’t remember more than 5-9 things. They sit in back brain, subconscious mind. We draw it to conscious mind.
    - Adaptive leadership: we need to use whole brain. We can access to huge reserve.
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  + If we try to lead adaptive change, we have to overcome social proofing, and etc. How to do?Use series of tools.
* **The future wheel analysis:**
  + Work out central trend then implication, and then work out 2nd and 3rd order implication. And begin to map consequences of decisions, potential consequences. Implications (social, economic) of working from home.
  + The futures wheel is a method for graphical visualisation of direct and indirect future consequences of a particular change or development. It was invented by Jerome C. Glenn in 1971, when he was a student at the Antioch Graduate School of Education (now Antioch University New England) (Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Futures_wheel>) .
* Diagram, shape
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* **Progress is radical over time yet incremental in time.** Over a period of time, something may appear to be quite radical, but it didn’t happen radically in time.
  + Compared to biological evolution organisational or political adaptions are lightning fast, however they also take time to consolidate into new norms and processes.
  + Adaptive leadership requires persistence.
  + Significant change is the product of incremental experiments building over time: culture changes slowly. (Don’t mess with our culture, culture eats strategy for breakfast. American management guru, Peter Drucker)
  + Adaptive leaders need to stay in the game and take the heat.
    - Mobilise people to meet their immediate adaptive challenges
    - Over time this builds adaptive capacity
    - Fosters new norms that enable the organisation to meet the adaptive challenges posed by evolving realities, opportunities and pressures.
  + It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent that survives. It is the one that is most adaptable to change. Charles Darwin, (1809-1882) Evolution of species
* **John Fisher Transition Curve (1999-2012)**
* Diagram
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  + Developed by lady who looked grievances. How you dela with grievances? Grievances curve. John fisher adapted to change curve.
  + After event you have a little bit anxiety. Happiness and fear, what will be the 2nd order implications?
    - Threat: organizational change will affect me?
    - Guilt: I shouldn’t have to be worry about this.
    - Survival guilt: I am survived but my best friend died of covid.
    - Depression: it is not good as it looks.
    - Gradual acceptance:
    - Anger: it is normal man!! Lead people through.
    - Drift of the curve
      * Denial: outliers who say we don’t need that.
      * Disillusioned with change: oohh it is not working etc.
      * Hostile: severely depressed.
      * Huge amount of work for leader of change
      * Some of it cut them: if you are not vaccinated we don’t treat you in hospitals or you work very hard to bring back them on board.
  + Lead people through these emotions. Change is all about dealing with emotions. As a leader you lead people through this change. Whether it is adaptive change or transition.
  + People become complacent, they drop out of the Haifetz’s zone of disequilibrium. You gotta keep people within this zone of disequilibrium to fight compalceny. Because if people feel too comfortable they are not willing to continue with the change.
  + Build Iraqi MOD, 2004,, Bryan’s role: plan and lead it. Leading Iraqis and American collegues through this change, we have every kind of people, hostile, disillusioned etc. Hostile became al qaeda. We failed to deal with hostile.
  + Changing Kosovo’s military to service units, 2008: Kosovo Liberation Army, 1000 of fighters, their view they won against Serbia. They didn’t win their nationhood, it was agreement between UN and NATO. They wanted to be army of Kosovo. 150.000 KLA is too big army need only 10.000. What to do? Huge money from world bank for this people to go thtrough this change curve. By meeting their hopes and dreams. Pensions, grants to transition from military to civil.They adapted and stop being hostile.
* **The adaptive leadership iterative process**: Observe, Interpret, Intervene
  + **Observe:** events and patterns around you.
    - A subjective activity depending on previous experience and unique perspectives.
    - The goal is to make observation as objective as possible:
      * **Get off the dance floor and on to the balcony**- gain distance, watch yourself as well as others while you are in the action, see the patterns of action and interaction . Difficult from the ground floor level.
        + Who is talking to whom
        + Who responds to whom
        + What are the alliances and relationships beyond the org chart
        + What is the history of the problem
        + What are the different views of it
        + What are the patterns of behaviour relevant to the problem
        + How is our culture and structure affecting behaviour
  + **Interpretations:** what you are observing (develop multiple hypothesis about what is really going on).
    - There are multiple interpretations: there will be counter ‘truths’.
    - Our brain is designed to make meaning- survival technique- we subconsciously make patterns from the information we take in from our senses and develop hypothesis. System 2 Thinking
    - Avoid action before you have tested your interpretation/ hypothesis. System 1 Thinking
      * What underlying values and loyalties are at stake?
      * To what extent are people interpreting the Adaptive problem as Technical?
      * Seek challenge to your interpretation.
      * Avoid seduction – tackling the Technical problems.
      * Hold multiple interpretations simultaneously, avoid seeking the one right answer.
      * An interpretation is only a guess as to what is going on.
      * Making your interpretation public is an intervention and often a provocative one: make it tentatively as an experiment and then observe reaction and interpret, was it a good guess or wide of the mark.
  + **Interventions:** Design interventionsbased on observation and interpretation to address the adaptive challenges you have identified, Heifetz, R.A. Grashow, A and Linskey, M. (2009)
    - Your intervention should reflect your hypothesis about the problem.
    - It should be in the form of an experiment and in the service of a shared purpose.
    - The intervention should provide context connecting your interpretation to the task on the table, people can see your perspective is relevant to the collective effort
    - If people cant see the relevance their interpretation may be you are riding a personal hobbyhorse
    - The intervention must be realistic, grounded in available resources.
    - Practice designing interventions outside your comfort zone, it makes you less predictable and less easily thwarted or neutralised.
    - Consider your own skills and competencies. The greater your skills and competencies the greater the range of interventions you will be willing and able to generate.
* Tools to think about change and its implications to adopt.
  + Future wheel
  + **Model of emergent strategy**: ‘A pattern in a stream of decision’ Henry Mintzberg
    - * Strategy futile because it will change, challenges. So intended or deliberate strategy will adapt to become emergent strategy.
  + Force ~ (driving force is inner drive created by need) field analysis of Lewin:
    - Forces for change:
      * Customers want new product,
      * improved speed of production,
      * raise volumes of output,
      * maintenance cost increasing
    - Forces against change
      * Loss of staff over time
      * Staff frightened of new tech.
      * Env effects of new tech
      * Cost
      * Disruption
  + Four lenses model (of Johnson et al.) is thought as a way to look change.
  + **Strategic drift theory** (Johnson et al., 2017, p. 180)**:** It shows how organization change over time. There are four phases[[2]](#footnote-2) of adaptation of organization to environment. Strategic drift phase is important. Capture the trends of environment or otherwise drift will happen, and it may make organization useless.
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* + Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other. Kennedy
* **Experimenting:**
  + When dealing with an adaptive challenge there is no obvious answer to the question: what is going on here?
  + Trying to define the problem is a contentious issue: managing this ambiguity is part of the adaptive approach. It requires courage, tenacity, humility and an experimental mind set. *That didn't appear to work lets try something else.*
  + You do not need to defend your intervention, learning from current events, each intervention is a next step or mid course correction.
    - Iraq, star and stripes magazine: bryan was trying to explain what they were doing. In terms of adaptive approach in reforming Iraq’s MoI. They explain that they conducted series of experiments. The didn’t know the solution. Because there never been a problem like this. An Islamic state defeated by non-islamic army, for iaqis infidel army. That “infidel” army began to reform institutions having destroyed them. We do not have predecessor on what we were doing. They just make it up as they went along. We were experimenting. When explain to this journal 2-star general joe phil and bryan were working for Patreaus. Magazine headline was general doesn’t have a plan. He is winging it. Didn’g go well with 4-star general and pentagon. They defended this is the reality. They said you cant say that. You gotta tell that you have a plan&strategy. One dilemma in experimenting within an adaptive challenge. Be cautious who you share with that experimenting.
  + You run each experiment with hopeful conviction- Marriage, an adaptive challenge.
    - Couples always experiment what works. Kids, kids go being alone again, all adaptive challenge. You approach all those states with hopeful conviction.
  + F. Scott Fitgerald: “*the test of a first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposing ideas in mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function”.* F. Scott Fitzgerald, from The Crack-Up, February 1936.
  + Adaptive leadership must connect with the values, beliefs and anxieties of the people you are trying to move. Engage hearts and minds to overcome the status quo bias.
    - Don’t approach with logic only, we are emotional being. Appeal both to logic and emotion.
* **Connect to Purpose**

*True knowledge exists in knowing that you know nothing.* Socrates

* + Adaptive change involves risk to your reputation and material gain. The change must be on behalf of a greater purpose you find compelling.
    - If experiment doesn’t work people may decide you are not fit to purpose.
    - Cries for change ministers for not good handling of covid. They haven’t come up with immediate solution.
  + What might such a purpose look like? Will the results be valued in your organisation?
    - What is greater purpose?for uk in covid it was to protect NHS. Delivers the need of health, at the point of need at no cost. Amazing institution. Think of it destroyed by covid. People understand that, and this enabled people undergo the pain & uncertainty.
  + Tough questions, the answers lie in the articulation of your own personal values.
  + Defining a shared purpose is a challenging and painful exercise: narrow interests will have to sacrificed for the whole.
  + When you face a tough decision or when prospects for success look bleak, explaining to a trusted ‘other’ what you are trying to do and why provides guidance, sustenance and inspiration.
    - Explain your insecurities to trusted other. You cant do it public as senior leader.
* VUCA

*No plan of operations extends with certainty beyond the first encounter with enemy’s main strength* (Moltke, 1993, p. 45).

*Plans are nothing, planning is everything.* Eisenhower

*It is very relevant with adaptive leadership, it is about experimenting.* Continue planning and adapt it. That’s the essence of adaptive leadership.

* + The Acronym (artificial word) VUCA originated in the US War College to describe situations that are **volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous**. It was first used in 1987 and based on the leadership theories of Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus. It was the response of the US Army War College to the collapse of the USSR in the early 1990s.
    - VUCA is very nice, it is the reality what we live in.
  + We are dealing with "unknown unknowns" (Rumsfield) can emerge that place teams in territory that models cannot predict. The decision-making process that responds to rapid change is as important as the decision itself. Make plans **Visible** for all via clear and transparent communication.
  + Nothing we do will stand contact with reality. We will have to adjust it.
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1. Core conceptions of Kurt Lewis (Rummel, 1975, pp. 35–39):

   Mind, as a complex energy field containing systems of tension in various states of equilibrium.

   Behaviour, as a change in the state of this field (of tensions and forces).

   Unpacking these conceptions, ambigious concepts of him:

   **Life space**: person’s subjective world, or perspective, subjective reality

   **Needs:** Organize behaviour and influence the space’s cognitive structure. Gratified in achieving *goals.* Goals have ***valence***(or value, goals degree of attraction-positive valance.

   If the need is hunger, food has positive valance ~ pulled by food

   If the need is security, dangereous object has negative valance~pushed by bomb

   We try to move either toward or away from these valances in our life space, this movement is called locomotion.

   **Tension:** If locomotion is prevented, tension happens. Inner personal reality is field of tensions -of energy- in various states of equilibrium and processes of discharge.

   **Force:** Driving force is as the inner drive created by need and associated with the valence of the corresponding goal.

   **Field:**

   Synonym of whole life space, a genotype underlying the space’s subjective manifestations.

   Or refers to energy, localized in system of tension, associated with forces driving and restraining a person in his life space. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Incremental change, strategic drift, flux, and transformation or dead. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)