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.
  + 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 dont 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 who exercise authority and positional power are not leaders. 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&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&leading
  + **British Military Doctrine: The Nature of Leadership**
    - The Army Leadership Doctrine (2021, p.5-10) under ‘Leadership Styles’, ‘The Directive Style’ “*Do what I tell you*” Contains the cautionary warning, *‘it is dangerously easy to fall back on in less demanding circumstances and overuse can have a negative impact’.* 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, to journey
    - Management - stuff and numbers
      * Stuff may be process. Numbers, calculating rational numbers.
      * Latin manos, to handle.
* 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.
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* + Feedback from John Carter, harvard university
    - Like it but they must not overlap.Leadership and management dont overlap. They are fundementally different concepts.
    - But they thought there are some similarities, thats why they touch (2 circles)
    - Mission not worth risking life situation: still command. Do it! Iwill be prisoner of conscience. How do you get people risk their lives? You cant order. Persuade and convince them. Diagram changed.
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Put leadership on both side of the authority circle. There is some leadership youdid through authority, there is some done outside. Management is always in circle. Outside circle you request smtg from people normally you cant force them to do. Doing risky thingfor ribbon in military, in banking I would request million, how bizarre. In military we have to do in another way

Literature describes these 2 approcahes:

Exercising the positional power in a **tranactional relationship**. It is exchange. You did it or trouble.

Exercising personal power.**Transformational leadership**:

Full model of leadership, management and command: like this: 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 if obey 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.

* Toxic leadership:
  + started USA, then uk
  + there is still some resistance to confront it in some military cultures.
  + Kicked of by americans as a result of crises. In general change in theory in leadership is kicked by crises. Previous leading doesn’t work because of change.
  + Crises was beginning of 2nd gulf war. Some cols and lef cols turned down promotions. They didn’t accept the command associated with promotion. Because they wouldn’t serve under the command of same person he served at the first gulf war. The same happened in unionist army in civil war. They do it because they don’t want to be part of incompetent officers they know before. Secretary went to US Army war college, this year of 2003 we will examine how it would appear in the amerücan army, we appear to have a generation of officers some of whom are as admired from above, as they are reviled brom bottom. How we got here. Ripple effect to other forces. Ripple effect of examining what was described as the dark side of the leadership. Or toxic or poisonous leadership.
  + Books:
    - Transforming toxic leaders, alan goldman
    - Surviving toxic leaders, Kenneth o. gangel
    - The allure of toxic leaders, jean Lipman-blumen
  + Marcia Whicker coined phrase and linked to three dysfunctional leadership styles., Toxic leaders when organizartions go bad, marcia lynn whicker, 1996. She researched how organizations are failed due to the nature of leader. She coined the term toxic leaders, and they are linked in her research to 3 dysfunctional leadership styles. If they do trustworthy bit they give green light. Very few of them did. They are not trustworthy.
    - **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 poisins the org.
      * *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 apples, one toxic leadership can have a damaging effect on individuals, groups, organisations and even countries. One rotten apple effects 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 (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.
    - A picture containing shape
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    - 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

    Description automatically generated
  + **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.
  + **Bass and Avolio’s MLQ Leadership Factors ‘ The Full Range of Leadership’**
    - Transformational and transactional leadership is useful in differentiating command and leadership. These terms are of James MacGregor Burns, political scientist. 1978, Leadership book. American leaders, there two types, Transactional and transforming leaders.
      * Those enter into transaction with their electorate. Vote for me and I will for you. Iwill 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)
    - Bernard Bass, 1985, Leadership and performance beyond the expectations. This book changed the way people think. He rename it as transformational leadership. He took this from Downton, Rebel Leadership. 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). Mult,-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 it diagrammatically, Bryans, 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 wanna go beyon expected outcomes this 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 leadersi .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.
  + 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.
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