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Abstract

Over the past 25 years, technological and other changes have dramatically transformed the Australian workplace. Continuous demands for quick results, an ever improving bottom line, shorter time frames and constant change have had particular impact on the role of leadership, which has become more nebulous yet, at the same time, is held more responsible for organisational success.

The research question—What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change? — addresses the nature of modern leadership and the role of organisational leaders. The study has three broad aims: to understand the nature of contemporary organisational leadership; to examine whether current leadership practice is meeting organisational demands; and to identify how our current and future leaders can be better supported in a changing organisational context.

The study explores the perceptions and practices of 61 leaders who work in a wide range of Australian public and private organisations through analysis of in-depth interviews. Key themes relevant to these leaders’ experiences are identified. These provide insight into the activities and thinking that support or hinder leadership success and their implications for the organisation as a whole.

The findings suggest that organisational leadership is best conceptualised not as a unitary phenomenon but, rather, as comprising two largely interdependent—though frequently confused—disciplines. The investigation identified eight ways in which both forms of leadership can be hijacked from their intended purposes. Drawing on the study data, the researcher has developed a leadership and management taxonomy that depicts how leadership and management should work together in order to achieve an organisation’s short- and long-term goals.

The research thus makes an original contribution to empirical and theoretical work in the field of organisational leadership education policy and design. The study’s recommendations provide a framework and guidelines for improving the performance and competence of contemporary Australian organisational leaders during these challenging and often uncertain times.
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1 Introduction

The research question – What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change? - reflects the importance of examining how the complexities of a leader’s sociocultural world are experienced and understood in both a particular context (the Australian workplace) and at a particular point in time (the postmodern era). Much of the knowledge which informs our modern leaders is the result of a series of Federal Government decisions and initiatives which were formed almost twenty-five years ago. So radical and pervasive were, and are, these initiatives that in order to provide meaning to the modern day context as well as address the conundrum posed by the research question, it warrants opening this study with a retrospective of the Australian workplace beginning in the later part of the 1980s.

1.1 Background

The Australian workplace of the late 1980s was very different from what it is today. The workforce at that time comprised of members of the Silent Generation (those born between 1925- 1945) and Baby Boomers (those born between 1946- 1964) whose values were primarily those of duty and hierarchy (Babb & Parlett, 2002 and Sayers, 2006). Multiculturalism was still finding its feet and it was much less common for women to hold senior positions than it is in contemporary workplaces (Sayers, 2006). Personal computers such as the Commodore 2 and the Acorn Archimedes ran on a Disc Operating System (DOS) (Kent, 2001) while the Apple MacIntosh computer utilised its Professional Disc Operating System (ProDOS). Both DOS and ProDOS computers had very basic, non-colour, graphic user interfaces (GUI), (Reimer, 2005) and in the 1980s they were still largely viewed as glorified typewriters (Hurst, 2007). By the late 1980s fax machines were widely used in business - although the messages tended to fade from its heat-sensitive paper after a few weeks.
Commercial use of the internet would not become de rigueur in Australian workplaces until after Tim Berners-Lee’s World Wide Web explosion in the early 1990s (Clarke, 2004; Leiner et al., 2000; Markoff, 2006). Consequently in the late 1980s what we now call ‘snail mail’ was still the most common form of communication other than telephone and fax. In most organisations mail was delivered to the organisation’s central registry where it was opened, logged and filed. The files were picked up generally twice daily and delivered to the intended recipient for actioning and on completion returned to the organisation’s central registry. Thus corporate knowledge was kept, filed and carefully monitored by the organisation’s registry department (see University of Canberra, 2012).

In the late 1980s, job promotions were largely given to internal candidates and were based on meritocracy and longevity. The exception was executive positions, which according to were usually filled from a pool of external candidates (Saunders, 1996). By the end of the decade, however, technological and Equal Opportunity advancements began to impact on the way business was conducted not only in Australian organisations, but also internationally. As a result Australia began to experience trade problems which quickly escalated to the point that the Country was left with a marked down commodity export value. This situation subsequently led to a “decline of the current account and a growth in foreign debt” (Goozee, 1993, p.62).

In 1986, the Hon. John Dawkins (Commonwealth Minister for Trade 1984-1987) responded to the deterioration in Australia’s external position and the escalating impact of technology on business practices by embarking on a fact-finding mission in 1987 to a number of Western European countries. The purpose of this mission was to determine what was being done overseas that could be replicated in Australia in order to make our industries more efficient and competitive in the global marketplace (Mullard, 1995, p.211). On returning to Australia Dawkins asserted that, if our companies were to have any chance of exploiting new market opportunities and technologies, the workforce would need to improve its traditional skills, attain higher levels of cognitive, problem solving and social skills and improve its leadership and teamwork ability (ACTU/TDC, 1987, p.19). Dawkins also warned that as a result of Australia’s financial situation Baby Boomers would probably remain in the workforce longer than had previous generations. Therefore there would be a need for the Government to provide work-related education and training to these adults.
throughout their working lives in addition to the subsequent generations (ibid). It was around this time that Australia began to move away from a one-person, one-job model of employment to one of ‘multi-skilling’. This reflected the Government’s desire for the Australian workforce to acquire “a wider range and a higher level of skills and knowledge” (Goozee, p.62).

As a result of these and other developments, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) and the Commonwealth Government jointly proposed a series of initiatives that would change the way in which leadership and middle level management would be viewed, taught and implemented in Australian workplaces (Goozee, 2001).

1.1.1 Changes in the Vocational Education and Training (VET) Sector

In the mid1980s, tertiary education in Australia was still divided between federally funded universities; State funded Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and Technical and Further Education (TAFEs). At that time, universities offered students higher degree qualifications, CAEs offered formal post-secondary qualifications of a more vocational nature (such as teaching, nursing, accountancy and information technology) and TAFEs offered trade qualifications (Goozee, 1993). However this educational division began to change in 1987 when the Hon. John Dawkins- who was by then the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training (1987- 1991), wrote two significant papers which would be the catalyst for an intense restructuring of the combined tertiary education sector. The first was a Green Paper entitled Higher education: A policy discussion paper (Dawkins, 1987) and the second was a White Paper entitled Higher education: A policy statement (Dawkins, 1988).

In these Papers Dawkins asserted that TAFEs should share with universities the responsibility for post-secondary education in Australia and that there should be closer links between TAFE and higher education. He further asserted that TAFEs should have a legitimate role in providing higher education courses on their own right and that, if TAFE facilities could be shared with universities in the delivery of courses this would allow for fewer and larger Educational Institutions (Dawkins 1988).
These recommendations led to the formation of the Unified National System (UNS) where Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) became universities in their own right, were absorbed by a singular university or were divided and absorbed by several universities (Bessant, 1996; Hill & Johnston, 1993).

Dawkins also proposed a number of additional initiatives including course articulation and credit transfers from TAFE to university and flagged the expectation that higher education institutions would eventually cease to deliver Associate Diploma and Diploma courses, which would be taken on by TAFEs (Dawkins, 1988). Of the many initiatives that were introduced between the late 1980s and the mid-1990s those of particular relevance to this study are the introduction of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and Competency-Based Training System (CBT).

1.1.2 The Australian Qualifications Framework

After a long collaborative process between the Commonwealth, States and Territory Governments, which also involved industry, educational and training representatives, the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), according to its (2013) website came into being on January 1st 1995. Regardless, the purpose of the AQF was (and remains) to provide a comprehensive, nationally consistent, flexible framework for all qualifications in post-compulsory education and training in Australia. The main aims are to:

- provide consistent recognition of the outcomes achieved;
- recognise previous student achievements and competence;
- allow the development of multiple entry and exit pathways to assist continuous learning; and
- provide the terms of reference for qualifications in post-compulsory education and training in Australia (NCVER, 1990).

The AQF replaced the descriptors of the Major National Tertiary Course Award levels which had been previously established by the Register of Australian Tertiary Education (RATE) (Goozee, 1993).
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The intention was to create a seamless educational pathway with multiple entry and exit levels, from the secondary school sector through to the vocational sector and then into higher education (see Table 1). In this way, the architects of the AQF hoped to create a meaningful framework that would support life-long learning across Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher education sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VET sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary school sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior secondary certificates of education*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Term ‘senior secondary certificate of education’ is a general title for qualifications at this level. Individual The State and Territory senior secondary school qualifications retain their current titles and requirements (NCVER, 1995).


1.1.3 Competency Based Training (CBT)

According to Bolden and Gosling (2006), the competency movement, which seeks to improve, standardise and assess workplace performance and behaviour “has its origins in the changing economic and political context of the late 1960s, with the concept of ‘managerial competency’ largely arising from the work of McClelland, (1973)” (p.148).

Quickly gaining popularity in the USA, the movement had already spread to Canada and the UK by the time Dawkins embarked on his fact finding mission.
As a result of its examination by the Federal Government of the day, Australia followed the UK with the development and establishment of its own competency-based vocational education system in the late 1980s and 1990s (Mullard, 1995).

The early definition of ‘competency’ as defined by the then Australian National Training Board (1992) follows:

Competency comprises knowledge and skill and the consistent application of that knowledge and skills to the standard of performance required in employment. The concept of competency includes all aspects of work performance. It includes:

- Performance at an acceptable level of skill,
- Organising one’s own tasks,
- Responding and reacting appropriately to the unexpected,
- Fulfilling the role expected in the workplace, and
- Transfer of skills and knowledge to new situations.

The process of confirming that a person has achieved competency, is “assessment” (p.iv).

However the definition of competency has since evolved into something which is arguably more generic and industry rather than employment based:

[Competencies are] the nationally agreed statements of the skills and knowledge required for effective performance in a particular job or job function – they describe work outcomes as agreed by industry. As such they do not describe the procedures necessary to perform a particular role but rather identify skills and knowledge as outcomes, that contribute to the whole job function (National Skills Standards Council, 2013).

The assessment of CBT knowledge and skills attainment in Australia has always been based on the student’s behaviour in the workplace. The emphasis is on measurable behaviour and an encouragement of conformity rather than diversity on the part of individuals - the assumption being those who excel in the same role display the same behaviours.

According to critics such as Ewer and Ablett (1996) and Cornford (2000), the choice of CBT for Australia was politically motivated.
Rozario & Hampson, (2007) suggest that the system, conceived under a Labour Government, was adopted because it not only allowed for an uncomplicated, checklist style of assessment (competent or not yet competent) that could be easily determined by assessors but because it also favoured industrial criteria such as skill recognition and assessment over pedagogical appropriateness.

However, from its inception, CBT had its detractors - both nationally and internationally. Some were concerned that competent performance, even at a lower level, was too complex to be reduced to such a simplified from of assessment and argued that the fragmentation of roles are better understood as integrated wholes (Ashworth & Saxton, 1990; Norris, 1991; Ecclestone, 1997; Grugulis, 1998 and Bolden & Gosling, 2006). Wolf (1995) wondered how a generic set of competencies could be suitable in all contexts and countered that there may be numerous ways to perform a given work task, other than the implied single model of competence used to teach and assess performance.

Sparrow (1997) warned that the focus on behavioural competencies rather than on an organisational approach would shift attention away from the organisation and its business processes thus leading to an inevitable reduction in organisational innovation, learning and performance. Agreeing with Sparrow, scholars such as Cullen, (1992); Lister, (1994); Bolden & Gosling, (2006); and Carroll, Levy & Richmond, (2008), asserted that the competency focus on past and current performance would not be able to guarantee the skills and knowledge needed to meet future challenges.

The criticisms against CBT were not confined to business, however. Tovey (1997) also argues against CBT but on the basis that the process specifying training outcomes by behavioural-based learning outcomes is educationally unsound and does not allow for either incidental learning or the attainment of knowledge and skill which underpins a particular competency unit. Others (e.g. Brundrett, 2000 and Carroll, Levy & Richmond, 2008) suggest that there is no empirical evidence linking competencies to improved organisational outcomes.

Regardless of the criticisms, CBT remains an integral part of the current Vocational Educational System in Australia and continues in the USA, Canada and the UK. Competency based education and training systems are also in use in other countries.
including New Zealand, Singapore, Mexico, France, Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Botswana Namibia, and Sri Lanka.

Once the CBT system had been accepted by the Federal Government in the early stages of Australia’s training reform, Industry Training Advisory Bodies (ITABs) were set up as a liaison between Industry and Educational Institutions and the newly formed Australian National Training Authority. As Butterworth (1993) explains:

The formation of the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) and State Training Agencies as part of the recent vocational education and training (VET) initiative has been a response to a number of pressures, not the least of which has been the need to build more effective bridges between industry and the VET system. The new Australian VET system is founded upon a network of ITABs as the major source of industry-related information and advice to guide its planning, policy and resource allocation decision-making (p.27).

More specifically, the purpose of the ITABs was to assist in the identification and articulation of skills and knowledge descriptors (competency standards, also less formally known as competencies) at each of the six AQF levels. The assumption was that attainment of these identified competencies would not only give students appropriate vocational qualifications but would furnish Industry with knowledge workers who had attained the required knowledge and skills set(s).

Initially the Australian Qualifications Framework and CBT were geared up to address specific skills in the Mining, Retail, Health and Tourism sectors. However in the early 1990s the focus of CBT began to shift to the idea of applying competency-based training to leadership and management development. Accordingly in 1992 the Federal Labour Government commissioned an Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills. The Task Force Committee, led by David Karpin, was charged with the responsibility of determining how ‘to strengthen management development and business leadership in Australian enterprises’ (Karpin, 1995, p vii).

Three years after it was first commissioned Karpin released his report entitled Enterprising Nation: Renewing Australia’s Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia-Pacific Century (1995).
To this day this report is more commonly known as *The Karpin Report*.

### 1.1.4 The Karpin Report

In 1995 after three years of inquiry, the two volume Karpin Report was released. It included twenty-eight recommendations based in part on the informed input of relevant practitioners and other Australian management and leadership experts of the time. In the report, responsibility is implicitly deflected away from senior management and Government policy and directed at improving the competency of frontline managers whose performance is deemed to be crucial to the success of Australian business but whose skills are generally perceived as lacking (Karpin, 1995, p. 33, in Rozario & Hampson, 2007).

According to Karpin and his Committee, competency-based training is more suitable for those on the frontline and education is more appropriate for senior managers (Karpin, 1995). Although the terms training and education are often confused or used interchangeably, they are very different (Murray, 2004, p.118).

Training, according to Tripathi & Reddy, (2004)

> is the act of increasing the knowledge and skill of an employee for doing a particular job. It is concerned with imparting *specific* skills for *particular* purposes [author’s emphasis]. On the other hand, education is a broader term concerned with increasing the general knowledge and understanding of the employee’s total environment (p.195).

This view echoes Clarkson’s (2001) earlier suggestion that education has a wider focus than training and that training “gives instruction and practice in the use of tools, whereas education provides the background including the wider context in which the tool is to be used” (p.2).  

But Clarkson (ibid) also warns that

> education is a precursor to effective training. This is because high-quality education will sensitize the conscious mind so that it can begin to integrate the information studied. Without this educational component, training may deteriorate into a meaningless set of actions.
The third of the Karpin Report’s twenty-eight recommendations (See Appendix 1) introduces the need for frontline managers to attain leadership skills:

It is recommended that a program be put into place to develop, disseminate and promote relevant competencies in leadership to compliment management development and also for use in the general community (Karpin, 1995).

Although the intention of this recommendation was clear, Karpin and his Committee refrained from defining management and leadership other than suggesting:

A manager is an individual who achieves enterprise goals through the work of others. At the senior executive level, a leader is a good steward of the enterprise's future. At all other levels, a leader is an individual who achieves enterprise goals through the work of others without relying on her or his position or power (Karpin, 1995).

Karpin also refrained from suggesting that the Government should be the body responsible for defining specific desirable leadership skills and attributes. Arguably this decision was prompted by Craig and Yetton’s (1995) research which was commissioned by Karpin, in which they argued:

numerous leadership studies had failed to discern any traits that could be reliably used to set leaders apart from others, and which could therefore form the basis of leadership selection and development” (p.1185).

Craig and Yetton further warned that it was pointless to try and find or develop leaders, suggesting instead that various Australian enterprises, sectors and communities should find or develop their own successful leaders.

Instead they recommended that the Karpin Committee’s focus should be on identifying and developing management competencies, since there was a plethora of available management theories and methods which could be used to determine whether performance was excellent or poor (Craig & Yetton, ibid).

How much weight these recommendations carried with Karpin is unknown, but the implementation strategy that accompanied the third of his recommendations suggests that a leadership program should be modelled on the Williamson Foundation
Leadership Program (now called Leadership Victoria). It further suggests that the Foundation could be responsible for researching what constituted world’s best practice techniques for leadership application and from such findings, develop leadership programs and accompanying resource materials to be used in leadership and management development by industry and the general community.

Karpin’s (2005) eleventh recommendation, which also has relevance to this study, states “It is recommended that there be a national training program for frontline managers” (p.285). The second last implementation strategy of this recommendation suggested that “The program is to be called the ‘National Certificate in Workplace Leadership’ and would be integrated into the national qualifications framework to ensure articulation with other programs” (ibid).

Thus Karpin and his committee not only handed over responsibility for leadership training to private enterprise, but they did not make the distinction between leadership and management. This paved the way for what became the Frontline Management Initiative (FMI), which is anchored in the competency-based training model (Rozario & Hampson, 2005).

1.1.5 The Frontline Management Initiative, Competencies and Programs

Karpin’s eleventh recommendation established the need for a National frontline manager training program. The assertion was that although participants would be working in enterprises without any previous formal management training once they embarked on a frontline management course they would be able to demonstrate the application of quality principles in their operations and in their human resource development processes (Karpin, 1995, p.iix). As Smith and Roos (2003) later reported:

The Task Force estimated that about 180,000 frontline managers in Australia were without formal management training; and estimated that approximately 80,000 to 100,000 of these would qualify "by working in quality committed enterprises". The target was to provide access to management training for 80,000 of them over five years. It was envisaged that participants would be released, at the employer’s cost, for up to twenty days of structured training, which would be spread over a period of twenty to forty weeks. There would be approximately ten units involved in the course. TAFE was expected to be a major deliverer of the FMI program, supplemented by industry associations and private
providers. The report noted that "upgrading of TAFE’s capacity to deliver management development courses are critical to the success of this proposal" (p.2).

The Karpin Report listed ten competencies considered by senior managers as being essential for frontline managers (Karpin, 1995, p. 687). These competencies were selected from a larger list developed by Collins and Saul (1991) who undertook research into the matter on behalf of the Karpin Committee. However Karpin’s ten recommended competencies were not reflected in the original eleven competencies which comprised the FMI (see Appendix 3). Neither was Karpin’s specific recommendation for a National Certificate in Workplace Leadership accepted consisting of ‘up to 20 days structured training spread over a 20 to 40 week period’ (ibid), with participants to be released at cost to the employer.

There has been considerable debate over Karpin’s assertion that Competency Based Training is, as a general system of learning, the best model to improve the effectiveness of middle-level Australian leaders, managers and supervisors. As previously reported, critics of CBT argue that the system is inherently weak (Ashworth & Saxton, 1990; Barry, 1996; McKenna, 2002; Magnassen, 2010; Norris, 1991; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Rozario & Hampson, 2007). However a 2011 review into the Karpin Report by Innovation and Business Skills Australia determined:

Findings from this project indicate that the 28 Karpin Report recommendations have proven over time to be robust and strongly related to organisational success. Market forces, rather than concerted action by Government, ensured that many of the recommendations found their way into practice within organisations and educational settings. It appears that the recommendations had more resonance with business and industry than with Government. The continuing relevance of the recommendations is a testament to the forward looking focus of the report (p.5).

Although the Karpin Report relied strongly on contemporary but now largely outdated evidence, it continues to form the basis of current middle (Frontline) management training in Australia.
The much anticipated Frontline Management Initiative was launched in 1995 but not without criticism. As Rozario (2007) asserts

the competency standards which were the backbone of the FMI were not developed by an ITAB but by ANTA [the Australian National Training Authority] itself, through numerous workshops and so on. Thus business was not involved directly in the development of the competencies [researcher’s emphasis]. One official expressed concern that ANTA had taken upon itself to decide what competencies were central to an organisation and which were peripheral (p.120).

Critics of the Frontline Management Initiative (FMI) and competencies continue to debate whether the management competencies are accurate, whether they and the associated courses reflect the needs of industry, and whether the Australian Government has the right to impose on business what their frontline managers should be learning (e.g. Currie & Darby, 1995; Dunphy et al., 1997; Howard, et.al 2003; Jubb & Robotham, 1997; McFarlane & Lomas, 1994; Mclagan, 1992; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Robotham & Jubb 1996; Rozario & Hampson, 2007 and Scott & Yates, 2002).

However FLM and FMI have also had its vocal supporters including Mulcahy and James (2000) and Selby Smith and Ferrier, (1996). In 2002 Barratt- Pugh and Soutar evaluated FLM and FMI on behalf of the National Centre for Vocational Education Research and determined “that FMI is making a significant impact at the individual and organisational level, and is increasingly making an impact at the business level” (p.71).

However, the conflicting views concerning the meritorious nature of the Karpin report, FMI or FLM as a whole are not specifically under investigation in this study. Rather, the interest is in how and why Frontline Management Courses which, are accredited by the Australian Federal Government, came to include a core unit that promotes and endorses leadership as a management (discipline not role) function and how well leadership is addressed by this one module. This unit is currently entitled ‘BSBMGT401A Show leadership in the workplace’. It consists of the following elements: ‘a) Model high standards of management performance and behaviour; b) Enhance the organisation's image; c) Influence individuals and teams positively; and

What are of primary concern to some FMI and CBT detractors is the fact that this is the only widely available leadership module that contributes to nationally accredited VET qualifications. Another concern is that the development of learning materials (course content) for this (and any) competency standard is left entirely up to individual providers to create and teach. Consequently the quality, quantity and content of the learning material can vary widely from one provider to another. It has also been remarked that competency-based programs are only as sound as the knowledge, understanding and experience of the trainer delivering the courses (Rozario & Hampson, 2007).

Overall, while broad competencies may be attained, the level of foundational knowledge and skill (education), and the material taught to achieve the required competencies are subject to subjective interpretation, as are the level and depth of competency assessments. Therefore the observation is that there is no real standardisation of leadership learning or assessment, even at this limited level of one module, as promised by the CBT system.

Further, as previously noted, leadership is promoted and taught through these programs as a subcomponent of the discipline of management that comprises only of the following elements: model high standards of management performance and behaviour; enhance the organisation's image; influence individuals and teams positively; and make informed decisions (Department of Employment, Education & Training, 2011).

In 2011, The Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, (DEEWR) funded Innovation & Business Skills Australia (IBSA) to review of the Karpin report. The review commented on the number of people (out of Australia’s total population of 21 million) who have gone through the Frontline Management Program as follows:

While the exact extent of take-up is impossible to determine (because private providers are not required to provide data on privately funded VET enrolments), estimates by experts consulted in this study suggest that 250,000 frontline managers have been skilled through some form of public program, and a similar number through private provision (IBSA, 2011, p.19).
It should be noted that there are several other individual units of competency which are accredited in Australia that focus on leadership and which provide a wider view of the subject (e.g. BSBMT605B Provide leadership across the organisation and PSPGOV604A Foster leadership and innovation). These, however, are privately owned and not available for general use.

In summary, Australian Federal Government through its Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) appears to support the view that this single Frontline Management module, with its four elements, contains all that entry to middle level managers need to know about leading and leadership. Such knowledge, moreover, is appropriately delivered through training rather than educational programs and by providers who have discretion as to what materials is taught to achieve these elements of competency. While organisations can, and probably do, access non-accredited leadership programs they are not as uniformly or widely accessed as FLM nor, arguably, do they carry the same distinction as a FLM qualification. In Australia, the only other avenue open to formally recognised leadership qualifications is through tertiary education. However the cost of putting a large number of staff through such a university degree is prohibitive for most organisations.

At time of writing it is 18 years since the introduction of FMI in Australia. This means that a large portion of an entire generation has entered Australian workplaces where Frontline Management courses and competencies shape both the actors’ and their employer organisations’ leadership and management knowledge, skills and expectations.

1.2 A Statement of the Problem
The current Australian workplace exists in an environment where technology enforces immediacy of communication and the expectation of fast work performance and outputs. Twenty-five years ago, it was common for corporate information to remain within organisations and for it to be managed through their central registries and archives.
However information was still largely limited to paper-based files and their life-cycle which central registries and the archive system could manage and maintain (Reed, 2000). In the modern workplace central registries are less common, and some would argue, are unnecessary because of the sophistication required in managing and storing electronic information. In most contemporary Australian workplaces actors can tap into humanity’s accumulation of a zettabyte of electronic data \(10^{18} \text{ bytes}\) (Floridini, 2010). Personal and work communications are often meshed together in email accounts, social networking sites and on personal hard drives that are accessed by individuals from their personally owned Blackberries, smart phones, iPads and laptops (Rose, 2013). This makes it more difficult for the wider organisation to access and manage information as well as making it easier for information to be lost when an employee leaves (Beazley, et. al., 2002) - particularly if the organisation does not have a suitable information management and information security systems (Floridini, 2010; Hinton, 2005; Taylor et. al, 2008).

The current workforce is highly transient and usually comprises three generations: Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y. The generational gap although not as wide between Baby Boomers and Gen X can take on gulf proportions in the workplace between Baby Boomers and Gen Y (Howe & Strauss 1991). According to Sheahan (2005) generally speaking, the members of Gen Y have superior technological skills, are more highly educated than previous generations, want immediate answers, readily question authority and challenge why things should be done a certain way. Gen Y actors are also likely to be less experienced team players than either Baby Boomers or Gen X, but are more success driven, are creative, demanding, confident and ambitious, as well as on the lookout for their next opportunity (ibid). Thus they are the most likely than those representing other generations to willingly go from organisation to organisation in the pursuit of their careers. While, again generally speaking, Gen Y are in a hurry to succeed, they often lack the skills and knowledge needed to be part of a team, an attribute which would serve them well in management and leadership positions (Kunreuther et. al, 2009; Strauss & Howe, 2000). As with all generations, Gen Y has been shaped by the environments, developments, leaders, events, as well as training, educational and other trends of its time.
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While today’s workplace is, arguably, better off for its different generational perspectives and abilities, the down side of a multigenerational (not to mention multicultural) workplace is that it also has the potential to create ongoing conflict as a result of different views about the nature and performance of their organisations and of their own and others’ work and the interactions between them. In the modern workplace a 25 year old Gen Y member could as easily be the leader or manager of a team of Baby Boomers twice his/her age as the reverse. Clearly, knowledge of how to lead in a multigenerational and multicultural workplace cannot be attached to single generation or ethnicity. It remains an open question, however, whether leadership requirements at the frontline can be met solely through the completion of four elements taught as part of the nationally accredited Frontline Management program.

As the following chapter will discuss in more detail, the need to uphold many fundamental organisational practices, such as working within organisational policies and structure, appears to be less important now than it was in the 1980s. Consequently, in contemporary workplaces the rights of the individual often takes precedence over the responsibilities of the role. Job descriptions and duty statements - if they exist, are often vague or are out-dated almost as quickly as they are created. Leader and manager roles are often meshed in organisational thinking and practice to the point where it is not always clear where the responsibilities and accountabilities of each role begin and end.

What is more, leadership which was once confined to the top echelons can be exercised formally or informally, anywhere in contemporary organisations.

Another change in the modern workplace involves the way in which leaders and managers are hired. When personnel are internally promoted into leadership positions, it is often on the basis of their technical/professional experience and/or skills. However, as will be proposed, having skills and experience in a core field does not automatically translate into leadership (or management) competence. As a result, leaders are often left floundering after promotion. Inexperienced leaders run the risk of either focusing on the technical/professional aspects of their role, with which they are more familiar, or on those aspects which they personally most enjoy, or they may interfere with the work being done by those who report to them, for the same reasons.
It is also not uncommon for externally recruited leaders to approach their role on the basis of “this is how I did it when I worked for such and such a company”. This approach is problematic since, regardless of how similar organisations appear to be, no two organisations—even those in the same industry—are the same (Selznick, 1957; Senior & Fleming, 2006). Moreover, what works in one rarely translates fully to another because each organisation is at a different point in its evolution, has a different culture, and/or has different local policies, procedures, social and environmental impacts, staff and histories (Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Draft, 2010). Because organisations differ so too do their leadership requirements.

Due to lack of resources, most Australian workplaces look to the VET Sector or Higher Education to equip their workforce for suitable skills attainment prior to or during their employment. But as previously suggested, this does not always ensure a competent leader or manager (particularly at the middle organisational level), or ensure that their performance will remain linked to the organisation’s purpose.

The researcher is an organisational consultant with national and international experience spanning more than two decades. She is keenly aware of a growing sense of confusion, frustration and concern about leadership roles and responsibilities and the competing demands on leaders in the workplace. Numerous leaders have voiced these concerns, particularly in relation to their uncertainty about how they should lead in work environments where the demand to succeed seems to be escalating, where internal and external organisational change is the norm and diversity and information overload is a given. It is these concerns—the increasing level of disquiet about leadership and management performance in Australian organisations, together with the magnitude of the changes with which leaders and managers must continuously cope—that have driven the formulation of the research question: What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change?

1.3 Aims and Significance of the Study

It is a truism that improving the performance and cadre of Australian workers has many benefits such as increased productivity, improved industrial relations, a healthier bottom line and improved organisational reputation.
This is reflected in growing popular and academic interest in the topic of leadership. It is the researcher’s contention that leadership, as currently conceived, is outdated and tends to produce major problems for Australian organisations, particularly in times of change, and that training and educational efforts to produce the next generation of leaders are inadequate.

The aims of the present investigation are to:

1. Demystify the role of contemporary leader and leadership in the context of change-related responsibilities in Australian-based organisations;
2. Explore ways of identifying when leaders and/or leadership are diverting from their intended purpose;
3. Develop a research-based set of guidelines for use by all sectors of industry in the process of leading change.

1.4 Research Questions

The research was conducted in the North and Western regions of Australia with middle and senior – level leaders, each of whom had a minimum of five year’s leadership experience and were regularly involved in initiating and/or implementing change initiatives in their organisations.

The central research question examined in this study is: What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change?

The following related sub-questions were formed from the areas most contested by leadership authors and scholars in the literature reviewed. The research interest being whether these conflicting views would also be present in the workplace and if so why.

1. What is leadership?
2. What, if any, difference is there between leader, leadership and management activity?
3. What is the purpose and responsibility(ies) of leaders and leadership in modern organisations undergoing change?
4. What impact, if any, does personal identity have on leader and leadership function?
5 Is the role of leader owned by the organisation and therefore on loan to the incumbent?
6 Can leadership be taken off its purpose and if so how and why?
7 What nature and form does change take in contemporary Australian-based organisations?
8 Is there a relationship between leading and successful leadership in a change environment?
9 Is there a model of leadership and management interaction which is suitable for contemporary Australian-based organisations which can be used to assist the change process?

It should be noted that although this research was conducted in the North and Western regions of Australia, leaders and managers are fundamental to all organisations in Australia. Similarly Federal legislations relating to business practices and the education and training initiatives that impact the organisations that participated in this study also impact on every other organisation in modern Australia.

1.5 Research Design

Despite a plethora of literature concerning the change process and change management (e.g. Kanter, 1983; Boleman & Deal, 1991; Mitzberg, 1994; Drucker, 1995; O’Toole, 1995, Hurst, 1995 and Senge, 1999), there is still some confusion about the specific roles that leaders and leadership play in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change.

In the absence of previous scholarship into this conundrum and with no previous theory or hypothesis to test, this research takes a theory-building approach in order to address the central research question.

Because the research question requires illumination and understanding about how the complexities of leaders’ sociocultural world are experienced and understood in both a particular context (the Australian workplace) and at a particular point in time (modern era), this study was best suited to qualitative rather than quantitative inquiry (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008: Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
Social constructionism was used in this study as the research epistemology, interpretivism as the research theoretical prospective, an embedded single-case study and mixed purposeful sampling were used in the first phase of the research methodology. Ethnographic interviews were conducted in the workplaces with 61 subjects who held middle and senior leadership positions in five organisations. The participating organisations represented the Government and the Private Sector with a subset of profit and not for profit status.

*Organisation A: Private for Profit (PP)*

Organisation A is a private, for profit company in the oil and gas Industry, located in the North of Australia. It has an external Board of Directors and an executive team of seven people. Four others have middle management responsibilities which they hold in conjunction with other (including leadership) roles. Of the additional 48 employees, six hold administrative and HR roles and 38 (including some middle managers) hold technical positions. This business is owned by and answerable to a parent company whose head office is in another State and which employs more than 3,000 staff. Organisation A is well established, with very little staff turnover, has revenue at time of research of $80 million Australian dollars and a depreciated optimised replacement cost of assets (DORC) in excess of $380 million Australian dollars. [“The DORC method calculates the current market value of an asset based on the gross replacement cost of a modern equivalent asset which has been optimised for the particular purpose and which is then adjusted for depreciation to reflect the reduced lifespan of the original asset”, Australian Taxation Office, (2011)].

*Organisation B: Private, Not for Profit (PNFP)*

Organisation B is a leading community benefits organization located in the Western region of Australia. It has a not-for-profit status and is answerable to an external Board of Directors. The company has an executive management structure of six people and employs a further 58 full-time staff. At time of research was conducted, these 58 employees oversaw the work of 240 part-time workers whose ages ranged from 16 to 62 years and who varying levels of mental (and in some cases also physical) disabilities.
These special-needs employees perform packaging and light manufacturing tasks, across four separate geographical sites.

**Organisation C: Private, Not for Profit (PNFP)**

Organisation C is an amalgamation of two companies, each of which holds identical contracts for delivering Work for the Dole (WfD) programs on behalf of the Australian Government, in the western and northern regions of Australia. Work for the Dole is a Federal Government funded program that provides work experience opportunities and activities for eligible job seekers.

It involves local communities in activities that provide work experience for the unemployed and is designed to help the unemployed re-attach to the labour market. Work for the Dole is also designed to provide communities with quality projects/activities that are of value to them. Each of the two companies is answerable to its own Board of Directors. Both were created and defined by Federal Legislation. One of the companies has a staff of nine permanent and 12 contracted staff. The other company has a full-time staff of 38.

The main difference in the make-up of these two organisations is that 20% of the employees in the second company are indigenous Australians. For the purpose of the present study, however, they are appropriately grouped together because their context, contracts and required outcomes are the same. The funding for these two organisations at time of research was in excess of $10 million Australian dollars.

**Organisation D: Government for Profit**

Organisation D operates in the communications sector and is one of the largest Federal Government organisations in Australia. The business employs 62 sales and marketing people, their ten managers and six senior executives, who in turn who had, at time of research, a direct impact on a further 1,730 staff. This organisation, although heavily constrained by Government legislation, operates on a for profit enterprise.
The variety of organisational types and sizes, the variety subjects (age, sex and ethnicity) who hold leadership positions at different levels within these organisations and the varied times and places in which the interviews were conducted ensured that the researcher had enough rich raw data to meet the requirements of data triangulation (Denzin, 1970). In order to test for consistency as suggested by (Patton, 2002) and to overcome the potential for intrinsic bias as warned by Denzin (1989) semi structured questionnaires, an interview guide, digital recordings, field notes, memos and emails were used in the data collection phase of the research.

The raw data collected from each interview was transcribed into individual word documents. From there attributes were assigned to each of the transcripts according to the interview guide number, the type and status of the organisation, the subject’s gender and age bracket. NVivo 8 software program was used to create an initial template which mirrored the categories of the interview guide and then to create further categories and subcategories (nodes).

Thematic analysis of the coded data allowed the development of a final template consisting of major and sub-themes and characteristics for reflection and the development a grounded theory.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

As reported this study employed a single embedded case study, mixed purposeful sampling and ethnographic interviews in order to a) examine the subjects' individual working lives and b) subsequently understand the relationships among aspects of reality of interest concerning the central research question.

Connell et al (2001) suggest that "the researcher's choice of methodology is inevitably shaped by limitations and research considerations that go beyond epistemological and research question issues and which ultimately result in compromise' (p4).

Accordingly, one limitation to the study- which could also be argued as being strength is in the nature of qualitative research itself in seeking to define the reality it purports to measure. Abbot (1992) expands on this concern and suggests that because individual cases are generally narrative, only population studies can really be analytic and thus a lesser approach will have inherent limitations (p. 140).
However Edleson (1988) counters this view and suggests that 'the same kind of reasoning about hypothesis may be used whether the domain being studied is a single person, single cultural object or a single, society, organisation, group or family' (p.253). Patton (1990) concurs and asserts that there is no strict sample size required in qualitative studies and that such decisions are left to the researcher. Regardless, the number of interviews conducted (61) might be considered to be small and were conducted in Australia only.

This study does not target specific industry sectors. Rather it addresses the organisational aspects which are common to all industry sectors in Australia with the only differences being whether the organisation also has to conform to Australian Legislation concerning its Government or private, for profit or not for profit status. Two of the contributing organisations fall into the category of medium sized organisations, one, although a branch of a much larger organisation has financial and reporting responsibilities that afford it the category of a large organisation and other is one of Australia’s largest Government Departments.

These organisations are located in North and West Australia. Therefore a major limitation to this study relates to the generalisability of the findings on the basis of number of leaders interviewed, the number, and size of organisations in which these leaders work, the non- specific sectors in which the study takes place and the location of these organisations.

However it should be noted that the participants in this study and their organisations are informed by the same Federal educational and training constructs that are also utilised by or potentially impact on all other Australian organisations. Similarly each of these organisations in the study is also impacted by the same communication technology and business practices, Federal laws and constraints as those experienced in wider Australia.

Therefore while the number of participants and size and locations of their organisations is restrictive the limitations posed by these aspects are arguably less than might be if this study was conducted in a country where the differences in education, business practices, technology and laws varied between regions.
Another limitation to this study concerns the process of defining leader and leadership and which can vary strongly from one person to the next. Primarily, this limitation can be identified as being perceptual on behalf of the respondents.

This same perceptual construct may also be present, particularly in the identity portion of the interview instrument because as identified in the literature reviewed, it is possible for a leader or manager to have problems critically analysing their own role and abilities if they cannot suitably define them (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Biddle, 1979; Collins, 1998; Haslam, 2004; Noonan, 2003). Although there are undoubtedly limitations to this study there are also opportunities for further research in the future to test the findings and recommendations in a wider context.

1.7 Organisation of Thesis

1.7.1 Chapter Two: Literature Review

This work is a study of the human condition and behaviors in an organisational context which brings it into the realm of the social sciences. Accordingly this chapter begins by reviewing the central underpinning constructs related to Social Theory before moving on to Personal, Social and Organisational Identity, Human and Social Capital, Organisations, Leadership, Leadership and Management theories and Power. Once addressed, the chapter then turns the reader’s attention to the individual actor who inhabits the leader role. It addresses the fundamental principles of individual thought and emotions and explains how human emotions and reactions are triggered and how this can inhibit leader and leadership performance and behavior.

The literature then moves on to the nature of first and second order change and opines that there are hundreds of change models within these two typologies but that they generally fall into Van de Ven and Poole’s (1995) four basic theories of change – those which reflect life cycle, evolutionary, teleological and dialectic models.

However because the specific role that leadership plays in organisational change has been poorly theorised to date, the body of the review explores in some depth contemporary literature concerning what might be termed as change gone wrong, or organisations in crisis. Focus is placed on dysfunctional leadership, influence, and the effects of internal and external pressures on change agents and recipients.
The review then addresses the leadership pedagogy which significantly contributes to the way in which leader and leadership is viewed, taught and re-enforced in this country.

It concludes with a review of both the philosophical assumptions that underpin research design and the various methods and methodologies available to the researcher in the collection and analysis of data.

1.7.2 Chapter Three: Research Methodology

Chapter Three describes in detail the philosophical assumptions which underpin this research as well the four-staged research methodology employed. Stage one addresses the research design. It explains the nature of various case study and sampling strategies before identifying that a single embedded case study comprised of mixed purposeful sampling is the most appropriate for use in this particular study. This section also reports on the four sites chosen two capital cities in Australia. These sites represented the Public and Private Sector and profit and not for profit statuses.

Stage two explains the data collection methods which are suitable for the type of research design previously identified and explains why ethnographic interviews, interview guides and semi-structured questionnaires, digital recordings and field notes were chosen from those on offer. It then reveals the 4 themes and 38 questions formulated to address the research question and which make up the interview guides and how the subject narratives will be captured. This section also addresses how to preserve subject anonymity and address the ethical implications associated with interviewing as well as how the researcher will minimise the potential for bias during the interview process. Stage three addresses how the raw data will be coded according to Stauss and Corbin's (1998) Grounded Theory principles, and explains how the NVivo8 software program will be utilised to assist the coding process and data analysis.

1.7.3 Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

Chapter 4 presents the findings from the in-depth interviews with 61 participants who took part in the case study. The emerging key themes are identified and explained.
through the use of template analysis, open, axial and selective coding using the NVivo8 software program.

1.7.4 Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Implications

Chapter five begins with a summary of the thesis so as to provide context before discussing the findings in relation to the study’s aims and objectives and relates them to previous research and theoretical models.

Based on this discussion, an original leadership and management taxonomy is presented. The study’s conclusions provide a new understanding of the nature of leader, leadership and management behavior and interactions in relation to first and second order change, as well as introducing the original concept of leadership hijacking. Finally, the implications for future leader and leadership pedagogy and research are discussed.
Chapter Two: Literature Review
2 Literature Review

A review of the literature reveals that although there is a substantial body of scholarship concerning management, leadership and personal identity, the lines between the three are often blurred (Blanchard 2006; Deming, 2000; De Vries, 1993; Drucker, 2001). More specifically, there is a dearth of information about the practicalities behind the successful interplay of leadership and management functions in the workplace. Further, the literature is predominantly normative, focusing on what leaders and managers ‘do well’, or on what they ‘should do’ or ‘should be’ rather than on functionality - particularly as it relates to organisational change. This lacuna is reflected in Australian workplaces through job descriptions that combine management and leadership accountabilities under one job title and where leadership is taught as a component of management courses.

Because of the social nature of the study, the literature review begins by adumbrating the central underpinning constructs related to sociology, social theory, personal, social and organisational identity. The focus then shifts to human and social capital, organisations, leadership, management and organisational change. The biological nature of influence and emotions is also addressed because of its relevance to resistance to change. Although the specific role that leaders and leadership play in organisational change has been poorly theorised to date, there is emerging scholarship which addresses what might be referred to as ‘change gone wrong’, or organisations in crisis, as well as the factors that contribute to this phenomena. Consequently the latter part of the discussion ventures into the relatively uncharted waters of dysfunctional leadership and influence, and the effects of internal and external pressures on change agents. The chapter concludes with an account of leadership education and its expression in those current government and industry training strategies and deliveries that support popular leadership knowledge and skill acquisition in Australia today.

2.1 Social Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Sociology and Social Theory

Sociology is the scientific study of human society—its origins, organisation and development (Barcan, 1993).
It puts human behavior under a microscope but takes a more holistic interest in how individuals construct their realities; how the world has impacted on the individual; how they affect social change and how, as Berger (1963) suggests, people attain a “transformation of consciousness” (p.72). Further, sociology questions “taken-for-granted assumptions about the world we live in, what we see as ‘familiar’ and ‘normal’ within the context of our everyday lives, and provides a new and more critical perspective of the world through the use of scientific theories, concepts and empirical evidence” (Berger, 1963, p21).

As the eminent German Sociologist, Norbert Elias, explains, in order to understand the nature of sociology

one has to look at oneself from a distance, to see oneself as a human being among others. For sociology is concerned with the problems of society, and society is formed by oneself and other people together; the person who studies and thinks about society is himself a member of it (1970, p.13).

The term social theory is relatively new, not being found in the literature prior to the mid-20th century. The concept, however, can be traced back to much earlier times. The 18th century historical philosopher Giovanni Battista (Giambattista aka Vico or Vigo, 1668-1744), for instance, suggest that all human beings have a capacity for understanding history because they are the ones who make history. More than two centuries later this view would be echoed by Giddens (1979), who observes that “every social actor knows a great deal about the reproduction of the society of which he or she is a member” (p.5).

It could be argued that Giddens’s view is even more cogent some 35 years later, when the cult of celebrity is prevalent and a range of social and other media provide countless individuals with the means to influence popular opinion and, indeed, to represent particular views of reality as fact or truth. In this context, it is important to differentiate between social theory and editorialising.

As Gramsci (1979) suggests:

Everyone is a philosopher, though in his own way and unconsciously, since even in the slightest manifestation of any intellectual activity whatever, in ‘language’, there is contained a specific conception of the world, one then moves on to the second level, which is that of awareness and criticism (Prison Notes, vol. 1, p.626).
While social theory relies on input from interactions between ordinary people, it does not assume that opinions and singular observations represent ‘truth’. Social theory seeks to establish reliable observations, in contrast to prejudices and stereotypes, and to adopt an attitude of detachment rather than an attitude of partisanship or vested interest. Meaning is generated through systematic, critical debate about social life that is informed by well-defined concepts and techniques of analysis (Dillon, 2010; Kivisto, 2010).

Moreover, while “people usually understand their problems in reference to their own personal life story, they are not always aware of the complex links between their own lives and the rest of the world’s history” (Mills, 1959, p.13). Social theory, which underpins this research, refers to the theoretical frameworks that are used to explain and analyse change in society at either the macro or micro level. Social theory is interdisciplinary, often drawing from and contributing to diverse disciplines such as philosophy, politics, theology, medicine, history, economics, anthropology, sociology and business. (Giddens, 1979, 1984; Hogan, 1976; Marconis & Plummer, 2005).

Although, the term is relatively new—first appearing in the mid-20th century—it could be argued that social theory has been around for thousands of years. Notable historical philosophers and religious figures such as the Chinese philosopher Confucius (551-479 BCE), Mozi (also known as Mo Di, circa 470-390 BCE), St Augustus (354-430) and St. Thomas Aquinas (circa 1225-1274) used narrative and normative means to speak out against social inequities or unethical social behaviour and to encourage moral and just action.

Modern social theories can be traced back to the 18th century. In 1795, the Marquis de Condorcet published *Outline of the Intellectual Progress of Mankind*, in which he claimed that societies pass through stages, each of which represents the progressive emancipation of man’s reason from superstition and ignorance.

In 1797, the Rev. Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) described the relationship between population and food production in his *Essay on Population*. This legacy informed the work of August Comte (1798-1857), whose interest in the difference between social statistics and social dynamics subsequently earned him the title “father of sociology” (Ellwell, 1996).

The 19th century saw the emergence of a number of important theories of social and historical change, including Herbert Spencer’s (1820-1903) social evolutionism, Pareto’s (1848-1923) social cycle theory and the historical materialism of Karl Marx (1818-1883).
Karl Marx, Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) and Max Weber (1864-1920) are considered to be the three main architects of modern social science in the classical tradition. Durkheim’s work focused on how societies can maintain their integrity and coherence in modernity, while Weber proposed an interpretive approach to understanding social action based on the meanings and purposes that individuals attach to their own actions (Elwell, 1996).

Around this same time, social theorists associated with the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research (notably, Adomo, Horkheimer, Kirchheimer, Lowenthal, Marcue, Neumann and Pollock) sought to address perceived omissions in traditional Marxism and by employing insights from other disciplines such as antipositivist sociology, psychoanalysis and existential philosophy. In 1937 Horkheimer defined critical theory as a specific strand of thought in his essay entitled *Traditional and Critical Theory*. Critical theory Horkenheimer (ibid) suggests, directs its focus at the whole of society and should integrate all the major sciences, such as economics, history, geography, anthropology, economics, psychology and political science thereby improving society rather than merely seeking to understand and explain as in the classical theory tradition (e.g. Boulder, 2002; Dahms, 2008; Linklater, 2001).

By the mid-20th century, formal social theories were seen to be an essential part of scientific explanation. Theorists such as C.J. Hempel developed formal schemes through which a logical deductive system of propositions could be formalised into coherent theories of social reality (Hempel, 1959). In 1979, the term *postmodernism* entered the lexicon via the American theorist Ihab Hassan’s book, *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature*. This term was subsequently picked up by Jean-François Lyotard in his influential short work, *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (1979). Since that time, postmodernism—which challenges the idea of a single ‘truth’—has influenced numerous social theorists (Docker, 1994; Giddens, 1990; Harvey, 1991; Jameson, 1990), who suggest that a plurality of positions, interests and values are now equally valued within society. As a result, it has become difficult to assert the superiority of any one view over another, particularly in a decentralised, media-dominated society (Turner & Jonathan, 2000). For this reason, postmodernism rejects the possibility of a ‘grand theory’, as discussed below.
2.1.2 Grand Theory and Middle Range Theory

The term *grand theory* was first coined by the American sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959). A theory is considered *grand* “when it seeks to explain a large social landscape, or in a more contemporary vocabulary it tries to link macro- and micro levels of reality” (Turner & Boyns 2002, p.353)

While early proponents of grand theory included such notable thinkers as Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson and Jean Piaget, sociological interest in grand theory was such that by the 1980s it had taken a variety of forms (e.g. Critical Theory, Structuralism, Structural Marxism, and Structuration Theory). However grand theory also has its detractors, with some authors arguing that it would allow a fixation on theories rather than encouraging researchers to embrace the theory-less world of empiricism. One notable protagonist was the American sociologist and architect of structural functionalism, Talcott Parsons (1902-1979). While Parsons insisted that there can be no one universal scheme to understand the unity of social structures, defenders of grand theory (e.g. Gregory et al., 2009) countered that: “No matter the phenomenon investigated, it could always be slotted into a wider theoretical scheme. Nothing would be left out; everything would be explained” (pp. 315-316).

*Middle range theory*, like grand theory, refers to an approach to theory construction rather than to a specific theory. Raymond Boudon (1934- ) defines middle-range theory as:

> a commitment to two ideas. One idea is positive, and describes what such theories should do: if a theory is valid, it explains and in other words consolidates and federates empirical regularities which on their side would appear otherwise segregated The other idea is negative, and relates to what theory cannot do: It is hopeless and quixotic to try to determine the overarching independent variable that would operate in all social processes, or to determine the essential feature of social structure, or to find out the two, three, or four couples of concepts ... that would be sufficient to analyze all social phenomena (1991, pp 519-522).

The middle-range theoretical approach was first developed by Robert Merton (1910- 2003) and is a departure from *grand* social theorising. Although Merton agreed with Parson’s supposition that a successful theory cannot be formed entirely of simple statistics or observations, he directly opposed the formulation of abstract theories on the basis of the application of total theoretical systems to social life.
Rather he contended that sociologists should concentrate on measurable aspects of social reality that can be studied as separate social phenomena (Kaufman, 2003) and that middle-range theories must share three major characteristics:

1. They do not attempt to deal with all social phenomena; rather are concerned with one or a few phenomena.
2. They tend to be ultimately linked to each other.
3. They are abstract enough to transcend simple description but concrete enough to generate testable hypotheses (Merton, 1968, pp.1-2).

Pinder and Moore (1980) suggest that, in the last 40 years of organisational study, there has been a movement away from grand theories where researchers treat “organisations as one homogeneous group of phenomena and towards middle range theory where the study of organisations, their form and content can occur in terms of a single frame of reference” (p.169). Moreover Pinder and Moore (ibid.) assert that there is value in using middle range theory in organisational studies because it is “research oriented as well as—or instead of—being oriented to the needs of management practitioners” (p.285).

2.1.3 Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory

Although Edwin Garrigues Boring (1933) is attributed with coining the term identity theory his views on the subject were not afforded the serious attention by either philosophers or psychologists at the time. Rather identity theory did not to gain traction until it was further developed in the 1950s through its association with such philosophers as J.J.C. Smart (1920- ), U.T. Place (1924- 2000), Herbert Feigl (1902 – 1988) and Giles Deleuze (1925-1995).

Growing interest in the notion of identity within both the psychological and sociological disciplines resulted in each discipline developing theories to explain the human condition. Both Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory are perspectives of the concept of self (identity) and the nature of normative behavior, but because the roots of the two theories come from two separate disciplines (Psychology and Sociology) they occupy parallel but separate universes and exist with no cross referencing (Hogg et. al, 1995).

As a result “the coexistence of such apparently similar explanatory frameworks is problematic for social science” (Hogg et al., 1995, p 255).
Simply put, Identity Theory sets out to explain an individual’s role relative to behaviours (Burke, 1980; McCall & Simmons 1979; Stryker, 1968; Turner 1978) while social identity theory seeks to explain intergroup relations and group processes (Hogg & Abrams 1988; Tajfel & Turner 1979; Turner, 1982; 1985).

Identity theorists (e.g. Burke & Stets, 2009; Burke, 1980 & Wiley, 1991; Stryker, 1968, 1980) suggest that we have distinct components of ourselves for each position that we occupy in society and these are called role identities. For example a person could hold the role parent, tennis player, child, accountant, manager, leader, committee member, musician and blood donor. In Identity theory, the focus of the individual is on self or the “I”. The suggestion is that each role assumed is hierarchical with some identities having more self-relevance and importance to the individual than others. This is called identity salience (Abdelal, et al., 2009; McCall & Simmons 1978; Stryker, 1987). In explaining identity salience, Hogg et al. (1998) suggest that:

> Identities positioned higher in the salience hierarchy are tied more closely to behaviour. Thus people with the same role identities may behave differently in a given context because of the differences in identity salience (e.g. Callero 1985; Thoits 1991). For example one person may work on the weekend while another may spend time with the children although both may have a “parent” role identity. The difference in behaviour is due to differences in identity salience” (pp. 257-258).

Identity salience impacts behavioural and affective outcomes, relationships and individual’s perceptions and evaluations of others (Callero 1985; McCall & Simmons, 1978). However while Identity Theory hypothesizes that salient identities create congruent behaviour which can be considered as being attributional, it also acknowledges that salient behavior can be interrupted by the firing of the amygdala in the limbic brain. This is known as amygdala hijacking (and will be further addressed later in this chapter) which results in a temporary, usually emotionally motivated, behavior and is a short-term, “knee-jerk” response to a real or perceived threat (Goleman, 1996; Hogg et al., 1998; Stryker 1968).

In summary, the central characteristics of identity theory according to Hogg et al. (1995) are

1) social factors define self; 2) the social nature of self is conceived as derived from the role or positions that people occupy in the social world; 3) role identities vary in regard to their salience and 4) identity theory is interested in individualistic outcomes of identity-related
processes, although identity theorists acknowledge that reciprocal links exist between self and society, p 259).

The core assumption of social identity theory, is that an individual has not one, personal-self, but rather multiple selves which align to various group memberships (Hogg et al., ibid). Turner et al., (1987) assert that different social contexts may trigger an individual to think, feel and act according to his/her family, ethnic, religious or other group level of self. Apart from the level of self, an individual has multiple social identities (Haslam, 2001, p.21) which are the individual’s self-concept derived from their perceived membership of social groups (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002). Social Identity defines the “us” and the ‘we’ associated with any internalised group membership and the “them” that are not included in that group membership (Haslam, 2001) and in so doing enhances individual self-esteem (Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

Central to social identity theory is the hypothesis that individuals are more likely to display favouritism to an in-group on the basis that it is central to their self-definition, when a given comparison is meaningful or there is a justifiable or contestable cause. Further individuals will seek to categorise and find negative aspects of any out-group which does not meet these criteria (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002; Smidts, et al., 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

However, there are three variables according to Tajfel and Turner (1979, p.41), whose contribution to the emergence of in-group favouritism is particularly important. The first is the extent to which individuals identify with an in-group and internalise group membership as an aspect of their self-concept. The second is the extent to which the prevailing context provides ground for comparison between groups and the third is the perceived relevance of the comparison group, which itself will be shaped by the relative and absolute status of the in-group ( in Haslam, 2001, p.21)

It is this core assumption of multiple social identities and associated thoughts, feelings and behaviours along with the notion of group membership and exclusions which fundamentally distinguishes social identity from that of personal identity which refers to self-knowledge derived from the individual’s unique attributes (Turner, 1982).

2.1.4 Organisational Identity and Commitment

A subcomponent of social identity of particular relevance to the present inquiry is that of organisational identity.
Here an individual takes on the values, behaviours and ideals of the organisation (or of a subgroup such as a union, unit, department, division or branch) to which s/he physically or mentally belongs (Oakman & Brown 1986; O’Reilly & Chatman 1986; Patchen, 1970; Tajfel, 1982, Linstead & Linstead, 2005).

In the organisational behaviour literature, organisational identification has long been recognised as a critical construct that affects both individual satisfaction and the effectiveness of the organisation (Oakman & Brown 1986; O’Reilly & Chatman 1986). While social identity derives from the concept of (general) group identification (Tolman, 1943), organisational identity is “the process by which the goals of the organisation and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent” (Hall, Schneider & Nygren 1970, pp. 176-177).

As with other social identities, the individual can form numerous organisational identities. These can be non-specific (when the goals and values are shared with members of other similar groups, such as schools, hospitals, religions, political or sporting groups) or derive from the individual’s specific organisation, workgroup, department, union, age cohort, managerial level, clique and so on (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hatch & Schultz, 2004).

According to Pullen and Linstead (2005), an organisational identity is formed on the basis of the following:

- How well the individual aligns themselves with the organisation’s vision, goals, and objectives particularly if they are at odds with what they currently or previously held;
- How individuals identify with the organisation’s systems and requirements of them and how they are controlled and evaluate organisational members;
- How well they relate to the organisation and the tensions, strains or opportunities that may ensue;
- How individuals resist being colonised by discourses of which they do not approve; and
- How much autonomy the individual has in their role.
More than any other forms of social identity, organisational identities, even when formed, are susceptible to salience due to organisational change and internal and external influences.

Organisational identity should not be confused with organisational commitment, which is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation” (Reichers, 1985). Organisational commitment is characterised by a person’s belief and acceptance of the organisation’s (or any of its sub-sets’) goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation and desire to maintain membership (Reichers, 1985).

Commitment does not always mean that the individual has formed an organisational identity— the organisation may simply be seen as a convenient vehicle for the attainment of individual career goals (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Hafer & Martin, 2006). In such cases the individual could easily transfer commitment to another organisation without the psychic loss that would accompany the loss of a specific organisational identity (Levinson, 1970). Commitment, therefore, should not be viewed as a static state but as movement along a continuum. Neither is commitment always reciprocated by the wider organisation which may view the individual merely as part of its human capital as will be addressed later in this chapter.

Having addressed identity and social theory, the study now widens its scope to address the organisation and with it, its leaders and managers and the types of change which might be experienced in the organisational context.

### 2.2 Organisations

#### 2.2.1 Definitions

Although the literature abounds with advice for an organisation—how to change, lead, manage, structure, downsize or re-engineer it—it is surprisingly difficult to find a scholarly definition of the term itself. Senior and Fleming (1997) lament that most texts “do not give a straightforward definition of what organisation means” (p.4). Statt (1991), for example, suggests that an organisation is "a group of people brought together for the purpose of achieving certain objectives" (p.102). This vague definition not only lacks reference to the rigorous framework that guides an organisation’s activities, but also—by suggesting that an
organisation is a *group*—excludes small businesses comprising two people from the definition.

Equally unsatisfactory, although for different reasons, is Buchanan and Huczynski’s definition of an organisation as "a social arrangement for achieving controlled performance in pursuit of collective goals" (2004, p. 4).

This definition is too rigid since, it could be argued, that organisations do not always require performance to be controlled but, rather, use tools such as influence, guidance, training or mentoring.

The definition employed in the present study is that of Pride, Hughes and Kapoor (1989), namely: "a group of two or more people working together in a pre-determined fashion to achieve a common set of goals" (p.5). This definition acknowledges that an organisation can comprise as few as two people and allows for flexibility in relation to how work is achieved without sacrificing the notion of rigor or ruling out the use of other tools to achieve the common set of goals.

### 2.2.2 Organisations and Businesses

Whether it is a two person operation or a company employing hundreds of thousands of people, an organisation is an entity in its own right and separate from the people who own it and/or work for it (Gibson et al., 2012; Senior and Fleming, 1997). An organisation exists for a specific purpose (Baron & Greenberg, 1990):

> From the environment’s point of view organisations are instruments for producing products and/or services in demand within the environment. From the organisation’s viewpoint, the environment provides the raw materials and other inputs it needs to produce outputs, and then absorbs that output, thereby supplying the means to acquire more inputs and so on. (Hatch, 2013, p.58)

It can be queried whether the fundamental nature of all organisations is the same regardless of whether or not they have a business (for profit) component. In other words, is organisation synonymous with business?
Pride, Hughes and Kapoor, (2009) suggest that it is not:

A business is a particular form of organisation such as Kraft Foods, Inc., or Cracker Barrel Old Country Stores. To be successful a business must perform three activities. It must be organized. It must satisfy needs. And it must be profitable. (p. 9)

From this perspective, all organisations share a number of general characteristics. But ‘business’ is a sub-category of organisation linked with the concept of profit. That is, all businesses are organisations, but not all organisations are businesses.

Leaders and managers are relevant to all organisations regardless of the organisation’s industry, size, purpose, or for profit/not for profit status.

The process of organising involves implementing and maintaining “the formally prescribed pattern of interrelationships existing between the various units of an organisation” (Baron & Greenberg, 1990, p. 342). This is essential if actors are to work together in a predetermined fashion. When this does not occur, or when such structuring is not adhered to, there can be negative consequences for both the organisation and its actors.

2.2.3 Structure, Structuration and Strategic Drift

While some formal elements of structure must be present to warrant the term organisation (Carnall, 2003; Johnson, Scholes; Whittington, 2008), Vecchio, Hearn and Southey (1992) note that, “just as people have scanned the night sky for centuries and have learned to see constellations by drawing imaginary lines between the stars, there are many ways in which to structure an organisation in relation to its environment” (p. 526). Dougherty (2006) suggests that it is the organisation’s purpose (mission) that determines how an organisation should be structured, because the mission “shapes the individual roles, relationships, specialist and functional boundaries and interactions, procedures, communication paths, and other mechanisms required of that organisation” (p.117).

All organisations have some degree of formal structure, which, according to Mullins (2005), is created by management in order to establish relationships between individuals and groups, to provide order and systems and to direct efforts to carry out goal seeking activities.
Many organisations however may also operate simultaneously within an informal structure. This is often the result of social interactions (friendships and other relationships) in the workplace or because people find it easier, less stressful or more time-efficient to work in ways other than those prescribed in the formal structure (Senior & Fleming, 2006). According to Giddens (1986), this is problematic because actors can drift away from organisationally mandated ways of doing things to practices based on personal preference and lifestyle patterns. Giddens (1984) labelled this phenomenon, structuration.

Structuration theory suggests that agency and structure cannot be separated but are connected to one another in what he calls the duality of structure. In his seminal work, The Constitution of Society, Giddens (1894) describes structure in terms of modalities comprised of rules and resources that engage human action.

In an organisational context, actors are the elements that enable the creation of organisational structure, policies, procedures, job descriptions and accountabilities and who invent the values and norms that are reinforced throughout the organisation by social acceptance. When actors pay little attention to the organisational norms or substitute or reproduce them in a different way, this leads to separation between routines and motivations:

The consequences of what actors do, intentionally or unintentionally, are events which would not have happened if that actor had behaved differently, but which are not within the scope of the agent's power to have brought about regardless of what the agent's intentions are. (Giddens, 1984, p.11)

When this phenomenon becomes prevalent in an organisation, leaders often cease to notice that their formal structure and strategies are gradually and subtly being eroded, ignored, or by-passed, or have become outdated in a changing external environment. If the situation persists for too long, the consequences can often be costly. This effect is known as strategic drift (Hardy, 1989; Johnson, 1987).

Strategic drift has further negative implications in that it creates an informal structure where actors can fall prey to groupthink (Mitzberg, 1994; Esser & Liandoerfer, 1998). Jannis (1971) builds on Whyte’s (1952) original work on groupthink, elaborates on the concept:
I use the term groupthink as a quick and easy way to refer to the mode of thinking that persons engage in when *concurrence-seeking* [original italics] becomes so dominant in a cohesive in-group that it tends to override realistic appraisal of alternative courses of action. (p. 42)

The assumption is that it becomes more difficult for the organisation to achieve its goals in an environment where groupthink, structural drift and informal structure counter the necessity for “working together in a predetermined fashion”. Some organisational scholars contend that informal structures and communication (including rumour, gossip and the ‘grapevine’) arise from a breakdown in the formal structure and contribute not only to loss of standards and productivity but also to high staff turnover, high levels of stress and insecurity in the workplace (Hatch, 2013; Miller, 2012). It has also been suggested that they result in challenges to management and leadership, and pose potential threats to an organisation’s reputation and ability to generate income (Eder & Enke, 1991; Davis 1995). Others, however, argue that informal communication does not have the same negative impact as do informal structures, but should rather be viewed as an important part of any organisation or group (Baron & Greenberg, 1988; Noon & Delbidge 1993; Rogers & Rogers, 1976; Shaw, 2013; Zaramba, 1988).

Thus the challenge facing modern organisations is how to maintain the integrity and continuity of the organisation’s structure through the use of its formal structure—policies, procedures, communication channels, job descriptions, performance appraisals and the like—without making the structure so restrictive that it inhibits communication or the organisation’s ability to respond to changing environments, or causes organisational structure to become valued as ends in themselves.

### 2.2.4 Money, Productivity and Outputs

All organisations rely on money—acquired through sales, funding or donations—as a form of energy used to keep them operating. As Smithin (2000) suggests, “economic activity in the capitalist or market economy is all about money; making money, earning money, spending money, saving money and so forth” (p.1). Money functions as a medium of exchange, a measure of value, a means of deferred payment and a store of value (Dwivedi, 2010; Greco, 2001).
Exchange occurs when an agreement is made whereby one person is willing to accept what the other person is willing to give in return (Schumpeter, 1954, 1994; Dwivedi, 2010). Problems arise when one person does not want to receive in return what the other is willing to give (Smithin, 2000) as sometimes occurs in a barter system. Money as a medium of exchange is unique in that it carries with it general acceptance: it is portable, difficult to counterfeit, legally enforced, and is a form of compensation guaranteed by the government (Dwivedi, 2010). This final point is important since money as an object in its own right is only worth the value of the paper or coin from which it is made.

Without the confidence that comes from government backing, money has little value in the modern world. Therefore it could be conceived that money is an idea backed by the confidence that it represents a certain level of exchange. This view is generally reflected in all neoclassical economic literature that attempts to define money (e.g. Rogers, 1989; Schumpeter, 1994; Smithin, 2000; Veblen, 1900).

Money is also used as a common denominator throughout the world as a measure of account and as an expression and/or comparison of the worth or value (price or cost) of objects/goods/services produced by organisations (Smithin, 2000; Walters, 1979).

The deferred payment system of borrow today and repay later (credit) is an old practice. Whether what has been borrowed today has the same value when payment is made (or the cost of deferred payment to the lender) has been a topic of discussion for thousands of years. Nonetheless, money is the most acceptable form of deferred payment, is legally enforceable and generally more stable than other types of commodity (Ingham, 1996; Keynes, 1930; Rochon, 1999; Wray, 1998). Money, unlike most other commodities, can be saved or stored for future use. As such, it is unique (Dwivedi, 2010).

These four monetary functions are so intrinsically entwined with productivity that Walters (1979) warns:

[I]f a modern economy were somehow deprived of a monetary mechanism and driven back to a system of barter, the level of output would be much lower and the variety of goods and services much smaller than is enjoyed with a monetary system. Money therefore serves as a “factor of production” enabling output to increase and diversify (p.9).
According to economists such as Wicksell (1962), Yeager (1997) and Horwitz (1992), however, although money is an extremely important exchange for production it is still an inanimate tool and not a causative agent. Rather, it is the myriad of decisions made and actions performed by people that brings about these effects in the first place. If an organisation’s ability to produce and deliver quality end products is in any way compromised, the organisation risks experiencing monetary problems in one or more of its functional forms. The role that leadership plays at that point becomes much more complicated.

2.2.5 Human and Social Capital

The Nobel Prize winning Economist A.W.Lewis (1915-1991) is attributed with developing the term human capital in his 1954 writings entitled Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. However arguably the best-known application of the idea comes from the Economist Gary Becker, whose 1964 book Human Capital became a standard reference in Economic studies for many years. In Becker’s view, human capital is similar to such physical means of production as factories or machines. Further he suggests that one can invest in human capital through such things as education, training or medical treatment and receive outputs largely depend on the rate of return from the human capital one employs (pp.11-18).

Social capital, although recently fashionable appeared almost a century ago when Hanifan (1916) defined it as being “those tangible assets [that] count for most in the daily lives of people: namely goodwill, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among the individuals and families who make up a social unit” (cited in Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Since then there have been numerous definitions of social capital which appear in the literature. Bourdieu (1985) defines social capital as

the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to memberships in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a “credential” which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word (p. 248).

Baker (1990) suggests that social capital is ‘a resource that actors derive from specific social structures and then use to pursue their interests; it is created by changes in the relationship among actors’ (p.619).
Pennar (1997) informs that it is “the web of social relationships that influences individual behaviour and thereby affects economic growth (p.154). However, Field (2008) simply suggests that “the theory of social capital, is at heart, most straightforward. Its central thesis can be summed up in two words: relationships matter” (p.1).

Regardless of the varied definitions, scholars generally agree that social capital is a valuable resource which should be fostered and protected (e.g. Adler & Kwon, 2002) which it could be argued, is why Leadership development researchers and practitioners are increasingly recognising the social processes involved in leadership (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

2.3 Leader, Leadership and Manager

2.3.1 Definitions

According to Bass (1990), there have been “as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 3). A review of the literature supported this view, revealing a vast number of often conflicting definitions. Accordingly, the researcher turned to the etymology of the word ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’ for clarification. The Arcade Dictionary of Word Origins (1990) explains that the root word of ‘lead’ comes from a prehistoric West and North Germanic word laithjan, “which was in turn derived from laitho, meaning way or journey and from which comes the English word lead” (p. 319). De Vries (2004) notes that the words ‘lead’, ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’ derive from the same Anglo-Saxon word læđ, meaning path or road. Accordingly, he proposes, if “the verb læđan means to cause to go with one; a leader is one who shows fellow travellers the way by walking ahead” (p.27).

There is a clear distinction between the purposes and functionalities of leader, leadership and manager. Leaders walk ahead and cause us to go to places not yet travelled, while managers hold an oversight role in which they are responsible for production to predetermined standards within existing and well known parameters (Joss, 2001). In such roles, managers may select staff, organise assignments and productivity, set their targets and manage employee performance in their daily work (Mintzberg, 2009; Daft, 2012).
2.3.2 Leadership Theories

Social commentaries about leaders and leadership are as old as humanity itself. The cave paintings at Lascaux, Kakadu, Altamira and Sierra de San Francisco, which predate Mayan and Egyptian hieroglyphics, display aspects of the lives and feats of the men, women and Gods who were important to their tribes.

Centuries later, Plutarch (2nd century A.D.) wrote of the "Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans". Sun Tzu's "The Art of War" (6th century B.C.) and Machiavelli's "The Prince" (1515 A.D.) are notable writings about leadership strategies, and both are still studied today. In more recent times, Rost (1993) has pointed to the growth of scientific interest in leaders and leadership:

[S]tudies have emerged from every discipline that has had some interest in the subject of leadership: anthropology, business administration, educational administration, history, military science, nursing administration, organisational behaviour, philosophy, political science, public administration, psychology, sociology, and theology. (p. 45)

He suggests that scholars “have primarily studied leadership from the context of their own fields and subfields, thus knowingly or unknowingly allowing their discipline to influence the subsequent definition” (ibid.) - a conclusion that is illustrated in the following attempts to define leadership:

Leadership is causing others to want what you are doing to accomplish the work of the school (DeBruyn, 1976, p.14)

Leadership is an interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes (benefits/costs ratio) will be improved if he behaves in the manner suggested or desired (Jacobs, 1970, p. 232)

Leadership can be perceived as a particularly emotion-laden process, with emotions entwined with the social influence process (George, 2000, p. 1027).

Nonetheless, Rost (1993) asserts, leadership is more widely discussed than defined: “over 60 per cent of the authors who have written about leadership did not define leadership in their works” (p.7).
Even so, Bennis and Nanus (1985) refused to define leadership themselves, on the grounds that they did not want to “further muddle the bewildering melange of leadership definitions” (p.20). Nearly three decades later, Bennis (2009) continues to hold this view: “Braque the French painter [once said] the only thing that matters in art can’t be explained. The same thing might be said of leadership” (p. xxxii).

Leadership theories broadly fall on one or other side of the nature-nurture argument. There are those that emphasise particular qualities inherent in the individual and those that focus more on historical or real-world context and circumstance. A brief overview of the main leadership theories follows.

2.3.2.1 Great Man Theory

So-called ‘great man’ theory is ensconced in the nature rather than nurture side of the debate., An early leadership theorist, was the 19th century historian Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), who proposed that “the history of the world is but the biography of great men” (as cited in Nichol, 2006, p. 47). He believed that leaders shaped history through both their personal attributes and divine inspiration. At the time, Carlyle’s observations prompted a spate of leadership studies by those who could be seen as leaders themselves—members of the aristocracy, clergy and especially those in the military. This theory contributed to the notion that leadership had to do with breeding, birthright and being male.

Moore (1927), for example, proposed that leadership is “the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led and induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation” (p.27). Though seemingly an outdated product of hierarchical cultural and social systems, it can be seen to linger on, even in the 21st century, in the form of shared membership to select social groups and known as the ‘old school tie’ or ‘boys’ club’.

2.3.2.2 Group Theory

By the 1930s, the western world was still suffering the effects of World War I and the Great Depression. Together with the emergence of new philosophies, such as communism and existentialism, this contributed to the erosion of the class system and a swing to the other side of the nature/nurture divide.
In the 1930s, while the concept of the Great Man had not fully subsided, the theory was gradually being replaced by what Bogardus (1934) called ‘group theory’. He contends that leadership is “interaction between specific traits of one person and other traits of the many, in such a way that the course of action of the many is changed by the one” (p. 3). Group theory reflected the emerging idea that leadership, rather than emanating from one great or inspired person, develops within small groups or is imposed by the dictates of external beliefs, values or rules. It replaced the singularity of leadership with the notion that leadership is naturally produced by the group.

Group theorists focused on attempting to formulate leadership attributes in order to identify and nurture those with the potential to be 'good' leaders. The theory, however, failed to account for the fact that not all those with the ‘right’ qualities actually became leaders.

2.3.2.3 Trait Theory

Derived in part from Jungian theory, the trait model of leadership, which emerged in the 1940s, was based on the identification of individual traits (physiological, demographic, personality, intellectual, task-related and social characteristics) that are considered to characterise effective leadership. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (1947) and the Katz Skills Taxonomy (1955) are trait theory tools used to determine leadership potential that are still in popular use today. Trait theory continued to see leadership as something inherent in certain individuals, with certain inherited characteristics being suited to leadership. Trait researchers (e.g. Bennis, 1997; Covey, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; McCall & Lombardo, 1983; McGregor, 1960; McLelland, 1965; Stogdill, 1974) proposed that, if these leadership traits and associated skills could be isolated and identified, they could be taught to others who could also become great leaders.

2.3.2.4 Behavioural Theory

Behavioural theory emerged in the 1950s and 1960s as a reaction to the emphasis on inherent traits (Derue, et. al., 2011). Behavioural theorists (e.g. Horton, 1992; Malandro, 2009; Misumi, 1986; Skivington, 2003) focuses on what leaders do rather than on classifying inborn traits or capabilities and assert that leadership capability is something that can be learned.
Behavioural theory suggests that success is defined in terms of describable actions and that it is possible for others to behave or act in the same way. It assesses both leadership success and the actions of leaders and suggests that, with a large enough study, leadership research can correlate statistically significant behaviours with success. It also identifies behaviours that contribute to failure, thus adding a second layer of understanding. Consequently, behavioural theorists assert that leadership is easier to teach and to learn than are the more ephemeral 'traits' or 'capabilities' of previous theories.

2.3.2.5 Contingency Theory

By the 1960s the world had experienced a Second World War, a war in Korea, and was in the grip of the Vietnam War. Capitalism in the western world was laying down the foundations for globalisation, and higher education had become more accessible to youth from all socio-economic backgrounds. Reflecting this rapidly changing social landscape, Fiedler (1967) espoused the view that no particular leadership style is best in every situation and that there is no ideal leader. Fiedler’s contingency model emphasises that the leader’s effectiveness is based on a situational contingency which is a result of interaction between two factors: leadership style and situational favourableness (later called situational control). Moreover he suggests that a leader’s success depends upon a number of variables, including the leadership style used, qualities of the followers and aspects of the situation. Thus the contingency theory of leadership could be characterised as a combination of trait and behavioural theory (i.e. it acknowledges the role of individual traits or qualities and of context and circumstance).

2.3.2.6 Contemporary Theories

Subsequent development of Fiedler’s contingency model led, arguably, to more sophisticated modelling of various combinations of individual leader style/quality and external factors. Situational theory, for example, focuses on the behaviours that the leader should adopt in a given set of situational factors (often related to follower behaviour). The Hersey-Blanchard situational theory (1977) model suggests that leadership style should be matched to the maturity of the followers. This determination dictates the degree of supervision that a subordinate requires - the less motivated and/or less skilled employee requires more direction but as the employee becomes more motivated and skilled there is a diminished amount of direct supervision, direction or encouragement required.
In the 1970s, Boles and Davenport (1975) offered a new, comprehensive definition of leadership:

[Leadership is] a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward the production goals that are acceptable to maintain the group, and to dispose the needs of individuals within the group that compelled them to join it (p. 5).

According to participative leadership theory, the ideal leadership style is one that takes into account the input of others. The assumption is that group members feel more relevant and committed to the decision-making process and are more willing to follow the leader if the leader encourages their participation and contributions. In participative theories however, the leader retains the right to disallow the input of others. This theory is used in Jarvis’ popular 4 Quadrant Leadership model.

The focus on the relationship between leader and follower led to the development of a number of relationship theories including the transformational theories as proposed by Burns (1984) and later built on by Tichy and Devanna (1986) and Bass (1986). Each of these theories has a focus on the connections that form between leaders and followers. Here leaders are seen to motivate and inspire people by helping group members see the importance and higher good of the task. Transformational leaders focus on the performance of group members but also want each person to fulfill their potential. (e.g. Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 2003; Dobbs, 2010).

Two other well-known contemporary theories are transactional theory and excellence theory. The former sees leaders as visionaries who seek to appeal to their followers’ 'better nature' and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 314). In other words, the leader is a change agent. In the 1980s, Peters and Waterman (1982) initiated the leadership excellence movement which, while not as widely accepted as other contemporary models, was associated with the beginnings of the Total Quality Management movement, which has gained ground throughout the Western World.

This brief historical overview of some of the more influential leadership theories and movements of the 20th and early 21st centuries appears to portray sequential, increasing levels of sophistication.
Rost (1993), however, asserts that this view is misleading:

The theories did not run riot in any one separate time period, nor did they disappear from the picture when the next so-called dominant theory appeared on the scene. There were periods of heightened popularity for certain theories, but when that popularity waned, the theories remained in the minds of scholars, because they appealed to the structural-functional frame in which most researchers operated (p. 29).

He proposes that most leadership theories are extensions of the values and cultural norms of the industrial paradigm. Thus they are no longer applicable to the realities of the global organisational environment, where the terms 'leadership', 'leader' and 'manager' are often used interchangeably. This confusion—lamented by Rost—is examined in the following section.

2.3.3 Leadership and Management

A review of the pre-1980 leadership and management literature reveals that scholars wrestled with definitions of leadership and management and the distinction between the two. For example, Bavelas (1960) proposed that the purpose of leadership is “to maintain the operational effectiveness of organisations through decision-making systems which comprise the management of the organisation” (p. 492), while Filley (1978) defined leadership as “the ability of an individual to establish and maintain acceptable levels of satisfaction and job-related performance so that the organisation's needs are met well” (p. 52).

As more research into the nature of leadership was conducted in the last quarter of the 20th century, the difference between leadership and management started to be acknowledged. Maloney (1979), for instance, emphasises that “it is important to understand that leadership is not a synonym for either administration or management” (p. 11). Covey (1989) agreed: “Leadership is not Management” (p. 101). Similarly, Kotter (1990) proposed that, despite some similarities, there are distinct differences between management and leadership: “The purpose of leadership is movement and useful change, while the purpose of management is to provide stability, consistency, order and efficiency” (p. 6). Macobby (2000) takes the discussion a step farther, suggesting that:

According to the current wisdom, managers are principally administrators—they write business plans, set budgets and monitor progress. Leaders on the other hand, get organisations and people to change. That's true, as far as it goes, but there is a more useful distinction between management and leadership.
Management is a \textit{function} that must be exercised in any business, leadership is a \textit{relationship} between leader and led that can energise an organisation. (p. 57).

Despite this emerging understanding, many scholars, practitioners and authors—particularly in Australia—still cannot agree on whether leadership is a sub-component of management or has a separate purpose and functionality. Notably and as previously discussed, Karpin could not or would not make the distinction between leadership and management other than to suggest:

A manager is an individual who achieves enterprise goals through the work of others. At the senior executive level, a leader is a good steward of the enterprise's future. At all other levels, a leader is an individual who achieves enterprise goals through the work of others without relying on her or his position or power’ (Karpin, 1995).

This lack of agreement is further illustrated in the following quotes from two textbooks currently in use in several Australian Universities:

A glance at the shelves in your local bookstore will quickly confirm that leadership or leading – the process of inspiring others to work hard and accomplish important tasks – is one of the most popular management topics...[I] is also one of the four functions that constitutes the management process. (Schermernhorn, et al., 2011, p. 315).

[D]efining the term ‘manager’ is straightforward: a manager is someone whose primary responsibility is to carry out the management process. In particular, a manager is someone who plans and makes decisions, organises, leads and controls human financial, physical and information resources. ((Davidson, et al., 2009, p.10).

We noted earlier that management involves four basic functions: planning and decision making, organising, leading and controlling (ibid. p. 13).

Putting aside for a moment the fact that Davidson, et al.’s definition of ‘management process’ includes leadership functions (not to mention the idea that planning and decision making are part of one integrated function), the following inference is clear: even if an actor has responsibility for large financial and other physical resources (such as organisation-wide IT
or communications), unless s/he also has direct authority over other staff, s/he is no a manager. Indeed, Davidson et al. explicitly assert:

Typically, someone whose primary responsibility is not that of coordination, along with planning, leading, organising and controlling, but rather is tasked with procurement of materials, or production of goods, or delivery of services as their primary task is not referred to as a manager (ibid).

This appears to suggest that *any* interactions in which others are influenced by a person holding a ‘non-management’ position, or *any* planning, co-ordination or organising that occurs during the production of goods or the delivery of services, cannot be said to involve leaders or managers unless such activities are the primary tasks of those involved.

Two overall conclusions can be drawn from these examples. The first is that in Australia today, an individual cannot legitimately be viewed as being a manager or leader unless the managerial or leadership activities that they rightfully perform as part of their duties, comprise the majority of their role. Secondly leadership is still viewed as a function of management (the discipline, not the collective of managerial roles). This view prevails despite decades of scholarship suggesting that management and leadership are separate disciplines (e.g. Bennis, 1989, 2009; Blanchard, 2007; Burns, 1978; Covey, 1989, 2004; Kotter, 1996, 2013; Maxwell, 2007; Welch, 2005).

Supporting this view, Dr. John Kotter Professor Emeritus of Leadership at Harvard Business School, wrote a blog for the Harvard Business Review entitled ‘Management Is (Still) Not Leadership’:

In more than four decades of studying businesses and consulting to organisations on how to implement new strategies, I can't tell you how many times I've heard people use the words "leadership" and "management" synonymously, and it drives me crazy every time...People use the terms "management" and "leadership" interchangeably. This shows that they don't see the crucial difference between the two and the vital functions that each role plays (2013, p.1).
Why does this situation exist? Kotter (op cit.) suggests that it could be because the title of manager, which once reflected the managerial functionality of the role, has changed over time, while the title has not:

People use the term "leadership" to refer to the people at the very top of hierarchies. They then call the people in the layers below them in the organization "management." And then all the rest are workers, specialists, and individual contributors. This is also a mistake and very misleading. (p.1).

According to Kotter (op cit.):

Management is a set of well-known processes, like planning, budgeting, structuring jobs, staffing jobs, measuring performance and problem-solving, which help an organization to predictably do what it knows how to do well. Management helps you to produce products and services as you have promised, of consistent quality, on budget, day after day, week after week. In organizations of any size and complexity, this is an enormously difficult task. We constantly underestimate how complex this task really is, especially if we are not in senior management jobs. So, management is crucial—but it's not leadership. (p.1).

While definitions of management abound, they tend to cluster around two main schools of thought. Typical of the first group is the following:

Management is an authority relationship between at least one manager and one subordinate who co-ordinate their activity to produce and sell particular goods and/or services. (Rost, 1993, p.145).

This definition is problematic on two counts. First, the proposition that all managers have an authority relationship over at least one subordinate is meaningless in the case of those engaged in self-management. Secondly, the association of management with the production and sale of goods and/or services excludes those involved with charitable or other service organisations that are not involved in a sales process.

Mullins’s (2005) definition is representative of the second group. It contains no reference to selling and allows for self-management:
Management takes place within a structured organisational setting and with prescribed roles; is directed towards the (set) aims and objectives; is achieved through efforts of other people (or self); and uses systems and procedures. (p. 190).

In this definition, management is conceptualised as part of an organisation’s formal structure, which exists to ensure that stated goals/end products are achieved according to the organisation’s pre-determined requirements. In essence, Mullins suggests that management is an oversight or monitoring authority rather than an agent. This definition not only differentiates the functionality of management from the title of manager but also reflects contemporary thinking, as elaborated above. It is accordingly adopted as the working definition in the present study.

2.3.4 Leadership and Leader

As well as the confusion between leadership and management, there is a more subtle conflation of leadership with leader. Simplistically, it could be assumed that leaders operate by deploying leadership. After all, The Collins English Dictionary (1998) defines leadership as “the position or function of a leader” (p.880). Indeed the word leadership will occasionally be used in this document to reflect this meaning.

However, there are uses of the word leadership in the literature in ways which hints that leadership might be more than “the position or function of a leader” (op cit). Burns (1984) for example contends that, while we know a great deal about our leaders, we still know very little about what leadership really is (p.1). Five years on, Bennis (1989), poses the question, “What do you believe are the qualities of leadership?” (p. xxxv), thus initially implying that leadership is worthy of some form of structure in its own right which is separate from the leader. However he appears to take a different approach to leadership twenty years later when he merges the terms leader and leadership in the title of his (2009) book On Becoming a Leader: the leadership classic, and then by using the terms leader and leadership interchangeably throughout. Similarly, Bass (1990), attempts to classify leadership but then does this through the identification of 29 different human behavioural systems (p.36).
Other leadership scholars however, make a much clearer distinction between leader and leadership by explaining that leadership is the relationship between leader and follower that is fostered in order to achieve a particular outcome and is accomplished through the use of persuasion or direct or indirect influence (e.g. Atchison, 2003; Bailey, 1988; Bass, 1983; Gardener, 1989; Miller & Becker, 2008; Segal 1981).

For example:

Leadership is the process of persuasion by which a leader or leadership group (such as the state) induces followers to act in a manner that enhances the leader’s purpose or shared purposes. (Sergiovanni, 1989, p. 213).

Leadership is a relationship between leader and led that can energise an organisation. (Macobby, 2000, p.57).

Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. From this definition, there are four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists or is occurring... The relationship [is] based on influence ... [L]eaders and followers are the people in this relationship...Leaders and followers intend real changes...Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. (Rost, 1993, pp. 102-103).

Each of these definitions is useful when considering the central research question because they include the importance of followers and the idea of a relationship between leader and follower. However there are also important differences which warrant highlighting.

Macobby, for instance, acknowledges a relationship between leader and followers but does not explain the type of relationship that is required to “energise an organisation” (op cit.). Sergiovanni’s definition of leadership refers to the leader’s ability to engage support for the leader’s purpose or for shared purposes. This definition is only useful in this study as long as the leader’s purpose is in the best interests of the organisation and is not self-serving.

Rost’s definition, however, highlights the influencing relationship between leaders and followers and locates this in the context of mutually agreed purposes and intentions for change. Further, the definition is relevant to any discipline and, arguably, applicable to any era. It establishes what leadership is and untangles the confusion between leadership and leader, so that leadership processes and applications become much more transparent.
Therefore this definition can be used as a benchmark against which to determine how well, and by what means, leaders create mutual purposes, effect change and influence relationships. Rost’s definition of leadership (but not his definitions of management or leader) is therefore used in this study.

According to Burns (1979):

The crisis of leadership today is the mediocrity or irresponsibility of so many of men and women in power, but leadership rarely rises to the full need for it. The fundamental crisis underlying mediocrity is intellectual. If we know all too much about our leaders, we know far too little about leadership. We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age hence we cannot agree even on the standards which measure, recruit and reject it. (p. 1)

A growing number of leadership theorists insist that there should be less emphasis on the traits of the leader and more on understanding the nature of the influencing relationship between leader and follower (e.g. Bennis, 2009; Hare 1993; Korac-Kakabadse, et al., 2001; Kotter, 1996; Puth, 2001; Rost, 1993).

2.3.5 Social Capital and Leadership

As previously discussed, social capital is a term used to refer to the resources that accrue to individuals or groups by virtue of their membership of social networks. The concept of social capital captures the idea that one’s family, friends and associates constitute an important asset, which can be called upon in a crisis, enjoyed for its own sake, and/or leveraged for material gain (Halpern, 2004: Field, 2008 and Lin, 2002). J.D. Rockefeller (1839–1937) once famously asserted that the ability to deal with people is as purchasable a commodity as sugar or coffee and that he would pay more for that ability than for any other under the sun. Thus leaders who have a diverse stock of social and organisational networks, including civic associations and ‘friends in high places’, are in a strong position to take advantage of new opportunities or to resolve disputes (Isham, 1999; Schafft, 1998; Varshney, 1999).

Conversely, the absence of social capital can have an equally important impact, as any leader who has been ‘left out of the loop’ on important decisions understand only too well (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). A person who is poor in social capital is not a member of (and may even be actively excluded from) certain social or organisational networks, institutions, decision making processes or other sources of influence that could be used to secure needed
outcomes, good jobs or leadership support (Narayan, 2000; Wilson, 1987, 1996; Woolcock). In other words, there is a link between social capital and power.

2.3.6 Power and Leadership

The Collins English Dictionary (1998) defines power as a ‘force or influence’ (p.1215). In the social sciences, power is an elusive concept and there is much debate around its definition, foundation, function and operation. As Lukes asserts, power is an “essentially contested concept (1974, p. 26).

Power per se is neutral or potential until shaped by the leader who exerts it. Thus power is commonly evaluated retrospectively, contextually and on the basis of its consequences. Summarising Luke’s’ (2005) viewpoint, Lorenzi (2006) states:

The basic common core to any mention of power in the analysis of social relationships is the notion that A in some way affects B in a significant manner. ..In the new edition, Lukes expands the concept of power, which is a capacity rather than the exercise of that capacity. Power can be held even where it is not used or needed. The notion of interest is also a very evaluative notion and each view of power rests on a different conception of interest (p.88).

One of the core problems for leaders in any organisation involves how to use power in order to influence actors to achieve an organisation’s short- and long-term goals (Bailey, 1988; Bass, 1985; Cialdini, 2009; Cohen, Fink & Gadon, 1994; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). While specific methodologies or guidelines do not exist, there is an often cited taxonomy (French & Raven, 1959) of the most common forms of organisational power bases that may prove helpful to leaders.

In their original formulation (shown in Table 2), French and Raven (1959) identified five distinct bases of power: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert and referent power. Numerous social researchers have since used and/or developed this taxonomy (e.g. Carson, Carson & Roe, 2006; Finkelstein, 1992; Podsakoff & Schreisheim, 1985).

Subsequent additions include Raven’s (1965) informational power and Hershey and Blanchard’s (1984) connection power (see also Bartos, 2008; Bass & Bass, 2008: Cheung-
Reward power is an actor’s ability to influence others’ behaviour by providing those others with things they want to receive. Such rewards can be either financial (pay raises or bonuses), or non-financial (promotions, favourable work assignments, conditions, more responsibility, new equipment, further training or education, praise, and recognition).

Coercive power refers to an actor’s ability to influence others’ behaviour by the use of fear, punishment or threat of punishment. Typical organisational punishments include: reprimands; undesirable work assignments; threat of loss of pay or bonuses; withholding key information, promotional possibilities, further education or training; threat of or actual demotion, suspension, or dismissal.

Legitimate power is an actor’s ability to influence others’ behaviour because of the position that s/he holds within the organisation. Legitimate power is also known as positional power because the actor holding the particular position is given the right to influence and direct certain other individuals within a particular scope of authority.

Expert power is generally viewed as an actor’s ability to influence others’ behaviour because of her/his recognised knowledge, skills or abilities. For example, medical practitioners, accountants, engineers and computer scientists have power based on their expertise and specialist skills even when they rank low in an organisation’s hierarchy. (Luthans, 2011).

In 1965 Raven proposed a division of expert power, identifying a further category of informational power.

*Expert Power* results from the target’s faith that the agent has some superior insight or knowledge about what behaviour is best under the circumstances (“My supervisor has had a lot of experience with this sort of thing, and so s/he is probably right, even though I don’t really understand the reason.”) “Understanding the reason,” then, is what distinguishes *Informational Power* from *Expert Power*. (Raven, 2008, p.3, italics in original).

This distinction reflects the fact that, although leaders and managers are expected to have more information power than their reportees, this is not always the case, particularly if the reportee is physically closer to information sources or more attuned to the organisation’s ‘grapevine’ than her/his seniors (Stimson, 2011).
Group members can turn information into power by providing it to others who need it, by keeping it from others, by organising it, increasing it, or even falsifying it. Some individuals achieve informational power by deliberately manipulating or obscuring information or at least making certain that the information remains a secret shared by only a few group members. (Forsyth, 2010, p.227)

Referent power is the actor’s ability to influence others’ behaviour because s/he is liked, admired, and/or respected. Such power can accrue to persons who are not formally entitled to influence others, such as friends, family members, sports men and women, socialites, media personalities, singers, actors, designers, advertising agencies, politicians and even con artists.

In 1982, Hershey and Blanchard added connection power to the list of power base classifications. Connection power derives from who you know, vertically and horizontally within and outside the organisation and within and outside a specific industry (Franz & Sarcina, 2009; Grayson & Baldwin, 2011; Kellerman, 2010; Lussier & Achua, 2010). Recognised for centuries in popular parlance ("old boys’ club", “old school tie” etc.), connection power forms the basis for social networking (Christakis & Fowler, 2009).

Table 2: French and Raven’s Power Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Power</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward power</td>
<td>The target person complies in order to obtain rewards he or she believes are controlled by the agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive power</td>
<td>The target person complies in order to avoid punishment he or she believes are controlled by the agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate power</td>
<td>The target person complies because he or she believes the agent has the right to make or request and the target person has the obligation to comply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert power</td>
<td>The target person complies because he or she believes that the agent has special knowledge about the best way to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent power</td>
<td>The target person complies because he or she admires or identifies with the agent and wants to gain the agent’s approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


French and Raven proposed that, in each classification, the target person complies because of various forms of pressure applied by the agent.
The assumptions embedded here are that: 1) the target person is initially in a state of resistance or opposition to the agent’s requirements; 2) as a result, the agent brings pressure to bear on the target person through one of the identified power bases; 3) the target person has the freedom of choice (however small) to decide whether to accept the type of pressure being imposed; and 4) if mutual agreement occurs, the target is influenced to adopt the agent’s view.

The original taxonomy does not explain the mechanisms by which compliance occurs as a result of exerted power. Raven (1993) partially addressed this lacuna by suggesting that “[a]n unsuccessful influence attempt may result from a misperception of the available effective power bases, as perceived by both the influencing agent and target” (p.9).

Arguably, reward power cannot successfully be utilised if the reward on offer has no value to the recipient. Similarly, coercive power is meaningless if the recipient either does not fear, or is willing to endure, the consequence of non-compliance. Legitimate power relies on the recipient acknowledging the status and right of the power source. Expert power relies on the recipient agreeing that the power source has relevant expertise. Referent power relies on the target relating to, liking or admiring the source of power. Therefore, although a leader may have the power to influence an actor, the actor also has the power to comply or not comply. In other words, a leader cannot lead unless s/he has a mutually agreed relationship with followers who, for whatever reason, are willing (freely or grudgingly) to follow (e.g. Bennis, 2009; Blanchard, 2006; Burns, 1978; Kotter, 1996; Yuki, 1994). While this provides further support for the use of Rost’s (1993) definition of leadership in this study it necessitates investigation into the mechanics or biology of influence.

2.4 The Biology of Influence

The first element of Rost’s definition of leadership (1993) is that the relationship between the leader and the follower is one based on influence (p. 102). Influence refers both to the capacity to have an effect on the character, development, or behaviour of someone or something, and to the effect itself (Collins English Dictionary, 1998, p.790). Cialdini (2009) identifies four interacting (often simultaneous) channels of influence: the influence we have on others; the influence others have on us; the influence that others have on others which we may observe from a distance, read about or experience; and the influence that we have on
ourselves. Influence, like power, is neutral until there is an accompanying intent and a receptive interpretation. Thus influence can be good, bad, positive, negative, helpful, coercive, empowering, ethical, unethical, indifferent, clumsy, productive, counter-productive or any other type that is intended by the influencer and/or interpreted by the receiver (Cialdini, 2009; Fazio, et al., 1992; Ganer 2005). In the context of the present study, it is important to understand the mechanisms by which leaders influence others and how that influence is expressed in organisations undergoing change.

2.4.1 The Brain

In the 4th century BC, Hippocrates (circa 460-370 BC) recognised that the brain is the organ of the senses, knowledge and wisdom. Although we still know more about the workings of outer space than we do the workings of the brain (Seung, 2010), social researchers can access a substantial body of relevant scholarly and popular literature. Most people, for instance, are familiar with the left brain/right brain concept even if they cannot link it to Roger Sperry’s (1974) split brain theory of left and right hemispheric specialisation.

According to this theory:

Each hemisphere is indeed a conscious system in its own right, perceiving, thinking, remembering, reasoning, willing, and emoting, all at a characteristically human level, and . . . both the left and the right hemisphere may be conscious simultaneously in different, even in mutually conflicting, mental experiences that run along in parallel (p,11).

Sperry has been credited with bringing neuroscience to the general public, and social scientists have become increasingly interested in the brain in recent decades. No doubt leaders have always wondered about why people think as they do and have pondered the questions posed by Mintzberg (1976): “How can humans be smart and dull at the same time? How can they be so capable of certain mental activities and at the same time be so incapable of others?” (p.49). Some of the answers to these and other questions relevant to understanding the nature of influence can be found in Sperry’s split brain theory and MacLean’s triune brain theory.

In the early 1960s, the neurologist Paul MacLean proposed an elegant Darwinian model of the triune brain (meaning three brains). This theory holds that, although we generally think of
the brain as being one organ, it actually comprises three complexes or smaller brains that have evolved over time in a brain-within-brain structure (MacLean, 1990).

As shown in the following figure, (Erlauer, 2003, p.8), these are: the reptilian or R-complex (also known as the brain stem), the paleomammalian brain (also known as the mid-brain, mammalian brain and limbic system) and the neocortex (the cerebral or higher brain).

**Figure 1: The Triune Brain**


Each of these three brains has its own specific purposes. According to MacLean (1960) so different are these three brains from an evolutionary point of view that “[s]peaking allegorically, we might imagine that when a psychiatrist bids the patient to lie down on the couch, he is asking him to stretch out next to a horse and a crocodile” (p.300). According to LeDoux (1999), the connections between the cerebral brain and the limbic brain are not particularly well coordinated because, in evolution are terms, the brain is still a work in progress.

2.4.1.1 The Reptilian Brain (or R-Complex)
The human brain has evolved from the inside out. The reptilian brain, the oldest of the three brains, is so called because we share its functions with reptiles and birds.
It consists of the upper part of the spinal cord and the basal ganglia, the diencephalon, and parts of the midbrain—all of which sit atop the spinal column like a knob in the middle of our heads (MacLean, 1990). The purpose of the R-complex is closely related to physical survival at its most basic level. Among other things, it maintains and regulates heartbeat, breathing and body temperature. It also plays a crucial role in establishing home territory, reproduction and social dominance.

This part of the brain is still very active in modern day humans and can be observed in action in courtship rituals, deception, racism, competition, ambition, posturing, materialism, ‘one-upmanship’, attention seeking, defense of family, home, job, status, the compulsive need to be right and jealousy, among others The R-complex is instinctive, automatic, has a ritualistic quality, and—for survival purposes—is highly resistant to change. Fortunately it can also be modified by our more developed brains (Gazziniga, 2008; LeDoux, 1996; MacLean, 1990; Ramachandran, 2011).

2.4.1.2 The Limbic System

The paleomammalian brain consists of the septum, amygdala, hypothalamus, hippocampal complex and the cingulate cortex. MacLean first introduced the term *limbic system* to refer to this set of interconnected brain structures in a paper in 1952. MacLean’s recognition of the limbic system as a major functional system in the brain won wide acceptance among neuroscientists, and is now generally regarded as his most important contribution to the field. MacLean maintained that the structures of the limbic system arose early in mammalian evolution (hence the term “paleomammalian”) and has always been responsible for motivation and emotion in human beings. From a functional point of view, the limbic brain is largely responsible for the value judgments that are unconsciously made and which exert strong influences on our subsequent behaviours. Further, this is the part of the brain that records memories of behaviours produced by agreeable and disagreeable experiences.

A major component of the limbic system is the amygdala, which is important in associating events with emotion, and the hippocampus, which converts everyday information into long term memory and in memory recall. Repeated use of specialised nerve networks in the hippocampus enhances memory storage. This structure is involved in learning from both commonplace experiences (even when we are not aware of it) and learning through deliberate
study (Dogie, 2007; Gazzaniga, 2008; LeDoux, 1996). Thus the phrase “use it or lose it” very much applies to the limbic (and cerebral) brains. Those repeated activities and behaviours become entrenched but can just as easily be lost over time through lack of use or practice (Ramachandran, 2011).

However in order not to clutter the brain by retaining every piece of information that one learns or experiences, some neuroscientists believe that the hippocampus also helps to code and select which memories are stored by attaching what they call an **emotional marker** to some events. These emotional markers are also used to recall memories (Gazzaniga, 2008; Nussbaum, 2001). Thus what one had for breakfast on the 13th of June 1999 might not be stored in the hippocampus unless it was also accompanied by something of emotional significance for that individual. This explains why many people can remember what they were doing on the day that a particular famous person died. Once stored, the mechanism for recall can be any stimulus or combination that links to our five senses such as music, smells, colours or similar experiences, visuals, feelings, similar-looking people or behaviours. If the stored memory contains a lot of emotion, that too can be triggered with the memory. Thus people can experience flashbacks and relive experiences or feelings from the past as though they were manufactured in the present. Such is the strength of emotional markers (Dolcos et al., 2012 and Haas & Canli, 2008).

The amygdala comes into play in situations that arouse strong emotions and a firing of the amygdala can cause a shift in identity salience (Goleman, 2005; Gazziniga, 2008; LeDoux, 1996; MacLean, 1990; Ramachandran, 2011). But because the limbic system links emotions with behaviour, it also serves to inhibit the R-complex and its preference for ritualistic, habitual ways of responding (Goleman, 2005). To give a simple example, if someone was bumped on a crowded train, although the reptilian brain might want to retaliate, the limbic brain can over-ride such impulses based on earlier memories or learnings regarding the consequences of striking out at an unknown person in a confined space.

2.4.1.3 **The Neocortex (New Brain) or Cerebral Brain**

The neocortex is the outer portion of our brain which is approximately the size of a large crumpled newspaper page and which constitutes approximately five-sixths of the overall human brain.
This crumpling effect or folding in the neocortex allows a lot of storage space among its folds and valleys while also allowing it to fit in the confines of the skull.

The neocortex first assumed importance in primates and culminated in the modern human brain with its two large cerebral hemispheres, which are often referred to as the left and right brain (Sperry, Bogen & Vogel, as cited in Gazzinga, 1998).

The neocortex makes logical and formal operational thinking possible, allows creativity, imagination, higher level problem solving, artistry, mathematical ability and reasoning, and allows us to see ahead and plan for the future. The neocortex also contains two specialised regions, one dedicated to voluntary movement and one to processing sensory information. The neocortex has almost infinite learning abilities and is what has enabled human cultures to develop and change.

Recent neurological breakthroughs have determined that the cerebral brain in particular has neuroplasticity and is not, as previously thought, a static organ. Neuro refers to the nerves and/or brain and plastic refers to it being moldable or changeable in its structure. Thus neuroplasticity refers to changes in the brain (through the neural pathways and synapses) that are due to changes in behaviour, learnings, environment and neural processes, as well as changes resulting from bodily injury (Ramachandran, 2011). Neuroplasticity explores how and in which ways the brain changes throughout life (Doige, 2007; Pascual-Leone, 2011; Pascual-Leone, et al., 2005; Ramachandran & Blakeslee, 1998). The value of this concept to the present study is the notion that people can and do change their behaviour. It is often easier to make changes in the cerebral brain than in the limbic brain because of something called ‘amygdala hijack’.

2.4.2 Amygdala Hijack

As previously noted, the accepted understanding of the brain is that it is composed of three major parts. Moving from the inside out, the first is the reptilian brain, which is largely responsible for our on-going physical survival. The next layer is the limbic brain, which is responsible for our major emotions, memories and ensuing behaviours and which contributes to our emotional and social survival. The third and— in evolutionary terms, most recent—is the cerebral brain, which is responsible for our complex higher thinking including logic,
reasoning, artistry, innovations, spacial awareness and imagination as well as movement and numerous other functions that are not relevant to this study.

For the most part, these three brains work together under the direction of the pre-frontal cortex in the cerebral brain, which sits just behind the forehead. However there are times where the limbic brain, and more specifically the amygdala (which is responsible for emotions), can hijack reason and influence our attitudes and behaviours.

When the limbic brain perceives a situation or stimulus in the present that even vaguely matches similar past experiences and memories which warranted a freeze, flight or fight condition, then it will trigger the HPA (hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal) axis and hijack control away from the rational brain (Goleman, 1996). At such times we can lose all sense of reason. The limbic brain processes information milliseconds earlier than the rational brain (the cerebral brain). If there is a match between what is happening in the present and what happened in the past, the amygdala can act before any possible direction from the neocortex can be received and take control. This reactivity is particularly helpful in saving us from dangerous situations (Gazzaniga, 2008; Goleman, 2002; Le Doux, 1996). As Goleman (ibid.) explains: “Emotions make us pay attention right now—this is urgent—and gives us an immediate action plan without having to think twice” (p.87).

When the amygdala does not find any match to the stimulus within its bank of memories of dangerous or threatening situations, it acts according to the directions received from the prefrontal cortex. In other words it ‘allows’ the cerebral brain to remain in control and rationality continues.

The problem with the limbic brain and, more specifically, with the amygdala is that it is not logical or rational. It cannot differentiate between things that are similar. Rather it assumes that things that are similar must be the same. Thus actors can consider that the change that is being introduced in the workplace today is the same as a different change that was proposed or introduced in the past (Goleman, 1999; Damasio, 1999; McLean, 1996). The amygdala is behind such generalising statements as “All X type of people are (fill in the blank)”; “I can’t do it”; “They will never change”; “All Y people are dangerous”; “It’s no good talking to them”, and “This won’t work”. Such statements are also accompanied by some show of emotion (Ekman & Rosenberg, 1997, 2005). During an amygdala hijack, negative emotions and emotional memory rule and cause reactions and behaviours that are without the benefit of
logic or reason. While an amygdala hijack is occurring, others (e.g. colleagues or leaders) can become, in effect, the enemy (Goleman, 2002).

An amygdala hijack lasts between seconds and minutes but the impact is not over once the emotional triggering ceases. This is because new memories have been formed and stored which contain those negative experiences, attitudes and emotions and memory of the emotional outburst. So next time there is a triggering, the amygdala has more memories and emotions behind it, and the firing can appear worse than earlier instances (Damasio, 1999; Ekman, 1994). This can lead to (more) tarnished relationships and diminished trust over time between the parties involved in conflict situations. The corollary is that there is benefit for leaders if they deliberately create positive memories in the minds of those whom they lead.

The cause of this lack of direct control over our emotions lies in the way that the human brain is interconnected. Our brains have evolved in such a way that they have far more connections running from our emotional systems to our cerebral cortex (the locus of conscious control) than the other way around (Gazzinga, 1998; Goleman, 1996; Le Doux, 1996). This is because the limbic system has to deal with all of the sensory inputs that we continuously encounter in order to “produce behavioural, autonomic and hormonal responses” (LeDoux, 1996, p.296) that are necessary for survival. One very important set of behavioural responses is that of emotions.

2.4.3 The Role of Emotions

Decades of research by social scientists such as Ekman, Matsumoto, Frank, Scherer and O’Sullivan, building on the works of Darwin,(1872,1998), has concluded that there are seven basic emotions which are universal in nature and which are expressed on the face in the same way in all cultures. These emotions are happiness, anger, sadness, disgust, fear, surprise and contempt (Ekman, 2003: Ekman & Friesen, 2003; Matsumoto 2009).

Many other emotions fall under these seven basic emotions and vary in name on the basis of their intensity. For example, annoyance and not happy (as used in the Australian idiom) come under the emotion of anger although they are less intense, and concern and worry come under the heading of fear for the same reason. By the same token, rage falls under the heading of anger but is greater in intensity and terror is a more exaggerated form of fear (Ekman, 2002; Matsumoto, 2013).
Lazarus (1991) suggests that these seven basic emotions (and their nuances) are triggered by the same psychological themes in every culture. As previously noted, (each) emotion exists in order to trigger a behavioural response that the brain perceives is needed for the individual’s survival at that point in time. The seven basic emotions, the stimuli that trigger the emotions and the purpose of each emotion are shown in Table 2.1 from Matsumoto et al. (2013).

Table 3: The Seven Basic Emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>1. Universal Underlying Psychological Theme (trigger)</th>
<th>2. Function of the emotion (Prepare behavior to allow)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Goal attainment or accomplishment</td>
<td>Future motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Goal obstruction, norm violation, perceived injustice</td>
<td>Remove the obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Loss of loved one or object (or position, status, respect, authority)</td>
<td>Recoup resources; call for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>Contamination; offensive behaviours or rotten objects</td>
<td>Repulsion or elimination of the contaminated object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Perceived threat to physical or psychological well being</td>
<td>Avoid threat; reduce harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Sudden novel (unexpected) objects</td>
<td>Orient and obtain more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt</td>
<td>Immoral actions (against one's own moral code, values, standards)</td>
<td>Assert one’s superiority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Matsumoto et al., 2013, p 22.*
There are numerous ways in which the behaviours identified in the third column of this table can manifest in the workplace. For instance, some of the modified displays of anger include backstabbing, politicking, lies, refusal to follow directions, bypassing seniors/others, creating cliques, and passive or aggressive resistance.

Each of these behaviours represents an attempt to discredit a person or curb her/his authority, power or influence in order to remove the obstacle that stands in the way of the protagonist’s goal attainments, usual way of behaviour or sense of justice.

Fortunately, positive emotions also fall under the emotional family of happiness, such as pride in work well done, passion for a role or company and mutual respect between colleagues. Such a culture fosters creativity and a sense of self-worth and achievement.

Thus what leaders do and do not do, how they use their power bases, how they communicate and interact with others, how they use their leadership as well as whether or not they allow negative attitudes and behaviours to permeate their teams, are extremely important considerations for leaders, teams and organisations. They all support or inhibit the building of positive or negative memories and responses and facilitate or prevent the occurrence of amygdala hijacking.

2.4.4 Feelings, Moods and Personality Traits

Neuroscientists agree that feelings encompass the entire process of events that begin in the brain and are eventually experienced in the body. Feelings can, but do not always, include emotions. (Damasio, 1994, 2005; Gazzaniga, 2008; Harcourt, 1999, 2003). Thus we can feel happy, angry, sad, annoyed, or delighted and we can also feel tired, hungry, thirsty, in pain or aroused. All feelings motivate subsequent behaviour.

According to LeDoux (1996), emotions are a subcategory of feelings which are generated in a different part of the brain from thoughts and which involve more brain systems. As previously noted, emotions are triggered by stimuli that result in immediate, automatic and unconsciously motivated behaviour. LeDoux (1996) explains the difference between emotion and thought in this way:

When we are in the throes of emotion, it is because something important, perhaps life threatening is occurring, and much of the
brain’s resources are brought to bear on the problem. Emotions create a flurry of activity all devoted to one goal. Thoughts unless they trigger emotional systems, don’t do this. We can daydream while doing other things like reading or eating, and go back and forth between daydream and other activities. But when faced with danger or other challenging emotional situations, we don’t have time to kill, nor do we have the mental resources. The whole self gets absorbed in the emotion (p.300).

It is important to note that what triggers an emotional response (either positive or negative) in one person may not do so in another. This is because emotions are linked to working memory, which is the gateway to human emotional and non-emotional experiences (Le Doux, 1996; Medina, 2008; Ramachandran & Blakslee, 1998). Thus people can have very different responses to the same event. The intensity of the triggered emotion is dependent upon the intensity of earlier recorded experience(s) where the brain perceived that survival was either threatened or enhanced. The emotions connected with such situations can remain buried in the limbic brain and, although forgotten, can still be readily triggered without a cognitive understanding of why this has occurred (Damasio, 1998). In such situations, people justify (cognitive dissonance) why they feel emotional without having a rational explanation—“I don’t know why but I’ve never liked hospitals – it must be the smell of disinfectant” or “I am always drawn to people with brown eyes – I don’t know why, they just seem so kind” or “I can’t explain it but I always get sad during the holiday season”.

Emotions involve a momentary patterned set of changes in physiology, cognitive activity, subjective feelings and facial expressions (Ekman & Rosenberg, 2005). Defining factors associated with emotions include a sudden onset; a life cycle lasting no more than minutes and contextually motivated behaviour (Ekman, et al., 1994; Matsumoto, et al., 2013). Moods, however, involve a slower build up and last for extended periods of time—hours, days or even longer (Damasio, 1998; Ekman et al., 1984, 1997; Ekman & Rosenberg, 2005; Gazzaniga, 2008; Matsumoto, et. al., 2013).

Each mood is saturated with frequent occurrences of a particular emotion(s). When someone is in an irritable mood, he/she is ready to become angry, likely to construe matters in such a way so as to have the opportunity to become angry, and his/her anger when it occurs is likely to be more intense and of a greater duration than it would be when he/she is not in an irritable mood (Ekman and Rosenberg, 2005, p.560).
A *trait* (also known as a personality trait, characteristic or attribute) is a style of behaviour that dominates one or more periods of a person’s life. Thus a hostile trait, for example, “may be manifested by frequent bouts of irritability, by an aggressive behavioural style or in impatience, abruptness and related behaviours” (Ekman & Rosenberg, 2005, p.560).

Emotions, moods and traits can occur at the same time (Matsumoto et al., 2013; Gazzaniga, 2008). Thus a person who is characteristically happy and positive is more likely to trigger joy and laughter than is another who is characteristically sad. A person who is attributionally fearful is more likely to be risk adverse and cautious, to see danger in a situation and to trigger fear than the individual who is attributionally happy. Traits are the result of learned behavior over a long period of time (Matsumoto, et al., 2013; Ramachandran and Blakslee, 1998) but, because of its neuroplasticity, the brain can also change as the result of new learned behaviours and experiences. This only occurs if there is the perception that the new behaviour is more pro-survival than the established behaviour. Even so, such change takes time (Winston, 2006).

### 2.4.5 Implications for Leaders

Organisations are not static enterprises. In practice, every organisation is in a continual process of change to a greater or lesser degree. Because of the different character traits of the actors, opinions concerning work and change can vary widely, as can intent and agendas. Further, because of the stress that often accompanies organisational change, actors are subject to human emotions and reactions triggered in the limbic brain that is usually outside their immediate control (an amygdala hijack). Goleman (2002) asserts that a leader’s self-control is vital when facing someone who is in the throes of an amygdala hijack so as to avoid escalating the existing upset or creating a dual hijacking. Nothing, he suggests, gets resolved positively when two people are in the midst of an emotional hijack. Further as has already been noted, emotions triggered by leaders take them (even momentarily) out of their organisational identity and into their personal identity where it is easier to communicate and make decisions which can be self-serving.

Therefore recognising and understanding the nature of emotions allows the leader not only to better self-regulate but to understand the motivation behind the emotions.
Further, with this understanding leaders can predict their own or others’ subsequent behaviour and can avoid the negative impact caused by unconscious influence and rather focus on deliberate influence.

2.4.5.1 Unconscious and Deliberate Influence

Using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), neurophysiologists Rizzolatti, Giacomo, Craighero and Laila determined that not only are certain parts of the brain (the inferior frontal cortex and superior parietal lobe) active when a person performs an action but, at the same time, they are also mirrored in the brains of those observing the action being performed (Gazzaniga, 2008; Ramachandran & Blakeslee, 1998; Rizzolatti, 2004). It is thought that these ‘mirror neurons’ are active from birth and that an infant’s view of the world is first learned by mirroring the facial expressions, emotions, postures and behaviours of those with whom s/he is intimately connected (Gazzaniga, 2008; Elman, 2000; Ramachandran, 2000). Ramachandran believes that mirror neurons allow us to experience by observation rather than by direct involvement. Thus we can wince when observing someone else in a painful situation, become emotional when watching a movie or get drawn into an argument not of our making. Mirror neurons also allow us to copy movement, feel empathy for others, predict behaviour, infer intentions and to be self-aware. Crudely put, this part of the brain has a ‘monkey see, monkey do’ component which allows us to pass on or accept learning and information very quickly without us always being aware that it is occurring (Rizzolatti & Craighero, 2005). Thus there is a biological aspect to influence which is involuntary, often unfiltered and is at the heart of the process which is known as emotional contagion.

Schoenewolf (1990) defines emotional contagion as the process by which “a person or group influences the emotions or behaviour of another person or group through the conscious or unconscious induction of emotion states and behavioral attitudes” (p.49). Emotional contagion, unlike cognitive contagion, is less conscious and more automatic and therefore—depending on the emotion involved—it can have a positive or negative impact on others without them being aware that they are being influenced (McColl-Kennedy & Smith, 2006). On the positive side, emotions can be purposefully manipulated in order to help others to become more confident, innovative, and enthusiastic, and to create a more stable, harmonious, positive workplace.
On the negative side, emotional contagion can cause riots, mob mentality, group think, organisational bullying, and discrimination, and a negative workplace culture (Decety & Ickes, 2009; Hatfield, et al., 1994; Pugh, 2001).

Whether positive or negative, emotional contagion has a direct link to the attitudes, behaviours, organisational commitment and productivity of team members. Of more concern to this study is the notion that, if it is allowed to continue, emotional contagion is what fuels the creation and sustainability of certain behaviours in others and can ultimately create the organisation’s culture (Barsade, 2002; Harvey, et al., 2007).

2.4.5.2 Organisational Culture

According to Ravasi and Schultz (2006), an organisation’s culture is a set of shared mental assumptions—either positive or negative—that guides actors’ thoughts, actions and behaviour in their organisation. An organisational culture can be so entrenched that it not only affects the way actors and groups interact with each other and with their clients and stakeholders, but can also teach new members what constitutes acceptable perceptions, thinking and feeling within that organisation. (Kotter & James, 1992; Schein, 2010).

Schein (2010) asserts that in the course of trying to get their organisations to become more effective, leaders are sometimes amazed at the degree to which groups and individuals continue to behave in obviously ineffective ways (p.8). Further, he suggests that instances of infighting, resistance to change, communication problems and misunderstandings that should not occur between ‘reasonable people’ are precisely the types of behaviours which, despite the threat they pose to organisations, often make up its culture:

I will continue to argue (1) that leaders as entrepreneurs are the main architects of culture, (2) that after cultures are formed, they influence what kind of leadership is possible, and (3) that if elements of the culture become dysfunctional, leadership can and must do something to speed up culture change (p.8).
2.4.6 The Dark side of Leadership

With the increasing number of government, corporate, sporting and religious scandals, leadership is being scrutinised from new, relational, inter-personal and psychological perspectives. How leaders build and maintain relationships to influence others has a direct bearing on the ongoing survival and reputations of their organisations and on the morale and performance of their subordinates (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Burch & Anderson, 2008; Conger, 1989; Demack, 2002; Hogan, 1994; Hogan & Hogan, 1994, 1997, 2004; Holland & Van Landuyt, 2004; Keely, 1995).

Because this study focuses on leaders and leadership in an organisational context there is value in addressing how a leader’s flawed personal characteristics and/or dysfunctional strategies can have a negative influence on her/his own and others’ careers, performance and organisational change (Elias 2008; Hogan & Hogan, 1997; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Raven, 1993). However, despite increasing scholarly interest in the negative side of leadership, no clear and comprehensive definition of the phenomenon has emerged, although terms which appear in the literature to describe the negative aspects of leadership behaviour include ‘toxic leadership’ (Benson & Hogan, 2008); ‘leadership derailment’ (Tepper, 2000) and ‘bad leadership’ (Kellerman, 2005). Einarsen et al. (2007) propose the term ‘destructive leadership’ which, they suggest, is:

The systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organisation by undermining and/or sabotaging the organisation’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates. (p. 208).

Rejecting the construct of ‘destructive leadership’ as too narrow, Semann and Slattery (2009) coined the term ‘the dark side of leadership’:

It is an ongoing pattern of behaviour exhibited by a leader that results in overall negative organisational outcomes based on the interactions between the leader, follower and the environment. Organisational goals, morale and follower satisfaction are thwarted through the abuse of power and self-interest of the leader (p.4).
Higgs (2009) asserts four recurrent themes relating to dark side behaviours including 1) the abuse of power, 2) inflicting damage on others, 3) an over exercise of control and 4) rule-breaking to satisfy personal needs. Leaders exhibiting these behaviours are perceived as untrustworthy, overly ambitious and disingenuous by followers (Hogan, 1994).

2.4.6.1 Organisational Psychopathy

Some scholars warn that the most severe forms of dysfunctional leadership can be attributed a psychological condition known as *organisational psychopathy* where *psychopathy* is a personality disorder defined by a distinctive cluster of behaviours and inferred personality traits, most of which society views as pejorative. Therefore it is no light matter to diagnose an individual psychopath (Hare, 1993, p. ix).

While we normally associate psychopathy with heinous crimes, many psychopaths are white and blue collar workers who, because of their chameleon-like nature, are often overlooked—usually because “good people are rarely suspicious, they cannot imagine others doing the things they themselves are incapable of doing, usually they accept the undramatic solution as the correct one, and let matters rest there” (March, as cited in Hare 1993).

Psychopaths are often only recognised by the trail of destruction (usually financial, informational and/or relational) that they leave in their wake (Clarke, 2005; Babiak & Hare, 2006; Demack, 2001). The more symptoms of psychopathy they have, and the greater their sphere of influence, the greater the havoc they cause. McCormick and Burch (2005) suggest that organisational psychopaths typically appear on the surface as being as normal as anyone else but their actions “tend to be continually manipulative, irresponsible and deceitful; they crave power and prestige, schmooze to bosses, lie easily and take the credit for other people's work. Usually superficially charming and convincing, they lack empathy and any remorse for their actions and are often cool under pressure” (p. 34). As previously noted, leadership exists wherever others are influenced to follow an agent’s lead and is not confined to those with leadership title, accountabilities or sanction. Thus their negative but continuous influence can be felt at all organisational levels. However the degree of negative influence depends on the severity of its symptoms (Hare, 1993, p 34), as shown in Table (4).
[n.b. Each scholar cited in this section emphasises the importance of the concept of a spectrum or continuum; that symptoms and severity can be salient. Often leaders with such a psychopathology can appear more ‘normal’ than non- psychopaths, just as those who display some of these traits may not be psychopaths therefore diagnosis should always be left to professionals rather than using Hare’s Symptoms of Organisational Psychopathy as a tool for diagnosis of self or others].

Table 4: Symptoms of Organisational Psychopathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Symptoms of Organisational Psychopathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal/ Emotional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glib and superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric and grandiose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of remorse or guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to take personal responsibility for own actions – regularly blames others or justifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceitful (lies) and manipulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow emotions – often using them as manipulative tools (anger at others particularly when called to account, instilling fear/uncertainty in others, feigning sadness/crying, using sex to control others, including harassment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hare, 1993, p. 34*

Under a true organisational psychopath, subordinates are usually left fearful, with lowered self-esteem and doubts about their own abilities If cornered, such a leader will deny any personal responsibility for her/his actions and will shift blame to others, their organisation or other environmental factors.

Organisational psychopaths do not respond to help and do not self-regulate or see the need to change their behaviour. Therefore education is largely lost on them, instead they will take the
parts of learning that suit their agendas, including the status of certification, but will ignore those areas that require personal accountability or responsibility for their own development or their impact on others or their organisation (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Boddy, 2005, 2006; Demack, 2001; McCormick & Burch 2005).

2.5 Organisational Change

Just as the word leadership is often misused or confused with management, so too the words change, transition and transformation are often confused or used interchangeably. According to Bridges (2000):

The difference between change and transition can be illustrated with the example of a geographical move. The change is the relocation itself; it involves packing dishes, getting a mover, selling your home, and taking an airplane trip. The transition involves all the confusion, distress, and excitement that you and your family go through. (p.1)

In an organisational context, second-order change is a shift in the externals of any situation—for example, implementing a new program, restructuring a business or a department, moving to a new location, amalgamating, taking on new IT systems or rebranding. First order change could be something smaller such as taking on a new position or staff member (Bridges, 2003; Kotter, 2003; Kotter & Rathgeber, 2006; Senior, 2002; Senior & Fleming, 2006). Regardless of its size or nature, change is made up of events that are visible and tangible; they can happen quickly and, in an organisational context, change is about achieving the desired outcome (Senior & Fleming, 2002, 2006). Transition is concerned with moving people through the change process and managing related issues en route (Kotter, 2003; and Senior, 2006).

While the terms change and transition are relatively easy to differentiate, leaders and managers more typically interchange the terms change and transform. Change theorists (e.g. Deming, 1993; Senge, 1999; Senior and Fleming, 2006) suggest that there are important distinctions between these two words which, when applied and realised, not only result in a competitive edge but in unparalleled leadership “that is rare to find and that can make a difference for society” (Deming, 1993, p.16).
To transform, according to the Collins English Dictionary (1999), is “to alter or be altered radically in form, appearance or structure” (p.1623). According to Bridges (2000), transformation in an organisational setting is the result of a well-planned and executed change strategy:

The result is a metamorphosis to the desired state in which there is a deep seated adoption of the changes and the associated values, principles and/or processes. This leads to an embedded, and marked, change in organisational culture and reinforces a journey of continuous improvement (pp.3-4).

Taylor (2005) holds a similar view:

[Transformation] is literally a change in the structure of an individual’s mind and the linkages and protocols of an organisation. I am not speaking metaphorically here. This “rewiring” is accomplished by practicing the creative habits which result in strong memory. In an individual, in an organisation, in a region, or humanity on a planetary scale, this is absolute, physical and permanent change. This is not a phenomenon of mere intellectual change - it is a change in hardware as well as software (p. 5).

At first glance these definitions appear quite straightforward, but they are not entirely unproblematic. In Bridges’ account, transformation relates only to the organisation’s attainment of positive outcomes. Taylor does not link his definition of transformation to either positive or negative outcomes. Neither these nor other scholars address the idea that organisations and/or individuals can undergo a transformation from their starting position to a lesser or more negative state. Rather, the assumption is that when organisations and individuals do not undergo or complete the process of transformation, they somehow return to, or remain at, their pre-existing state. A great deal of scholarship has been devoted to improving staff morale, motivating, engaging and influencing. But there appears to be a gap in the literature in relation to what happens to individuals and organisations when there is failed change or when actors have failed to make the transition to the new order.

These observations will be discussed in more detail in a later section. For now, it is generally accepted that change is a daily occurrence in all organisations and that most changes result from routine decision making and, therefore, pass without comment. In some cases, change occurs as a result of an agent having “a vision of the future with some implicit commentary
on why people should strive to create that future” (Kotter, 1996, p. 68). However, the literature suggests that organisational change is most commonly reactive rather than pro-active and is often a knee-jerk reaction to failure and to salient, problematic or unmet expectations (Ancona & Chong, 1996; Ashmos and Huber, 1987; Farazmand, 2003; Gersick, 1991; Prigogine, 1997).

When a major gap exists between expectations and outcomes, actors are likely to identify a need for more in information and/or modification of existing routines or policies/procedures. Deliberate change, however, is more difficult to achieve when there is a groupthink perception that existing routines are adequate for achieving organisational goals (Cain, 2012; Hogg & Hains, 1998; Hogg & Packer, 2009). The following sections examine the context in which change occurs and review the more popular change theories.

2.5.1 First and Second Order Change

There are two contexts in which change can occur, known as first- and second-order change (Goodman, 1982; Levy & Merry, 1986; Watzlawick, et al., 1974). First-order change involves minor adjustments and improvements in one or a few dimensions of the organisation. In other words, it does not change or have significant impact on the organisation’s core purpose or values. Here change occurs among individuals or at group level and is characterised by adjustments within the existing structure such as doing more or less of something, adding or removing staff, or changing policies or procedures. In first order change, changes are reversible and do not require new learning or transformation. By nature it is a linear process, requiring ongoing effort; single-loop learning (allowing the organisation to carry on its present policies or achieve its present objectives); and incremental approaches (Levy & Merry, 1986).

First-order change is often associated with the theoretical perspective called organisational development (OD). This is “a system-wide application of behavioural science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organisational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organisation's effectiveness” (Cummings & Worley, 1997, p.2). Aligning organisational development with the influencing nature of leadership, Neilsen (1984) suggests that OD is “the attempt to influence the members of an organisation to expand their candidness with each other about their views of the organisation and their
experience in it, and to take greater responsibility for their own actions as organisation members” (pp. 2-3).

Second-order change tends to be associated with another theoretical tradition, that of organisational transformation. Second order change addresses such aspects as the organisation’s underlying mission, culture, operational methodologies, processes, and/or structure. It also addresses innovations, new technologies, markets and new organisational directions (Levy & Merry, 1986). Here the organisation makes irreversible changes at its core which require new learning and transformation to ensure it can operate in a different way or have people think or behave differently (Bateson 1979; Bergquist, 1993).

Second-order change is often precipitated by a crisis or rapid growth. Some of its characteristics are: it tends to be multidimensional (impacting on many aspects of an organisation); it is multilevel (affecting individuals, groups, and the overall organisation); it may appear irrational to some because the change is based on an unfamiliar (new or different) logic or worldview; it involves double-loop learning (examining and altering any mismatches along the way); and it results in a paradigm shift (Argyis, 1982; Levy & Merry, 1986). Second-order change can incur resistance from within the organisation and also outside it (e.g. from customers, suppliers, industry groups, stakeholders). When second order change or its process is seen as being too radical, change is viewed as a threat and subsequently engenders strong resistance (Kotter, 1996; Parilla, 1993; Senior & Fleming, 2006).

While first and second order changes are well established and generally accepted constructs within the literature some scholars lament that the dichotomy is overly simplified. According to Fullan (2001), for example, “the big problems of the day are complex, rife with paradoxes and dilemmas. For these problems, there are no once-and-for-all answers” (p. 67). Gersick (1991) also rejects the notion that first and second order change exist independently of each other and asserts that they should be replaced by a continuum or combination of change levels, since “organisations alternate between long periods of stable, continuous change and adaptation and brief periods of revolutionary upheaval” (p.34). Such differences notwithstanding, theorists and practitioners continue to seek new and better ways to effect change in organisations through the use of change methods and theories.
2.5.2 Change Theories

Hundreds of change models for organisations are described in the literature, and their number has grown since this study was first conceived. Van de Ven and Poole (1995) identify four basic models of change:

- **Life cycle models:** have an event sequence of change in an entity as it progresses through a necessary sequence of stages of start-up, growth, harvest and termination.
- **Evolutionary models:** consist of a repetitive sequence of variation, selection, and retention events among entities. Competition for scarce environmental resources between entities inhabiting a population generates this evolutionary cycle.
- **Teleological models:** view change as a cycle of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation, and modification of goals based on what was learned by the entity. This sequence emerges through purposeful social construction among individuals within the entity.
- **Dialectical models:** propose that conflicts emerge between entities espousing opposing theses (antithesis) and this collision produces a synthesis. This in time becomes the thesis for the next cycle of a dialectical progression. Confrontation and conflict between opposing entities generate this dialectical cycle.

It is important to understand that different theories of change underpin each of these models because as Van de Ven and Poole (1995) remark:

> it is very easy for the conceptual basis of specific theories to become obscure. As Kaplan (1964) warns, borrowing concepts from different theories without understanding the theoretical “roots” of these concepts can produce confounded explanations (p.6).

The following table displays a summary of these theoretical foundations.
Table 5: Families of Ideal-Type Theories of Social Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Life cycle</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
<th>Dialectic</th>
<th>Teleology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Developmentalism</td>
<td>Darwinian evolution</td>
<td>Conflict theory</td>
<td>Goal setting, planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontogenesis</td>
<td>Mendelian genetics</td>
<td>Dialectical materialism</td>
<td>Functionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metamorphosis</td>
<td>Saltationism</td>
<td>Pluralism</td>
<td>Social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage and cyclical models</td>
<td>Punctuated equilibrium</td>
<td>Collective action</td>
<td>Symbolic interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key metaphor</td>
<td>Organic growth</td>
<td>Competitive survival</td>
<td>Opposition, conflict</td>
<td>Purposeful cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Immanent program</td>
<td>Natural selection</td>
<td>Contradictory forces</td>
<td>Envisioned end state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefigured sequence</td>
<td>among competitors in a population</td>
<td>Thesis, antithesis, synthesis</td>
<td>Social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equifinality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event progression</td>
<td>Linear and irreversible sequence of prescribed stages in unfolding of immanent potentials present at the beginning</td>
<td>Recurrent, cumulative, &amp; probabilistic sequence of variation. Selection, &amp; retention events</td>
<td>Recurrent, discontinuous sequence of confrontation, conflict and synthesis between contradictory values or events</td>
<td>Recurrent, discontinuous sequence of goal setting, implementation and adaptation of means to reach desired end state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating force</td>
<td>Prefigured program or rule regulated by nature, logic, or institutions</td>
<td>Population scarcity</td>
<td>Conflict &amp; confrontation between opposing forces, interests, or classes</td>
<td>Goal enactment consensus on means cooperation or symbiosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commensalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Van de Ven and Poole, 1995 p. 514.

A more detailed account of the four types of models is provided below.

2.5.2.1 Life Cycle Models

The life-cycle paradigm is well established in the change literature, with numerous organisational scholars adopting organic growth as a metaphor to explain initiation, development and termination in organisational entities (e.g. Nisbet, 1970; Piaget, 1975; Kimberly & Miles, 1980). Life cycle theories assume that all organisational changes follow a predictable pattern that can be characterised by an irreversible series of development stages (Adzes, 1991; Greiner, 1972; Lynden, 1975; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995) which indicate that change is immanent. The typical progression of change events in a life cycle model follows a single sequence of stages or phases that must occur in a certain order.
Each characteristic sets the stage for the next; those acquired in earlier stages are retained in later stages and are derived from a common underlying process. Thus each of these events contributes a certain piece to the final product (Adzes, 1991; Colbert, 1978; Greiner, 1972; Lavoie & Kimberly, 1979; Lynden, 1975; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

Life cycle theory proposes that change does not occur because people see the necessity of (or even desire) change but because it is a natural progression that cannot be stopped or altered (Miller & Friesen, 1980; and Morgan, 1986). The focus here is on the importance of human beings in the change process. The argument is that change agents must assist members of the organisation to adapt to whatever phase the organisation is experiencing in its life cycle because change will not occur successfully unless all people are prepared for it (Goodman, 1982; Miller & Friesen, 1980; Pettigrew et al., 2002; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

Models in the life cycle tradition propose that, in the growth phase, all organisations need vision, creativity, entrepreneurship, gathering of resources and creation of an ideology. As the organisation evolves to the mature stage, it needs to focus more on internal processes and practices rather than external factors. Over time, renewal and expansion occur through managers observing the environment and selectively responding (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). It is also worth mentioning that life-cycle models are related to, but different from, learning models. In the latter, learning is more adaptive, habitual, and regulated by nature (Burnes, 1996) and emphasis is more on learning and unlearning habits—hence the interest in concepts such as emotional intelligence, adaptability to change and leadership skills (Collins, 1998).

2.5.2.2 Evolutionary Theory

In this approach, change is understood as a series of events relating to competitive survival, which is governed by the natural selection processes inherent in every human organism. The earliest evolutionary models derived from biological investigations of change (Darwin, 1809–1882). These were developed by social evolutionary theorists in disciplines such as political science and sociology (Durkheim, 1982; Spencer, 1989).
Both social and biological evolutionary models assume that actors have a minor impact on the nature and direction of the change process (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1985) but that change is primarily dependant on circumstances, situational variables, and the environment (Morgan, 1986). This premise is carried into the organisational space, where evolutionary models focus on the inability of organisations to plan for and respond to change and their tendency to reactivity manage change as it occurs. Competition between actors for customers, roles, promotion, idea acceptance and leadership is typical in this modality, where higher level decision-makers make their selections on the basis of what is most suitable for the scarce resource niche (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006; Baum & McKervey, 1999; Hannan & Freeman, 1977). Thus leaders scan the environment to discern new developments and structures. Processes are viewed as inherently less important in evolutionary models as in other models (Goodman, 1982).

Evolutionary theory is used in studies of trait leadership (e.g. Fiedler, 1967; Bass, 1990; Avolio et al., 2003: Derue, 2011), organisational models (e.g. Burgelman, 2002; Nelson & Winter, 1982) and change models (Davidow & Malone, 1992; Fiedler, 1996; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995) to explain how traits can be inherited, and whether organisational change proceeds gradually and incrementally or rapidly and radically. Evolutionary theory offers that traits can be acquired within a single generation through imitation and knowledge acquisition. Evolutionary theory and models emphasise slow change process, rather than discrete events or activities and the outcome and as such is often the formation of new organisational structure or principles (Kies, 1989).

2.5.2.3 Dialectical Models

The term dialectical derives from the Hegelian-Marxian perspective in which a pattern, value, ideal, or norm in an organisation is always present with its polar opposite (Martin, 2009). In this theory, change is understood as a process of thesis–antithesis-synthesis (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). It is assumed that all existence is shaped by opposition and conflict and that contradiction is a natural state. Stability is either directly or indirectly produced by accommodations, interactions and struggles that maintain the status quo between opposing forces or entities.
In dialectical models, organisations pass through long periods of evolutionary change during which the dialectical interaction between the polar opposites is marked by short periods of second-order or revolutionary change. This invariably leads to an impasse between the two opposing perspectives until challengers gain sufficient power to confront and engage incumbents, leading to conflict (Morgan, 1986; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). Conflict has to be resolved if it is to be a constructive force and not result in undesirable win-lose outcomes. Thus leaders play a central role in these models and collective action is usually their primary focus (Behfar, et al. 2008; Jehn & Bendersky 2003; Peterson & Behfar 2003).

The predominant change processes in the dialectical tradition are bargaining, consciousness-raising, persuasion, influence and power, and social movements. The outcome of change is a modified organisational ideology or identity (Benson, 1977; Greiner, 1998; Martin, 2006; Rosenthal, 1998). Organisations that have avoidant conflict cultures are likely to be less adaptive to change because norms against open discussion and the lack of information sharing can prevent effective solutions to disagreements, and, therefore, may impede conflictive change processes (Leslie & Keller, 2008). Czarniawska and Sevon (1996) suggest that the change literature itself “is a dialectical pattern in which the planned change and evolutionary models represent opposites, generating the four other typologies of models” (p.13).

2.5.2.3 Teleological Models

This construct is also known as planned change and scientific management. Here change is enacted through goal-setting mechanisms where the organisation is adaptable to the change requirements at any given point in time and where co-operation and consensus building is pivotal. Teleological change theory assumes that change occurs because of internal organisational drivers (leaders or other change agents) who motivate change rather than change being driven by the external environment (Brill & Worth, 1997). While the process for change is similar to that in evolutionary models, in that it is rational and linear, the individual leaders or managers are much more instrumental to the process. Key aspects of the change process in teleological models include planning, assessment, incentives and rewards, stakeholder analysis and engagement, leadership, strategy, restructuring, and reengineering and adaptive learning (Brill & Worth, 1997; Carnall, 1995; Huber & Glick, 1993).
Arguably, the best-known strategy within this tradition is organisational development, which tends to focus on first-order change and the analysis of obstacles and other individual factors that inhibit change (Golembiewski, 1989; Goodman, 1982). Here organisations proceed through distinct stages and it is the change agent’s role to effectively manage the transition from one stable state to another (Golembiewski, 1989). Although goals are set for addressing change, there is a heavy emphasis on cultural values, attitudes and organisational norms (Fleming, 2006) as well as on the use of group meetings to overcome resistance and help the change initiative (Hard & Trahant, 1996).

Another popular change management approach in the teleological tradition is Total Quality Management (TQM), which originated in Japan in the 1950s and was refined and developed for application in western societies in the 1980s by American management consultants W. Edwards Deming, Joseph Juran, and A.V. Feigenbaum. Total Quality Management capitalises on the involvement of management, workforce, suppliers and customers in order to meet or exceed customer expectations (Deming, 1986; Feigenbaum, 1991; Ishikawa, 1985). TQM assumes that change is inhibited because institutions are based on long-standing traditions, practices and values.

Teleological models assume that organisations exist in a somewhat stable condition and that managers can lead them from one set state to another. Some scholars however, who concerned that while most organisations pursue quality they do not always address obstacles (such as embedded values and structural or cultural hindrances) that prevent the levels of quality or transformation that is necessary to create successful change (Freed, Klugman & Fife, 1997; Schein, 1985).

2.5.2.4 Multiple Models

Van de Ven and Poole (1995) suggest that organisations can benefit from the use of multiple models, a view supported by recent organisational change theorists and leadership specialists such as Bennis (2009), Kotter (1995) and Welch (2005). The advantage of multiple models is that they combine the insights of various change theories and allow organisations to adapt the change process to better suit their needs. According to Bolman and Deal (1991), developers of the Four Frame Model of organisational change:
“Control is an illusion and rationality an afterthought…Organisational life is always full of simultaneous events that can be interpreted in a variety of ways” (p. 266).

They suggest that the key to accomplishing something that requires concerted action with others is to reframe one’s perception of the situation so as to take into account the divergent perspectives of the various players: “Their frame - not yours - determines how they will act” (p. 270). In the organisational context, the different organisational theories represent the unique ways in which actors approach or behave in organisations; by combining the various theories or lenses, leaders can more accurately assess situations and move toward creating real change rather than diffusion (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Life-cycle and evolutionary models are more appropriate to first order change because by nature they build on what has gone on before. By contrast, second-order change is in essence constructive, meaning that there is a conscious "break with (the) past basic assumptions or framework" (Warzlawick, et al. 1974, p. 523). Therefore teleological and dialectical models are more suitable in the context of second-order change.

2.6.2.5 Diffusion

While diffusion can be viewed as a change strategy it is not an overall approach to change. Diffusion occurs when change actors note trends or seek to capitalise on already established good ideas (Ellsworth, 2000). According to Rogers (1976), diffusion involves:

- awareness (an individual is exposed to an innovation but lacks complete information about it);
- interest (the person seeks information about the innovation);
- evaluation (the individual applies the innovation to his or her present and anticipated future situation and decides whether to try it);
- trial (the individual uses it on a small scale);
- and adoption (the person decides whether to use the innovation on a large scale) (pp. 290-301).

Some notable examples of diffusion as a change strategy include best practice - where multiple organisations follow an already established standard way of doing things (e.g. Bogan & English, 1994); standards brought out by the International Organisation for Standardisation; competency standards and franchises. Because diffusion rides on the back of already established change it does not generally engender the same level of resistance to change as does pure second-order change.
2.5.3 Resistance to Change

An organisation is a social environment made up of actors who hold concurrent personal, social and organisational identities (Burke & Reitzes, 1991; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). As previously noted, lack of organisational commitment can cause actors to slip into their preferred way of addressing situations, including resisting change in its many forms. According to Boldt, “while electrical engineers measure resistance in terms of ohms, in human relations resistance is measured in degrees of trust—or rather the lack of it” (cited in Newman, 2007, p. 57).

Resistance to change can occur anywhere in an organisation and at any time. While senior leaders may have a bird’s-eye view of the entire organisation and may understand the changes in the external business environment, it is often difficult for them to obtain buy-in to proposed change from others in the organisation. Resistance to change can even occur in an organisation’s management, when “the current vision/strategies are successful or have been successful in the past, or if they are shown to be the basis of competitive advantage or innovation” (Johnson, Scholes & Whittington, 2008, p. 208). Resistance to change, wherever it occurs in an organisation, must be addressed by the organisation’s leadership and/or management as failure to effectively handle it can hinder the change process, create ancillary problems in the workplace, and lead to avoidable risk (Gannon & Newman, 2002, p. 260).

Kotter (1996) asserts that “successful strategic change seems to demand a combination of cognitive/analytical skills and knowledge alongside a range of behavioural skills and knowledge” (p. 18). He maintains that effective leadership is the key to overcoming resistance to change and identifies eight common errors that leaders often make in dealing with change resistance:

The first is not instilling a sense of urgency at the beginning and throughout the change process (not fear or panic); second, failing to create a sufficiently powerful coalition; third, underestimating the power of the vision; fourth, under-communicating the vision by a factor of 10 (or 100 or even 1000); fifth, permitting obstacles to block the new vision; sixth, failing to create short-term wins; seventh, declaring victory too soon; eighth, neglecting to anchor changes firmly in corporate culture. (pp. 4-16)
Further, as Borgelt and Falk (2007) suggest, while leaders and managers will usually be involved in organisational change and future initiatives, they are also involved with the organisation’s daily outputs. Both thrusts require attention and failure to balance the two can lead to costly mistakes.

### 2.5.4 Is Change Always Necessary?

In contrast to the extensive literature on organisational change theories and models and the role of leaders in driving change, there is a remarkable absence of discussion of when not to change. Anecdotal evidence from contemporary Australian organisations suggests that most organisations restructure at least once every five years. Government Departments undergo name changes and amalgamations, centralisation and decentralisation almost as a matter of course whenever there is a change of government. The expectation of change is arguably viewed as an executive’s right and a trophy of managerial success. However, each time meta changes occur there is an associated cost, which is often borne by the taxpayer or consumer (Czarniawska & Sevon, 1996).

Yet, as MacDonald (1997) points out, what needs to be preserved may be just as important to understand as what needs to be changed. At times, he suggests, “executives should listen to the siren song of change with a healthy dose of scepticism” (p. viii). In most organisations there are actors somewhere who are either adjusting to first or second order change or who are championing the cause of preservation. The leader’s challenge is to gain acceptance of continuous change throughout the organisation so that innovations or preservations will be accepted and seen as relevant to the wide range of purposes at hand. Can leadership accomplish this in an increasingly regulated (some would argue, over-regulated) environment?

### 2.5.5 Change and Risk

The two key elements of organisational change, particularly at the macro level, revolve around the concepts of innovation and risk management. It is a truism in today’s rapidly growing electronic marketplace that innovation—usually understood as involving new products or services, markets, structures, branding and technology— is generally considered to be a matter of survival for all organisations to a greater or lesser degree.
Therefore it is somewhat surprising to note that in June 2009, at the ISBA Enterprise Innovation Summit in Canberra, the Society of Knowledge Economics (SKE) reported that, while Australia has one of the highest rates of entrepreneurship in the world, it also has one of the lowest rates of innovation within companies (p.3):

If we are to address the opportunities that lie in emerging knowledge based industries and increasing international competition, then the need to improve productivity and innovation performance are significant challenges and opportunities that demand change in the way our workplaces are led and managed. (p. 2)

The same view had been expressed by Jack Welch, former CEO of General Electric, almost 30 years ago. In 1980, his goal was to make GE the world's most competitive enterprise through innovation in an environment where the workers worked, managers managed, and everyone knew their place in a bureaucratic environment (Krames, 2003, p. 2). Accordingly, Welch led a self-proclaimed revolution involving reinventing the company from top to bottom. His strategy involved leading more in order to innovate, and managing less so as not to reinforce those aspects which were not working (Krames, op cit.). During his tenure at GE and as a result of his innovations, the company's value rose 4000% and was, for a time, the most valuable company in the world (Welch, 2001). While this is a positive and, arguably, a somewhat simplistic notion of innovative leadership, the problem for many actors is that innovation comes with risk.

In an effort to keep the organisation ‘safe’, and in order to identify, measure and deal with associated risks that may have an effect on the organisation, some managers can kill off innovative ideas or lessen them to a point where the innovation ceases to be of value to the organisation at times when it is needed. In other words, because leadership-driven innovation necessarily produces change, As a by-product, it can also generate confusion or chaos, which is often at odds with management’s purpose to bring order, compliance, risk aversion and risk management and which opens the door to legislative controls (Bodde & St. John, 2012; Kasparov, et al., 2012). Hence, the risk versus innovation debate reproduces in different terms the leadership/management debate, where innovation is arguably seen as the domain of leadership, and risk as the domain of management.

Risk is generally defined as the chance of something happening that will have an impact upon objectives. It is measured in terms of likelihood (the chance) and consequence (the amount of
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impact). The Australian Standard AS/NZS ISO 31000 (2009) defines risk as “the effect of uncertainty on objectives”. In a series of notes, it offers these further definitions:

An effect is a deviation from the expected — positive and/or negative. …Objectives can have different aspects (such as financial, health and safety, and environmental goals) and can apply at different levels (such as strategic, organisation-wide, project, product and process). …Risk is often characterised by reference to potential events…and consequences…or a combination of these…Risk is often expressed in terms of a combination of the consequences of an event (including changes in circumstances) and the associated likelihood…of occurrence (p.1).

The Standard suggests that organisations manage risk by anticipating, understanding and deciding whether to modify it. Throughout this process they communicate and consult with stakeholders and monitor and review the risk and the controls that are modifying the risk. This Standard describes this systematic and logical process in detail. (2009, p. iv.)

On the surface, the definition of ‘risk’ and ‘risk management’ may seem straightforward. Problems arise, however, when leaders try to innovate and managers try to implement risk management strategies without first understanding the difference between uncertainty, ambiguity and risk.

2.5.5.1 True Uncertainty, Ambiguity and Risk

Knight (1921) identified three types of uncertainty: risk, which is measurable statistically (such as the probability of drawing a red ball out of an urn containing five red balls and five black balls); ambiguity, which is difficult to measure statistically (such as the probability of drawing a red ball out of an urn containing five red balls and an unknown quantity of black balls); and true uncertainty, which is impossible to estimate or predict statistically (such as the probability of drawing a red ball out of an urn containing an unknown quantity of both red balls and black balls) (pp. 30-35).

Managing risk is relatively straightforward when it involves working with certainties. Managing unknown environments and circumstances (ambiguity and true uncertainty) is much more difficult. Often innovations in these environments are accompanied by a risk-
adverse approach which, as previously noted, often leads to over-regulation and takes away the responsibility of individual decision making. Furedi (2005) laments that:

Businesses are progressively dumbed down, not only by book authors who teach management by parable but also by managers themselves. Ironically, the infantilisation of work is happening at the same time experts tout employee skills and knowledge as a prime source of corporations' intellectual capital. Much of the dumbing down that occurs in organisations today is fueled by aversion to risk. Managers who are afraid to make their own decisions hire high-priced consultants to reaffirm the obvious: It is generally safer to adopt someone else's best practice than to engineer your own (p. 22) [italics in original].

Knight (op cit.) suggests that it is the inherent unknowability in business that is the key to risk, and not merely the fact of ignorance. This not only places the organisation at a financial risk but also creates a reputational risk which may be devastating to an organisation’s survival. When asked why reputation is so important, Edward Neville Isdell (Chairman of the Board and CEO of Coca-Cola 2004-2008) once famously said, “If I lost all of my factories and trucks but kept the name Coca-Cola, I could rebuild my business. If I lost my name, the business would collapse”. The necessity of building and maintaining a good reputation is also of importance to legendary financier, Warren Buffett (1930- ) once famously observed: “It takes 20 years to build a reputation and five minutes to ruin it. If you think about that you will do things differently” (in Bacon, 2011, p. 199).

The vital nature of a good reputation was indicated in a 1988 Citibank and Interbrand survey which found that 70% of the value of the top 100 British companies is attributed to their positive reputation. So important is reputation that, Fombrun (1996) asserts, a company’s share-price is actually an indicator of its reputation. Further, the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Global Risk Briefing, which targets senior executives responsible for corporate risk, concluded in its 2005 report that reputational risk emerges as the main concern for the majority of risk managers—ahead of regulatory risk, human capital risk, IT network risk, market risk and credit risk (p.3). The survey also showed that companies struggle to categorise, let alone quantify, reputational risk; compliance failures are the biggest source of reputational risk; SMEs lag behind on reputational risk; good communication is vital to protecting against, and repairing, reputational damage; and the CEO is the principal guardian of corporate reputation (pp. 2-3).
Whether driving innovation or the organisation’s key risk factors, the leader and her/his leadership—whether good or flawed—are at the centre of the playing field. The concept of flawed leadership leads to consideration of why leadership can become dysfunctional, what impact that poor leadership ability and application can have on decisions concerning organisational change or not implementing change when needed and how leadership can be hijacked away from its intended purpose by the leader his/herself or by others within or external to the organisation.

2.6 Research Theory

The focus of this thesis is on social actors in an organisational context, therefore the study is guided by the tenants of social research. Social research falls under the general heading of social science where science is thought of as being “a coherent body of thought over which there is a broad cohesive consensus among its practitioners as to its properties causes and effects” (May, 2010, p 5). Science is built on what we see, hear and touch rather than on personal opinion and speculative imaginings (Chalmers 1990). Yet the actual practice of science shows that there are not only different perspectives on a given phenomenon, but also alternative methods of gathering information and of analysing the resultant data (Williams 2000). While these differences affect the natural sciences, this research is concerned with the practice of the social sciences, because as Giddens (1997) suggests

> unlike objects in nature, humans are self-aware beings who confer sense and purposes on what they do. We can’t even describe social life accurately unless we first grasp the concepts that people apply in their behaviour (pp 12 -13).

A review of the literature indicates that the world of social science is divided between theorists and researchers. If social theorists gain the advantage by distancing themselves from the empirical world in order to reflect upon processes and their products, then social researchers do so by concentrating on the process of research (May, 2001). There is merit in both of these views as theory, methodology and methods are all part of the issues and processes that surround and inform the discipline (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln 2000; Strauss & Corbin 1998). However there are differences which, according to the
literature frequently lead to disagreements, as well as to confusions about the nature of research and the methodology by which it should pursue its aims. For this reason there is value in understanding the ways in which we gain our knowledge of the social world, the relationships that are held to exist between theory and research, and the part that ethics play in qualitative research practice.

2.6.1 Qualitative Research

According to Conger (1998), quantitative research alone cannot produce a good understanding of leadership because of “the extreme and enduring complexity of the leadership phenomena itself” (p.108). This view is supported by numerous scholars who seek out the answers to questions about meaning and culture and thus determine that quantitative methods do not adequately explain the phenomenon they wish to study (Conger, 1999; Hunt, 1999; Shank 2002). In defining qualitative research, Shank (2002) asserts that it is a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning where systematic means planned, ordered and public, following rules agreed upon by members of the qualitative research community; empirical, meaning that this type of inquiry is grounded in the world of experience and Inquiry into meaning denoting the understanding of how others make sense of their experience (p. 5).

Similarly Denzin and Lincoln (2000) propose that qualitative research involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach whereby “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). Thus qualitative research allows for opportunities to develop empirically supported new ideas and theories of, in this case, leadership phenomena. It also gives the researcher the flexibility to follow unexpected ideas during research while providing sensitivity to contextual factors and the ability to study dimensions and social meaning (Conger, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004; Merriam, 2002; Patton, 2002; Seale, Gobo & Smith, 2003; Weinberg, 2000).

2.6.2 Ontology or Epistemology?

Ontology is the science or theory of being and questions the real nature of entities, how they come into being and why.
Of particular relevance to this study, ontology poses the question of whether reality exists independently of our knowledge or if it is socially and discursively constructed and hence dependant from a particular time or culture (Marsh & Furlong, 2002).

Examples of ontological positions are those contained within the perspectives ‘objectivism’ and ‘constructivism’. Broadly speaking, an objectivist ontological position asserts that “social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors”, while a constructivist ontology “asserts that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors and implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision” (Bryman, 2001, pp. 16–18).

Perry (1997), basing work on Guba and Lincoln (1994) propose the following forms ontological perspectives: Positivism, where reality is real and apprehensible; Critical theory, where “virtual reality” is shaped by social, economic, ethnic, political, cultural and gender values which are crystallised over time; Constructruism, where multiple local and specific realities are constructed; and Realism, where reality is “real” but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehensible (p.547).

Epistemology is concerned with “providing a philosophical grounding for deciding what kinds of knowledge are possible and how we can ensure that they are both adequate and legitimate” (Crotty, 2011, p.17). It involves concepts of “knowledge, evidence, reasons for believing, justification, probability, what one ought to believe, and any other concepts that can only be understood through one or more of the above” (Fumerton, 2006, p.1). Crotty (2011) laments that ontology and epistemology is often enmeshed in the literature: “realism (an ontological notion asserting that realities exist outside the mind) is often taken to imply objectivism (an epistemological notion asserting that meaning exists in objects independently of any consciousness” (p.10). However Ratner (2008) explains that it is possible for ‘objectivism’ to be used in both ontological and epistemological contexts:

Objectivism is the notion that an objective reality exists and can be increasingly known through the accumulation of more complete information. Objectivism is thus an ontology (the world exists, is real), and an epistemology (knowledge can increasingly approximate the real nature, or quality, of its object -- that is, knowledge can become increasingly objective). Objectivist epistemology presupposes
an objectivist ontology -- in order to objectively know the world, there must be a real objective, definite world. (The inverse relation is not necessary -- it is theoretically possible that a real world exists but cannot be known objectively because human perception is biased, for example.) (p.567)

While Smith (2006) observes that ontology is largely overlooked in disciplines such as organisational theory, Crotty (2011) assigns a marginal role to ontology in social research on the basis that the meaning has been stretched “well and truly beyond its boundaries by authors such as Blaikie” (1993, p. 11). Instead he suggests, “it would seem preferable to retain the usage of ‘theoretical perspective’ and reserve the term ‘ontology’ for those occasions when we do need to talk about ‘being’ (op cit).

Regardless of the type of ontological stance taken in research, it is essential that researchers are able to justify their work. Crotty proposes the use of a hierarchy of research design (epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and methods) in order to understand and justify the research process. This, he suggests, provides a solid platform “to identify the assumptions about the human world and social life within that world, which are necessarily embedded within the methods, utilised to undertake a particular research task” (Crotty, in Feast & Melles, 2010, p.1).

Figure 2: Crotty’s Hierarchy of Research Design

Source: Crotty (2011, p.4)
2.6.3 Epistemology

Epistemology, according to Crotty (1998) is the theory of knowledge which defines what kind of knowledge is possible and legitimate. Further, it is concerned with “providing a philosophical grounding for deciding what kinds of knowledge are possible and how we can ensure that they are both adequate and legitimate” (p.17).

Epistemology takes three main positions: the first is objectivism, which holds that “meaning, and therefore meaningful reality, exists apart from the operation of consciousness” (Crotty 1998, p. 17). As an example, he explains “That tree in the forest is a tree, regardless of the operation of any consciousness” (Crotty, 1998, p. 8). Those who share this view contend that if they go about their research in the correct way it is possible to discover objective truth (Crotty 1998; Dilthey, 1985; Rand 1967). The second epistemological view is constructionism, which reject the view of human knowledge, contending that there is no objective truth waiting to be discovered but rather truth exists only through interaction with the different realities of the world (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Further, meaning is constructed by people in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomena (Burr, 1995; Crotty, 1998; Hacking 1995; Pavlovic, 2011).

Constructionism, permits the researcher to explore the views and comprehension of the various participants within the subject or context, and recognises that each may experience a different understanding of the same situation (Crotty 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Freebody, 2003; Hesse-Bibber & Leavy 2006; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). The third epistemological stance is subjectivism, which Crotty (ibid) suggests “comes to the fore in a structuralist, post-structuralist and postmodernism forms of thought” (p.9), and where meaning does not come out of the interplay between subject and object but rather is imposed on the object by the subject. Subjectivism Crotty (ibid) suggests, ascribes meaning that “may come from our dreams, or from primordial archetypes we locate within our collective unconsciousness or form the conjunction and aspects of the planets, or forms or religious beliefs, or from…That is to say, meaning comes from anything but an interaction between the subject and the object to which it is subscribed” (op cit).

In qualitative research epistemology requires trustworthiness, which is the equivalent of reliability in quantitative research (Gibbs, 2002).
While both refer to the similar issue of whether the results are a true reflection of our subject, reliability in a quantitative study is dependent on whether the researcher is actually measuring what they are supposed to be measuring (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). However, in qualitative research there are no numerical measures, so it is not possible to determine the internal consistency or a statistic of reliability. To overcome this, Triangulation is typically perceived to be a strategy for Carson et al (2001) asserts that trustworthiness within the context of qualitative research epistemology can be achieved by determining the appropriate theoretical perspective, methodology and methods for the study under consideration.

2.6.4 Theoretical Perspective

Theoretical perspective can be described as:

The philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes (Crotty 1998, p. 17).

There are two theoretical perspectives on offer to the qualitative researcher. The first perspective is *positivism* which relates directly to the epistemology of objectivism. Positivism subscribes to the theory that it is possible to obtain hard, secure objective knowledge about the external reality and that individuals have direct access to the real world (Carson et al., 2001; Giddens 1974; Mises, 1951). The positivist position is that data is derived from sensory experience is tested using logical and mathematical methods, which together is considered to be the exclusive source of all authentic knowledge (Hirschheim, 1985; Myers, 1997). By comparison, *interpretivism* holds that the social world is inherently different from the natural world, and thus cannot be studied in the same way. The interpretivist position is that people construct and re-construct their worlds (that is, society), and their knowledge of the perceived world (or worlds) has meaning in its own terms which can be understood through careful use of interpretivist procedures (Carson et al., 1998).

Further, Schwandt (1994) suggests the following outlook:

Proponents of these persuasions share the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it. This goal is variously spoken of as an abiding concern for the life world, for the emic point of view, for understanding meaning, for grasping the actor’s definition of a situation, for Verstehen.
The world of lived reality and situation-specific meanings that constitute the general object of investigation is thought to be constructed by social actors (p. 118).

Choosing from these two main theoretical perspectives not only drives inquiry into the phenomena of interest, it allows the researcher to employ appropriate and compatible methodology for use in their research.

2.6.5 Research Methodology

Strauss and Corbin (1999) suggest that qualitative research methodologies are any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification. More specifically, Cassell and Symon (1994) assert that the label qualitative methodology has no precise meaning in any of the social sciences. It is an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world (p.16).

2.6.5.1 Grounded Theory

The foundation of grounded theory, Glaser (1978) suggests is the “systematic generating of theory, that is systematically obtained from social research, and offers a rigorous, orderly guide to theory development that at each stage is closely integrated with a methodology of social research” (p.2). Grounded theory is considered an important method for studying topics of a social nature because it “allows the researcher to develop a theoretical account of the general features of a topic while simultaneously grounding the account in empirical observation or data (Martin & Turner, 1986, p.141). It can be used as a research philosophy where the researcher approaches a research question considered to be of interest with no a priori research framework or theoretical context (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978). It can also be used as a technique for analysing data, which involves the process of constant comparison where categories and properties are concepts which are identified by the researcher and evolve from the constant comparing of the data allowing the emergence of a theory (Bryant, 2002; Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998, 2001).
Although grounded theory was initially developed by the researchers Glasner and Strauss (1967), early in its development the two researchers separated and a bifurcation of the theory ensued and which resulted in the formation and building of the Glaserian School and Straussian schools of grounded theory (Stern, 1994). Glaser takes the stance that researchers should have an empty mind and leads with the principle that theory should emerge. Strauss permits a general idea of the area under study and uses structured questions to lead a more forceful emergence of theory. These differences and others are tabled in Onions (2006) comparison of the two schools of grounded theory methodological (GMT) approaches.
Table 6: Key Differences in GTM Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLASERIAN</th>
<th>STRAUSSIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning with general wonderment (an empty mind)</td>
<td>Having a general idea of where to begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging theory, with neutral questions</td>
<td>Forcing the theory, with structured questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a conceptual theory</td>
<td>Conceptual description (description of situations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical sensitivity (the ability to perceive variables and relationships) comes from immersion in the data</td>
<td>Theoretical sensitivity comes from methods and Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The theory is grounded in the data</td>
<td>The theory is interpreted by an observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The credibility of the theory, or verification, is derived from its grounding in the data</td>
<td>The credibility of the theory comes from the rigour of the method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A basic social process should be identified</td>
<td>Basic social processes need not be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher is passive, exhibiting disciplined restraint</td>
<td>The researcher is active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data reveals the theory</td>
<td>Data is (sic) structured to reveal the theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding is less rigorous, a constant comparison of incident to incident, with neutral questions and categories and properties evolving. Take care not to ‘over-conceptualise’, identify key points</td>
<td>Coding is more rigorous and defined by technique. The nature of making comparisons varies with the coding technique. Labels are carefully crafted at the time. Codes are derived from ‘micro-analysis which consists of analysis data word-by-word’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two coding phases or types, simple (fracture the data then conceptually group it) and substantive (open or selective, to produce categories and properties)</td>
<td>Three types of coding, open (identifying, naming, categorising and describing phenomena), axial (the process of relating codes to each other) and selective (choosing a core category and relating other categories to that)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarded by some as the only ‘true’ GTM</td>
<td>Regarded by some as a form of qualitative data analysis (QDA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Onions, (2006, p.5)
One of the central tenants of Glaser’s grounded theory paradigm proposes that reality exists but it cannot be completely measured through research because of the inability of both the researcher and the researched to fully to comprehend the situation, and because of the difficult constitution of the phenomenon under study (Guba and Lincoln 1994). Alternately Strauss, (and later Straus & Corbin’s) approach to grounded theory suggests that although reality cannot be known, it can be interpreted (Straus & Corbin, 1998).

The role that literature plays in grounded theory is also one of contention between Glaser and Strauss. Glaser (1992) asserts that “all data of whatever type is grist for the mill of constant comparison to develop categories and their properties” (p.24) thus permitting the use of literature as a means of original observations and interpretations by its author, (Onions, 2006). However he also suggests “the use of literature as primary rather than as secondary data where primary data is that collected by the researcher for a new study, and secondary data is collected by others and reused by the researcher” (Onions, 2006, p.5).

Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) claim that a preliminary review of the literature before beginning data collection enhances theoretical sensitivity and propose that the main literature review would be better undertaken later in order to support the emerging theory. Glaser disagrees, claiming that the use of the literature prior to entering the field would taint the researcher’s view of the field and constrain the generation of categories. Stauss further asserts that the literature review should be conducted only after analysis and in association with the emerging theory (Glaser 1992, in McCann & Clark, 2003). Glaser further warns that the researcher should not enter the field with any preconceived notions about what constitutes the problem. He proposes instead that the problem should emerge during the process of collecting, continuously comparing and analysing data (Glaser 1992). Strauss and Corbin (1998) on the other hand, propose four ways in which the problem could be identified – personal and professional experience; professional or collegial suggestion; technical and non-technical literature; and identified in the research study itself.

The Glaserian approach proposes that grounded theory should be conducted in a flexible, relatively unstructured manner but undertaken in a way which takes into account the principles and practices of qualitative research as well as the informants’ socially constructed realities. Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) ascribe to a more structured or rule-governed approach to data collection and analysis (McCann & Clark, 2003). A framework of questions,
they suggest, presents the researcher with the opportunity to understand the data more readily and develop theoretical codes from the data. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Glaser (1992) again disagrees with this approach warning that it may result in either forcing the data or the risk developing categories that are not supported in the data (Charmaz, 2000).

Regardless of the differences, there are common elements between the Glaserian and Strausian approaches to grounded theory which include the need for theoretical sampling, theoretical sensitivity, constant comparative analysis, coding and categorising the data, integration of theory and theoretical memos.

The strengths of grounded theory methodology is in its ability to provide a means of developing context based explanations of phenomena (Myers, 1997) and the exploration of a broad range of issues surrounding peoples’ behaviour, relationships and communication (Creswell, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Locke, 2001) while also allowing for the comparison of emerging concepts (Goulding, 2002).

2.6.5.2 Ethnography

According to Reeves et.al. (2008), “Ethnography is the study of social interactions, behaviours, and perceptions that occur within groups, teams, organisations, and communities” (p.1). Harris and Johnson (2000) suggest that the literal meaning of Ethnography is ‘a portrait of a people’ which is based on information observed and collected through fieldwork about a particular culture, its customs, beliefs and behaviours.

The use of ethnography can be traced back to the early 20th century when Bronislaw Malinowski and Alfred Radcliffe-Brown studied and documented the social arrangements and belief systems of small, remote, rural societies. This approach was later adopted and used by such members of the Chicago School of Sociology as Everett Hughes, Robert Park and Louis Wirth, who studied social life in numerous urban settings (Blumer, 1984; Evans, 1995). Gaining wide acceptance throughout the social sciences, ethnography is used in the present day by anthropological and social practitioners in the study of modern societies and communities of all kinds.

Of particular relevance to this study is organisational ethnography which involves, as the name implies, research into and of organisations in modern societies (Eberle & Mader, 2011).
Ybema, et al., (2009) observe that researching "the native's view" in modern organisations and comparing tribal life with corporate life sounds rather metaphorical when studying modern organizations. Other theoretical categories, however, became the common ground of many approaches for analysing the symbolic representations like "narratives, discourses, stories, metaphors, myths, slogans, jokes, gossip, rumours, and anecdotes found in everyday talk and text (symbolic language); rites and rituals, practices, customs, routines (symbolic acts); or built spaces, architectural design, clothing, and other physical artefacts (symbolic objects) (p. 8).

Directly in line and intertwined with this line of research are workplace studies where work and organisation are conceptualised as related accomplishments of actors interacting in a given context and where work is accomplished “through talk and interaction and the macro-concept of social structure coupled to what in more conventional social science is called structure” (Eberle & Mader, 2011 p. 61).

While the aim of ethnographic methods is to ‘get inside’ the way each group of people sees the world” (Hammersley, 1992, p.16), ethnographic methodology is more strategic and holistic and comprises of range of proposals and conversations about the best way attain and evaluate the results.

2.6.5.3 The Case Study

Mitchell (1983) defines a case study as a “detailed examination of an event (or series of related events) which the analyst believes exhibits (or exhibit) the operation of some identified general theoretical principles” (p. 192). Yin (1994) perhaps more specifically suggests that it is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 13).

Regardless of the definitions posed, most scholars agree that a case study is not a particular method but rather is a strategy or choice of what is to be studied (Stake, 2000; Stoecker, 1991; Yin, 1994, 2009).
Case study however was not without its early critics (e.g. Campbell, 1975; Campbell & Stanley, 1966: Miles, 1979). The general argument was that “You cannot generalise from a single case” (Flyvbjerg, 2004, p.1). However as case study became more commonly employed in social science this view began to change (Simons, 2009). Giddens (1984) exemplifies this change:

> Research which is geared primarily to hermeneutic problems may be of generalized importance in so far as it serves to elucidate the nature of agents’ knowledgeability, and thereby their reasons for action, across a wide range of action-contexts. Pieces of ethnographic research like . . . say, the traditional small-scale community research of fieldwork anthropology—are not in themselves generalizing studies. But they can easily become so if carried out in some numbers, so that judgements of their typicality can justifiably be made (p. 328).

Contemporary scholars have moved even further away from the early criticisms of case study. It is now generally accepted as an ideal methodology when a holistic, in-depth investigation is needed (Feagin et al., 1991; Simons, 2009) and thinking of generalisability “solely in terms of sampling and statistical significance is no longer defensible or functional” (Donnmoyer, 2000, p. 46). Yin (2009) contends that case study is

> a comprehensive research strategy that deals with situations, in which there will be more variables of interest than data points, relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to be converged in a triangulating fashion, and that benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis (p. 13).

Yin (1994) suggests that there are four categories of case study available to the social researcher - explanatory, exploratory, descriptive and multiple-case studies. The explanatory case is used to explain the presumed casual links in real-life interventions that are too complex for survey or experimental strategies; the exploratory case is used to explore those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear, single set of outcomes; the descriptive case is used to describe an intervention or phenomenon and the real life context in which it occurred; and the multiple case enables the researcher to explore the differences within and across cases (in Baxter & Jack, 2008, p.547).

Stake (1995) on the other hand adds three further categories - intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. The assertion is that intrinsic case is usually exploratory in nature where the
Case study researchers (e.g. Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1984, 2008) each suggest techniques for successfully organising and conducting case study research. In drawing on their work, they suggest that the researcher:

1) Determines and defines the research questions;
2) Selects the cases and determines data gathering and analysis techniques;
3) Prepares to collect the data;
4) Collects data in the field;
5) Evaluates and analyse the data; and
6) Prepares the report.

2.6.5.4 Sampling Strategies

Creswell (1998) and Weiss (1994) offer 16 different strategies for selecting a sample of informants to be included in a research study. They suggest that choice should be made on the basis of the scope of the study, the amount of time the researcher is willing and able to spend in data collection, and the tradition of inquiry used for the project. The following table describes the various types of sampling strategies and their accompanying rationale.
Table 7: Typology of Sampling Strategies in Qualitative Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Variation</td>
<td>Documents diverse variations and identifies important common patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Focuses, reduces, simplifies, and facilitates group interviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical case</td>
<td>Permits logical generalization and maximum application of information to other cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory based</td>
<td>Find examples of a theoretical construct and thereby elaborate on and examine it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming and disconfirming cases</td>
<td>Elaborate on initial analysis; seek exceptions, looking for variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowball or chain</td>
<td>Identifies cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme or deviant case</td>
<td>Learn from highly unusual manifestations of the phenomenon of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical case</td>
<td>Highlight what is normal or average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely but not extremely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically important cases</td>
<td>Attracts desired attention or avoids attracting undesired attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random purposeful</td>
<td>Adds credibility to sample when potential purposeful sample is too large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified purposeful</td>
<td>Illustrates subgroups and facilitates comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>All cases that meet some criterion; useful for quality assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td>Follow new leads; taking advantage of the unexpected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination or mixed</td>
<td>Triangulation, flexibility; meets multiple interests and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Saves time, money, and effort, but at the expense of information and credibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Creswell (1998, p.119)

Regardless of type of sample chosen, Patton (1990) asserts that there is no strict sample size required in qualitative studies and that such decisions are left to the researcher. However in selecting a sampling strategy it should be understood that regardless of the sample size, the sample had to fit the purpose of the study, the resources available, the question being asked and the constraints being faced (e.g. Cresswell, 1998; Patton, 1990; Stake, 2000; Weiss, 1994; Yin, 1994).
2.6.5.5 Narrative Inquiry

Narrative inquiry is the process of gathering information through the stories told by individuals for the purpose of research. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) suggest that “humans are story telling organisms who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives. Thus the study of narrative is the study of the ways humans experience the world “(p.2). In other words, people's lives consist of stories. While narrative inquiry is a qualitative methodology, the field notes, interviews, journals, letters, autobiographies, and orally told stories are all methods of narrative inquiry which require analysis.

2.6.5.6 Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a process undertaken by the researcher whereby they reflect on their own behaviour and thoughts, as well as on the phenomenon under study. Denzin (1971) suggests that the researcher must reflect on the conduct of self and others in interactive situations, and that these reflections become central pieces of data. Capturing personal accounts of such things as what is and is not asked and answered, what has been observed, and other significant data concerning the general nature of the research process is vital not only because the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis (Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Russell & Kelly, 2002; Stake, 1995) but because “all data of whatever type is grist for the mill of constant comparison in analysis” (Glaser, 1995, p.24).

2.6.5.7 Analysis

In qualitative study the data collection and analysis occur concurrently, however the type of analysis engaged in will depend on the type of case study employed (Yin, 2008). Regardless, the purpose of analysis is firstly one of data reduction. Collected data is selected, focused, simplified, abstracted and transformed in order to make it more readily accessible and understandable (Berg, 2004; Kvale, 1996). The processed data is then organised in such a way that it permits conclusions to be drawn and verified (Berg, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Yin (2003) advises that it is important during the analysis phase of any case study to return to the propositions used for the following three reasons: because it allows a focused analysis rather than allowing an analysis of data that are outside the scope of the research questions;
it allows the exploration of rival propositions which can provide an alternate explanation of a phenomenon; and by engaging in this iterative process confidence in the findings is increased as the number of propositions and rival propositions are addressed and accepted or rejected (in Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 555). While going through this process, researchers should take care not to treat each data source independently. Rather care should be taken to ensure that all data is converged in attempt to understand the overall case rather than on the various parts of the case or on any contributing factors which may influence it (op cit).

2.6.5.8  **Reporting**

It is important for the trustworthiness of the study that enough detail is reported so that the reader can assess the validity of the work. This is achieved by the researcher ensuring that: (a) the case study research question is clearly written, any propositions (if appropriate) are provided, and the question is substantiated; (b) the case study design is appropriate for the research question; (c) purposeful sampling strategies appropriate for the case study have been applied; (d) data are collected and managed systematically; and (e) the data are analysed correctly (Russell, et.al, 2005).

2.7  **Summary**

The focus of this thesis is on social actors who work in an organisational context and thus is guided by the tenants of sociology and social theory.

In simplistic terms sociology is the scientific study of human social relations, society, and its origins, how it is organised and how it develops (e.g. Barcan, 1993; Newman, 2012; Shaefer, 2011). Sociologists not only examine and interpret the specific compelling forces to which people are exposed but also their thoughts and feelings about such forces (Lamert, 2013; Turner, 1997). Social theory, which underpins this research refers to the theoretical frameworks used to explain and analyses change in society at either the macro or micro level and guides the social researcher in their studies and intervention strategies (Giddens, 1979, 1984; Hogan, 1976; Marconis & Plummer 2005). Although social theory relies on input from interactions between everyday people it does not assume that opinions and singular observations are truths but rather it tries to discern reliable observations in contrast to prejudices and stereotypes.
From there social theory tries to untangle detachment from attitudes of partisan and vested interest (e.g. Dillon, 2010; Kivisto, 2010). One way of doing this is through the use of critical theory.

Critical theory is a school of thought that stresses the reflective assessment and critique of society and culture (Adorno, 2002; Horkheimer, 1982; Thomas, 1993). According to Horkeimer (1982) the use of critical theory explains the practical and normative at the same time and identifies the actors required to change what is wrong with current social reality and provides both “clear norms for criticism and achievable practical goals for social transformation” (p. 250).

Postmodernism does not assume certainty based on scientific, or objective, efforts to explain reality. Rather its premise is that that reality is constructed as a result of the mind trying to understand its own particular and personal reality and not as a result of the human understanding of it (Hicks, 2004). Postmodernism is so called because it is denies the existence of any ultimate principles or of there being a scientific, philosophical, or religious truth which will explain everything for everybody which is characteristic of the so-called "modern" mind. For this reason, postmodernism is highly sceptical of explanations which claim to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions, or races and instead focuses on the relative truths of each person (Harvey, 1990; Jameson, 2001; Sim, 2001). In considering the development of theory, the literature proposes that the social researcher takes either an overarching grand theory approach or a more specific middle-range theoretical approach to their work.

The term grand theory was coined by the American sociologist C. Wright Mills in his 1959 treatise The Sociological Imagination and refers a highly abstract form of theorizing where overall explanations of phenomena in a specific discipline or realm of experience (such as economics, sociology, education or history) takes precedence over the understanding of the social world. The middle-range theoretical approach was first developed by Robert Merton (1910- 2003) who asserts that a successful theory cannot be formed entirely of simple statistics or observations.
Rather he asserts that sociologists should concentrate on measurable aspects of social reality that can be studied as separate social phenomena (Kaufman, 2003). To this end Merton (1968) proposes that middle-range theories have three major characteristics:

1. They do not attempt to deal with all social phenomena; rather are concerned with one or a few phenomena.
2. They tend to be ultimately linked to each other.
3. They are abstract enough to transcend simple description but concrete enough to generate testable hypotheses (pp.1-2).

Pinder and Moore (1980) suggest that in the last forty years of organisational study, there has been a movement away from grand theories where researchers treat “organisations as one homogeneous group of phenomena and towards middle range theory where the study of organisations, their form and content can occur in terms of a single frame of reference” (p.169). Moreover Pinder and Moore (ibid) assert that there is value in using middle range theory in organisational studies because it is “research oriented as well as – or instead of-being oriented to the needs of management practitioners” (p.285).

In sociology while the actor is viewed in external terms, their view of themselves is viewed in psychology as their personal identity and in sociology as their social identity. Both are concepts of the self and the nature of normative behavior. Identity theory sets out to explain an individual’s role related to behaviours (Burke, 1980; McCall & Simmons, 1979; Stryker, 1968; Turner, 1978). A subset of identity theory suggests that we have distinct components of ourselves for each position that we occupy in society (e.g. parent, accountant, leader, musician) which are called role identities (Burke, 1980; Stryker, 1968; Wiley, 1991).

Social identity theory on the other hand seeks to explain intergroup relations and group processes (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1985) and the notion that an individual self imposes belonging or not belonging to a particular social category or group (Hogg et al., 1995). A subset of social identity is organisational identity where the individual assumes the values, loyalties, behaviours of their industry, organisation, department, work group, union or organisational status.

Each form of identity and social identity is subject to salience (Hogg et. al. 1995; McLeish & Oxoby, 2008; Stetts, 2000) and should not be confused with commitment.
Organisational commitment exists only as long as the individual is willing to accept the organisation’s goals/values; exert effort on behalf of the organisation; maintain membership or when the individual views the organisation as a convenient vehicle for their career goals (Black, 2005; Hatch & Schultz, 2004).

An organisation is an entity in its own right, separate from the people who own it and/or work for it -regardless of whether it comprises of one person or employs hundreds of thousands of people (Scott & Davis, 2006). Organisations have specific purposes (reasons for existing) and produce end products in the form of goods and/or services which are created and/or delivered to those who need or want them (Baron & Greenberg, 1990; Pride et.al, 1989; Robbins & Judge, 2010; Senior & Flemming, 1997). While the literature reveals numerous definitions of organisation the most suitable for use as a working hypothesis in this study is “a group of two or more people working together in a predetermined fashion to achieve a common set of goals” (Pride et.al, 1989, p.5). Although this definition is not as recent as some other definitions found in the literature, it is the only one uncovered that is inclusive of an organisation’s for profit or not for profit status; supports the notion that an organisation can consist of as few as two people and highlights the need for actors to work in a predetermined fashion in the achievement of an organisations goals – all of which has relevance to this study.

Regardless of it’s for profit or not for profit status all organisations need some form of formal structure which Mullins (2005) proposes “is created by management to establish relationships between individuals and groups, to provide order and systems and to direct efforts to carry out goal seeking activities (p.32). However it is also common for an organisation to have an informal structure which is based on actors forming social relationships in the workplace or because it is less stressful or more productive to work in ways other than following the formal structure (Senior & Fleming, 2006). The erosion of or movement away from a formal organisational structure to an informal structure is called strategic drift (Johnson, 1987 & White, 1989). Organisational researchers such as Johnson, (1987) and Hardy, (1989), suggest that strategic drift makes it more difficult for an organisation to achieve its common set of goals and produce its end products.

Further strategic drift can contribute to a phenomenon called ‘group think’ (Esser, 1998; Whyte, 1952;) where “the mode of thinking that the person engages in congruence- seeking becomes so dominant in a cohesive group that it tends to override realistic appraisal of
alternate courses of action” (1971, p.42). Thus group think and strategic drift can hinder an organisation’s ability to be productive. This has a flow on effect because there is a direct relationship between an organisation’s ability to produce its end product and money.

Money has four major functions: as a measure of value, as a means of deferred payment as a store of value and arguably most important of all as a medium of exchange for the goods and services that the organisation produces or delivers. If an organisation’s ability to produce and deliver quality end products is in any way compromised there is the threat is that the organisation will suffer monetary problems in one or more of its various functional forms. The role that leadership plays at that point becomes much more complicated.

The most prominent leadership theories found in the literature were reviewed - Great man Theory, Group and Trait Theory, Behavioural Theory, Contingency Theory Contemporary Theories, and Participative Leadership Theory). Rost (1993) opined that “these theories did not run riot in one separate time period, nor did they disappear from the picture when the next so-called dominant theory appeared on the scene” (p.26). Arguably because of this, the literature abounds with numerous definitions of leader and leadership, many of which use the terms interchangeably along with the interchangeable use of management.

Consequently in order to find a definition of leadership that could be used as a working hypothesis in this study it was necessary to explore the literature with regards to the functionality of leader, leadership and management. Numerous leadership specialists and scholars espouse that there is a difference between leadership and management but perhaps none so clearly as Kotter (2013) who pronounces that “Leadership is Still Not Management” (p.1). The purpose of leadership according to Kotter since (1990) is “movement and useful change while the purpose of management is to provide consistency, order and efficiency” (p.6). After much research and analysis the following definitions of management and leadership were determined to be the most suitable to use as benchmarks in this study.

Management takes place within a structured organisational setting and with prescribed roles; is directed towards the (set) aims and objectives; is achieved through efforts of other people (or self); and uses systems and procedures (Mullins, 1990 p.166).
In this definition, management is perceived as being part of an organisation’s formal structure. It also supports the Pride et. al., definition of organisation which is, as previously reported, used in this study and where the stated goals/end products are achieved according to the organisation’s pre-determined requirements. In essence, Mullins (ibid) suggests that management is an oversight or monitoring authority rather than an agent. This definition not only differentiates the functionality of management from the title of manager, it also reflects modern thinking regarding management (e.g. Kotter, 2013) and self-management and excludes leadership as a component part. Therefore although there are other similar definitions in the literature, this one it will be used as a working hypothesis throughout this study.

The interchangeable use of leader and leadership frequently appears in the literature. Gaining clarification of these terms is important if the research question is to be adequately addressed. After much investigation the literature revealed that leadership is fundamentally the relationship between the leader and the follower and leader is an organisational or role identity. As an example Maccoby (2000) opines that “Leadership is a relationship between leader and led which can energise an organisation” (p.57) and Rost (1993) asserts that leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. From this definition, there are four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists or is occurring… [one] The relationship based on influence … [two] leaders and followers are the people in this relationship… [three] Leaders and followers intend real changes… [and four] Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. (pp. 102-103).

The Rost definition highlights the influencing relationship which occurs between leaders and followers, and that it occurs towards mutually agreed purposes with both intending real change [added emphasis]. Further he provides an objective definition which is relevant to any discipline rather than being constrained by singular disciplinary contextualization or era. The Rost definition of leadership also makes the distinction between leadership and leader and does not include it as an element of management discipline – all of which is relevant to the central research question. For these reasons it is the Rost definition of leadership which is adopted in this study despite it being one of the older definitions found in the literature.
It could be argued that one of the core problems for leaders in any organisation involves how to use power in order to influence actors to achieve an organisation’s short and long-term goals (Cohen e.at., 1994; Bailey, 1988; Bass, 1985; Cialdini, 2009; Hogan & Kaiser 2005). Unfortunately a review of the literature fails to reveal any specific methodologies or instructions which would allow this to occur.

The literature does however reveal a popular and oft cited taxonomy which classifies the most common forms of power bases found in organisations and which may be used at the discretion of its leaders. This taxonomy was developed by French and Raven (1959) who initially proposed five distinct bases of power: reward, coercive, expert and referent power. French and Raven also propose that in each classification the target person complies because [added emphasis] of various forms of pressure applied by the agent. Thus the assumptions are 1) that the target person must initially be in a state of resistance or opposition to the agent’s requirements; 2) as a result the leader brings to bare pressure on the target person through the use of any of the various classifications of power previously described; 3) the target person (the agent) has the freedom of choice (however small) to decide whether to accept the type of pressure being imposed on them and 4) if mutual agreement occurs the target is influenced to change from their initial reality to one closer to that of the agent.

However although French and Raven’s taxonomy describes how the power influence occurs it does not explain the mechanics of why it occurs. This level of understanding necessitates a laymen’s understanding of the workings of the brain.

In the early 1960’s, the neurologist Paul MacLean proposed an elegant Darwinian model of the tri-une brain (meaning three brains) and propounded this theory at length in his 1990 book The Triune Brain in Evolution . He explains that although we generally think of the brain as being one organ, it actually comprises of three complexes or smaller brains which have evolved over time in a brain within a singular encompassing structure. The three brains are: Reptilian or R Complex (also known as the Brain Stem), the Paleomammalian brain (also known as the mid- brain, mammalian brain and the limbic system) and the Neocortex (also known as the cerebral or higher brain).

Each of these three brains has a specific purpose and has evolved over time- although the interplay between the three through the synapses and neurological connectors can be uncoordinated (LeDoux, 1999).
Working from the inside out, the Reptilian Brain or R Complex is the oldest of the three brains and is closely related to one’s physical survival at a very basic level. Among other things it maintains and regulates heartbeat, breathing and temperature. It also plays a crucial role in establishing home territory, reproduction and social dominance. This part of the brain is still very active in modern humans and can be observed in action in courtship rituals, deception, racism, competition, ambition, posturing, materialism, ‘one-upmanship’, attention seeking, defense of family, home, jobs, the need for status, purpose, the compulsive need to ‘be right’, and jealousy – to name a few. The overriding characteristics of the R-Complex include its instinctive and automatic nature, ritualistic quality and resistance to change. It can however be modified by our more developed brains (Gazziniga, 2008; LeDoux, 1996; McLean, 1990; Ramachandran, 2011).

The paleomammalian brain or limbic system as coined by McLean in 1952, consists of the septum, amygdala, hypothalamus, hippocampal complex, and cingulate cortex. This part of the brain is responsible for motivation and emotion in human beings. From a functional point of view, the limbic brain is largely responsible for the value judgments that are unconsciously made and which exert strong influences on our subsequent behaviours. Further this is the part of the brain which records memories of behaviours produced by agreeable and disagreeable experiences.

A major component of the limbic system is the amygdala which comes into play in situations which arouse strong emotions. As previously noted, a firing of the amygdala can cause a shift in identity salience (Gassiniga, 2008; Goleman, 2005; LeDoux, 1996; MacLean, 1990; Ramachandran, 2011). However because the limbic system links emotions with behavior, it also inhibits the R-Complex and its preference for ritualistic, habitual ways of responding (Goleman, 2005).

The neocortex or cerebral brain is the outer portion of the brain which has almost infinite learning abilities and is what has enabled human cultures to develop and change. It contains two specialised regions, one dedicated to voluntary movement and one to processing sensory information. It is approximately the size of a large crumpled newspaper page and constitutes approximately five-sixths of the overall human brain.
It is the neocortex which allows logical and formal operational thinking possible, allows creativity, imagination, higher level problem solving, artistry, mathematical ability, reasoning and the ability to see ahead and plan for the future.

Recent neurological breakthroughs have determined that the cerebral brain in particular has neuroplasticity and is as not previously thought a static organ. Neuroplasticity refers to changes in the brain (through the neural pathways and synapses) which are due to changes in behavior, learnings, environment and neural processes, as well as changes resulting from bodily injury (Ramachandran, 2011). The value of this concept to this study is the notion that people can and do change their behaviour. However changes made in the cerebral brain are often easier than those in the limbic brain because of something called an amygdala hijack.

For the most part these three brains work in together conducted by the pre-frontal cortex in the cerebral brain which sits just behind the forehead. However there are times where the limbic brain, and more specifically the amygdala which is responsible for emotions, can hijack reason and influence our attitudes and behaviours. This happens so if there is a match between what is happening in the present with what happened in the past, the amygdala can act before any possible direction from the neocortex can be received and take control. This reactivity is particularly helpful in saving us from dangerous situations (Gazzaniga, 2008; Goleman, 2002; Le Doux, 1996). Goleman (ibid) explains that “Emotions make us pay attention right now - this is urgent - and gives us an immediate action plan without having to think twice” (p.87).

Decades of research by social scientists such as Ekman, Matsumoto, Frank, Scherer and O’Sullivan and building on the works of Darwin, (1872, 1998) concluded that there are seven basic emotions which are universal in nature and which are expressed on the face in the same way in all cultures.

These emotions are happiness, anger, sadness, disgust, fear, surprise and contempt (Ekman, 2003; Ekman and Friesen, 2003; Matsumoto 2013) although many other emotions fall under the headings of these seven basic emotions and vary in name on the basis of their intensity. Each of these emotions exist for a particular reason which is attached to the individual’s physical and mental survival and each emotion has a trigger(s) which causes chemicals to be released into the body which prepare an individual for some form of immediate behavior (Gazzaniga, 2008; Le Doux, 1996; Matsumoto 2013).
However it is important to note that what triggers an emotional response (either positive or negative) in one person may not do so in another. This is because emotions are linked to working memory which is the gateway to human emotional and non-emotional experiences (Le Doux, 1996; Medina, 2008; Ramachandran & Blakslee, 1998;). Thus various people can have very different responses to the same event.

Therefore what leaders do and do not do, how they use their power bases, how they communicate and interact with others, how they use their leadership as well as whether or not they allow negative attitudes and behaviours to permeate their teams, is extremely important to the leader, their team and to their organisation. It all supports or inhibits the building of positive or negative memories and responses and allows or largely prevents amygdala hijacking from occurring.

Neuroscientists agree that feelings encompass the entire process of events which begin in the brain through to what is experienced in the body. Feelings can but does not always include emotions. (Damasio, 1999; Gazzaniga, 2008). Thus we can feel happy, angry, sad, annoyed, delighted and we can also feel tired, hungry, thirsty, pain and aroused. All feelings motivate subsequent behavior. Simply stated, LeDoux (1996) advises that emotions are a subcategory of feelings which are generated in a different part of the brain than thoughts and they involve more brain systems.

However a trait, (also known as a personality trait, characteristic or attribute), refers to a style of behavior which predominates one or more epochs of a person’s life. Thus a hostile trait, as an example, “may be manifested by frequent bouts of irritability, by an aggressive behavioural style or in impatience, abruptness and related behaviours” (Ekman & Rosenberg, 2005, p.560).

Emotions, moods and traits can occur at the same time. Consequently a person who is characteristically happy and positive is more likely to trigger the emotion of joy and laugh, than another who is characteristically sad. Traits are the results of learned behavior over a long period of time. However because of its neuroplasticity, the brain can also change as the result of new learned behaviours and experiences. But this only occurs if there is the perception that the new behavior is more pro-survival than the established behavior. Even so, such change takes time (Winston, 2006).
Neuroscientists such as Ramachandran (2011) believe that the mirror neurons in the brain allow us to experience by observation rather than by direct involvement. Thus we can wince when observing someone else in a painful situation, become emotional when watching a movie or get drawn into an argument not of our making. Mirror neurons also allow us to copy movement, feel empathy for others, predict behavior, infer intentions and to be self-aware. Crudely put, this part of the brain has a monkey see, monkey do component which allows us to pass on or accept learning and information very quickly without us always being aware that it is occurring (Rizzolatti & Craighero, 2005). Thus there is a biological aspect to influence which is involuntary, often unfiltered and is at the heart of the process which is known as emotional contagion.

Schoenewolf (1990) defines emotional contagion as the process by which “a person or group influences the emotions or behavior of another person or group through the conscious or unconscious induction of emotion states and behavioral attitudes” (p.49). Emotional contagion, unlike cognitive contagion, is less conscious and more automatic and therefore depending on the emotion involved it can have a positive or negative impact on others without the individual being aware that they are being influenced (McColl-Kennedy & Smith, 2006). On the positive side emotions can be purposefully manipulated in order to help others to become more confident, innovative, and enthusiastic, and to create a more stable, harmonious, positive workplace. On the negative side emotional contagion can cause riots, mob mentality, group think, organisational bullying, and discrimination, and a negative workplace culture (Decety & Ickes, 2009; Hatfield et. al., 1994).

Whether it is positive or negative, emotional contagion has a direct link to the attitudes, behaviours, organisational commitment and productivity of team members. Of more concern to this study is the notion that if it is allowed to continue emotional contagion is what fuels the creation and sustainability of organisational culture (Hashim et.al, 2007).

According to Ravasi and Schultz (2006) an organisation’s culture is a set of shared mental assumptions – either positive or negative - which guide the actors’ thoughts, actions and behaviour in their organisation. An organisational culture can be so entrenched that it not only affects the way actors and groups interact with each other and with their clients and
stakeholders but it can also teach new members what constitutes acceptable perceptions, thinking and feeling within that organisation (Kotter & James, 1992; Schein, 2010). Schein (ibid) asserts that instances of infighting, resistance to change, communication problems and misunderstandings which should not be occurring between ‘reasonable people’ are the types of behaviours which even though threatening to organisations, often make up its culture and is the responsibility of leaders to change.

Just as the word leadership is often misused or confused with management, so too the words change, transition and transformation are often confused or used interchangeably. According to Bridges (2000):

The difference between change and transition can be illustrated with the example of a geographical move. The change is the relocation itself; it involves packing dishes, getting a mover, selling your home, and taking an airplane trip. The transition involves all the confusion, distress, and excitement that you and your family go through (p.1).

In an organisational context second-order change is a shift in the externals of any situation, for example, implementing a new program, restructuring a business or a department, moving to new location, amalgamating, taking on new IT systems or rebranding. First order change could be something smaller such as taking on a new position or staff member (Bridges, 2003; Kotter, 2003; Kotter & Rathgeber 2006; Senior 2002; Senior & Fleming 2006). Regardless of its size or nature, change is made up of events which are visible and tangible; they can happen quickly and in an organisational context change is about achieving the desired outcome (Senior & Fleming 2002, 2006). Transition is concerned with moving people through the change process and managing related issues en route (Kotter, 2003; Senior 2006).

Change scholars (e.g. Daszko & Sheinberg, 2005; Deming, 1993; Senge, 1999; Senior & Fleming, 2006) suggest that there are unique distinctions between change and transform (and derivatives transforming and transformation) when applied and realised, not only result in a competitive edge but in unparalleled leadership “that is rare to find and that can make a difference for society” (Deming, 1993, p.16). To transform, according to the Collins English Dictionary (1999), is “to alter or be altered radically in form, appearance or structure” (p.1623) and according to Bridges (2000) transformation occurs as a result of a well-planned and executed change strategy:
The result is a metamorphosis to the desired state in which there is a deep seated adoption of the changes and the associated values, principles and/or processes. This leads to an embedded, and marked, change in organisational culture and reinforces a journey of continuous improvement (pp.3-4).

A wider review of the literature addresses the notion that organisations and/or individuals can undergo a transformation from their starting position to a higher or better state but does not address that it can also undergo a transformation to a lesser or more negative state. Rather the assumption is that when organisations and individuals do not undergo or complete the process of transformation they somehow return to, or remain at, their pre-existing state.

Organisational change is most commonly reactive rather than pro-active and is often a knee-jerk reaction to failure and salient, problematic un-met expectations (e.g. Ancona & Chong, 1996; Ashmos & Huber, 1987; Farazmand, 2003; Gersick, 1991; Meek et al, 2007; Prigogine, 1997). When a major gap exists between expectations and outcomes actors are more likely to realise that engagement in information search and adaptation of routines or rules is needed. However deliberate change is more difficult when there is a groupthink perception that existing routines are adequate for achieving organisational goals (Cain, 2012; Hogg & Hains, 1998; Hogg & Packer, 2009).

There are two contexts in which change can occur. They are known as first- and second-order change (Goodman, 1982; Levy & Merry, 1986; Watzlawick et al 1974). First-order change involves minor adjustments and improvements in one or a few dimensions of the organisation. In other words it does not change or have significant impact on the organisation’s core purpose or values. First-order change is often associated with the theoretical perspective called organisational development where organisational development “is a system-wide application of behavioural science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organisational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organisation's effectiveness” (Cummings & Worley, 1997, p.2).

Second-order change tends to be associated with the theoretical tradition of organisational transformation rather than with organisational development. Second order change addresses such aspects as the organisation’s underlying mission, culture, operational methodologies, processes, and/or the organisation’s structure.
It also addresses innovations, new technologies, markets and new organisational directions (Levy & Merry, 1986). Here the organisation makes irreversible changes at its core which requires new learning and transformation to ensure it can operate in a different way or have people think or behave differently (Bateson 1979; Bergquist, 1993). Second-order change is often precipitated by a crisis or rapid growth.

Regardless of the size, or nature of change or even the terminology used to describe its focus, theorists and practitioners continue to seek new and better ways to introduce and affect change in their organisations through the use of change methods and theories. While there are arguably hundreds of change models in the literature they can generally fall into one or more of Van de Ven & Poole’s following:

- **Life cycle models:** which have an event sequence of change in an entity as it progresses through a necessary sequence of stages of start-up, growth, harvest and terminate;

- **Evolutionary models:** which consist of a repetitive sequence of variation, selection, and retention events among entities. Competition for scarce environmental resources between entities inhabiting a population generates this evolutionary cycle;

- **Teleological models:** which view change as a cycle of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation, and modification of goals based on what was learned by the entity (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). This sequence emerges through the purposeful social construction among individuals within the entity; and

- **Dialectical models:** which propose that conflicts emerge between entities espousing opposing thesis and antithesis that collide to produce a synthesis. This in time becomes the thesis for the next cycle of a dialectical progression. Confrontation and conflict between opposing entities generate this dialectical cycle (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995, p.14).

Although diffusion can be viewed as a change strategy it is not an overall approach to change as those previously identified.
Diffusion occurs when change actors note trends or seek to capitalise on already established good ideas (Ellsworth, 2000). According to Rogers, (1976) the adoption of diffusion include awareness (an individual is exposed to an innovation but lacks complete information about it); interest (the person seeks information about the innovation), evaluation (the individual applies the innovation to his or her present and anticipated future situation and decides whether to try it), trial (the individual uses it on a small scale), and adoption (the person decides whether to use the innovation on a large scale) (pp. 290-301).

Resistance to change can occur anywhere in an organisation and at any time, particularly when actors are unaware of the reasons for change in the face of “current vision/strategies [which] are successful or have been successful in the past, or if they are shown to be the basis of competitive advantage or innovation” (Johnson et al., 2008 p. 208). Wherever it occurs in an organisation, resistance to change must be addressed so that the change process is not hindered and ancillary problems are not created leading to avoidable risk (Gannon & Newman, 2002 p. 260). Kotter (1996) supports this view and asserts that “successful strategic change seems to demand a combination of cognitive/analytical skills and knowledge alongside a range of behavioural skills and knowledge” (p. 18).

Anecdotal evidence of contemporary Australian organisations reveals that most organisations restructure at least once every five years. Government Departments undergo name changes and amalgamations, centralisation and decentralisation almost as a matter of course whenever there is a change of government. The expectation of change is arguably viewed as an executive’s right and trophy of managerial success (Czarniawska & Sevon, 1996). Further each time meta changes occur there is an associated cost which is often borne by the taxpayer or consumer (op.cit). With change being a virtual constant, MacDonald (1997) warns that what needs to be preserved may be arguably as important to understand as what needs to be changed. Further he warns that at times “executives should listen to the siren song of change with a healthy dose of scepticism” (p. viii).

Organisational change often involves to some degree, risk. Managing risk is relatively straightforward when it involves working with certainties. However as Knight (1921) suggests it is the inherent unknowability in business that is the key to risk, and not merely the fact of ignorance. Unknowability can lead to various forms of risk including reputational risk and is potentially devastating to an organisation’s survival.
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Often innovation is accompanied by a risk-averse approach which, in turn, often leads as previously noted, to over-regulation and takes away the responsibility of individual decision making. To this end Furedi, (2005) warns that:

Businesses are progressively dumbed down, not only by book authors who teach management by parable but also by managers themselves. Ironically, the infantilisation of work is happening at the same time experts tout employee skills and knowledge as a prime source of corporations' intellectual capital. Much of the dumbing down that occurs in organisations today is fueled by aversion to risk. Managers who are afraid to make their own decisions hire high-priced consultants to reaffirm the obvious: It is generally safer to adopt someone else's best practice than to engineer your own (p. 22).

Moreover Daszko and Sheinberg (2005) contend that it is only leaders with new knowledge can lead transformational change in organisations:

Transformation occurs when leaders create a vision for transformation and a system to continually question and challenge beliefs, assumptions, patterns, habits and paradigms with an aim of continually developing and applying management theory, through the lens of the system of profound knowledge. Transformation happens when people managing a system focus on creating a new future that has never existed before, and based on continual learning and a new mindset, take different actions than they would have taken in the past (p.2)

There is a plethora of literature focusing on the positive aspects of leaders, leadership, change and transformation, however contemporary scholarship is also turning its attention to dysfunctional leadership and its role in frustrating organisational change and transformation. Holland and Van Landuyt (2004) observe:

Interpersonal flaws coexist with an individual’s well-developed social skills, which helps explain why people with these undesirable qualities sometimes ascend to leadership roles (Hogan, 1994; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Unfortunately, most research has focused on normal personality characteristics to the exclusion of dysfunctional tendencies.

With these major aspects addressed the literature review turned its attention to research philosophy together with a number of logistical considerations which guides the choice of the most appropriate data collection methods for use in this study.
Social research falls under the general heading of social science where science is thought of as being “a coherent body of thought over which there is a broad cohesive consensus among its practitioners as to its properties causes and effects” (May, 2010).

Conger (1998) suggests qualitative inquiry is more suitable for leadership studies over quantitative because of “the extreme and enduring complexity of the leadership phenomena itself” (p.108).

Ontology is the science or theory of being and questions the real nature of entities, how they come into being and why. Of particular relevance to this study, ontology poses the question of whether reality exists independently of our knowledge or if it is socially and discursively constructed and hence dependant from a particular time or culture (Marsh & Furlong, 2010).

A review of the literature further reveals that although qualitative inquiry allows the researcher the flexibility to follow unexpected ideas during research and the ability to study dimensions and meaning, (Conger, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Merriam, 2002; Patton, 2002; Seale et al., 2004; Smith, 2003; Weinberg, 2000), it is essential for qualitative researchers to be able to justify the specific methodologies and methods used to both gather and analyse data related to the specific research question (Denzin & Lincoln 2000; Lincoln & Guba 1985; Patton 1990).

Crotty (1998) suggests that such justifications should relate to the theoretical perspective that underpins the research and should be founded on the philosophical question of epistemology. Crotty’s (1998) hierarchy of research design proposes three forms of epistemology available to the social researcher – objectivism, constructivism and subjectivism. Objectivism holds that “meaning, and therefore meaningful reality, exists apart from the operation of consciousness” (Crotty 1998, p. 17). Constructionism, reject the view of human knowledge, and contends that there is no objective truth waiting to be discovered but rather truth exists only through interaction with the different realities of the world (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Finally Subjectivism subscribes to the notion that meaning does not come out of the interplay between subject and object but rather is imposed on the object by the subject.
Epistemology, regardless of type, requires trustworthiness, which is the equivalent of reliability in quantitative research (Gibbs, 2002) and is dependent on whether the researcher is actually measuring what they are supposed to be measuring (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

The strengths of grounded theory methodology – regardless of whether the researcher follows the Glaserian or Straussian model, is that it not only provides a way of developing context based explanations of phenomena (Myers, 1997) but it also allows the exploration of a broad range of issues surrounding peoples’ behaviour, relationships and communication (Creswell, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Locke, 2001;) but also allows for the comparison of emerging concepts (Goulding, 2002).

Ethnography is both a methodology and a method. Ethnographic methodology is strategic and holistic and comprises of range of proposals and conversations about the best way to attain and evaluate the results. While ethnographic methods are used as Hammersley (1992) asserts, “to document the culture, the perspectives and practices, of the people in these settings. The aim is to ‘get inside’ the way each group of people sees the world” (p.16). Organisational ethnography follows the same principles found in general ethnographic methodologies and methods, however in organisational ethnography the culture under study is the organisation and the people who work in and for them.

Case study as explained by Yin (1994) is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence is used” (p. 13). Yin (1994) suggests that there are four categories of case study available to the social researcher: 1) explanatory, 2) exploratory, 3) descriptive and 4) multiple-case studies, (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p.547) while Stake (1995) adds a further three: 1) intrinsic, 2) instrumental, and 3) collective (Mills, 2010, p.473). Case study researchers such as Simons, (2009), Stake, (1995), and Yin, (1984, 2008) each suggest techniques for successfully organising and conducting case study research. In drawing on their work, the suggestion is that the researcher:

1) Determines and defines the research questions;
2) Selects the cases and determines data gathering and analysis techniques;
3) Prepares to collect the data;
4) Collects data in the field;
5) Evaluates and analyse the data; and
6) Prepares the report.

Creswell (1998) and Weiss (1994) propose sixteen different strategies for selecting a sample of informants which can be used in case study. They suggest that choice should be determined on the basis of the scope of the study, the amount of time the researcher is willing and able to spend in data collection, and on the tradition of inquiry used for the project. Regardless of type of sampling chosen, Patton (1990) asserts that there is no strict sample size required in qualitative studies and that such decisions are left to the researcher. However in selecting a sampling strategy it should be understood that regardless of the sample size, the sample had to fit the purpose of the study, the resources available, the question being asked and the constraints being faced (Cresswell, 1998; Patton, 1990; Stake, 2000; Weiss, 1994; Yin, 1994, 2008).

Narrative inquiry is the process of gathering information through the stories told by individuals for the purpose of research. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) observe that “humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives. Thus the study of narratives is the study of the ways humans experience the world” (p.2). In other words, people's lives consist of stories. While narrative inquiry is a qualitative methodology, the field notes, interviews, journals, letters, autobiographies, and orally told stories are all methods of narrative inquiry which require analysis.

Reflexivity is a process undertaken by the researcher whereby they reflect on their own behaviour and thoughts, as well as on the phenomenon under study. Denzin (1971) suggests that the researcher must reflect on the conduct of self and others in interactive situations, and that these reflections become central pieces of data.

In qualitative study the data collection and analysis occur concurrently, however the type of analysis engaged in will depend on the type of case study employed (Yin, 2008). Regardless, the purpose of analysis is firstly one of data reduction. Collected data is selected, focused, simplified, abstracted and transformed in order to make it more readily accessible and understandable (Berg, 2004; Kvale, 1996).
The processed data is then organised in such a way that it permits conclusions to be drawn and verified (Berg, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

It is important for the trustworthiness of the study that enough detail is reported so that the reader can assess the validity of the work. This is achieved by the researcher ensuring that: (a) the case study research question is clearly written, any propositions (if appropriate) are provided, and the question is substantiated; (b) the case study design is appropriate for the research question; (c) purposeful sampling strategies appropriate for the case study have been applied; (d) data are collected and managed systematically; and (e) the data are analysed correctly (Russell, et.al, 2005).

Having touched on these fundamental principles, the applications and understandings of the researcher’s ontological stance, chosen epistemology, theoretical perspectives, methodologies and methods used in this study are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.
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This study concerns the role that leaders and leadership play in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change. A review of the literature in the previous chapter established that not only are the terms leader, leadership and management often confused and/or used interchangeably but so too is change and transformation. These terms were clarified as was the difference between organisation and business. A review of the literature further revealed that when an organisation’s structure is inappropriate to its needs, unsanctioned, informal structures form where an absence of clear reporting lines, role definitions, and accountabilities contribute to lowered social capital. The difference between first order change and second order change was highlighted and social change theories were introduced.

Because organisations are social environments the literature review examined social and identity theories and the negative impact caused by a clash of personal, social and organisational identities in the workplace. To understand how organisations develop their leaders and how leaders and leadership is viewed in contemporary Australia, the literature review included leader and leadership competency attainment through the much supported Frontline Management Initiative.

Finally chapter two reported briefly on ontological positions, epistemologies, theoretical perspectives, research methodologies, methods and analyses which could support this project.

This third chapter begins by explaining the philosophical assumptions underpinning the research. The research design is outlined and their subsequent application is described. Ethical considerations of the project are also discussed.

3.1 Research Question

The research is interested in understanding the conundrum posed by the central research question - What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change. Consequently the accounts, perceptions and interpretations of events experienced by leaders concerning their organisations, leadership and its application, leadership education, influence and organisational change are not only pivotal to
the central research question but also provide real life examples of material addressed in the literature review.

To ensure that the research covered these issues, the researcher followed Creswell’s (1998, p.99) suggestion to define the research question as broadly as possible and then ensure that the more specific sub-questions are designed to extract as much information as possible from the informants. Related sub-questions are:

1. **What is leadership?**
2. **What, if any, difference is there between leader, leadership and management activity?**
3. **What is the purpose and responsibility(ies) of leaders and leadership in modern organisations undergoing change?**
4. **What impact, if any, does personal identity have on leader and leadership function?**
5. **Is the role of leader owned by the organisation and therefore on loan to the incumbent?**
6. **Can leadership be taken off its purpose and if so how and why?**
7. **What nature and form does change take in contemporary Australian-based organisations?**
8. **Is there a relationship between leading and successful leadership in a change environment?**
9. **Is there a model of leadership and management interaction which is suitable for contemporary Australian-based organisations which can be used to assist the change process?**

This study’s findings will have implications for understanding how contemporary leaders function; the expectations that organisations have of their leaders; how leader and leadership skills should be taught or developed; and how leaders and managers should work together to affect change that is beneficial to their organisations and its dependents.

### 3.2 Theoretical Underpinnings

There are several important premises which underpin this research and therefore should be addressed. The most fundamental being that qualitative research is
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a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning where systematic means planned, ordered and public, following rules agreed upon by members of the qualitative research community; empirical, meaning that this type of inquiry is grounded in the world of experience and inquiry into meaning denoting the understanding of how others make sense of their experience (Shank, 2002, p. 5).

Conger’s (1998) stance is that there is value in employing qualitative over quantitative research when seeking to understand the leadership paradigm, because of “the extreme and enduring complexity of the leadership phenomena itself” (sic) (p.108).

Of further value to this study is the ability of qualitative inquiry to take into account the different meanings and realities that people assign to the external world which are based on their own historical, social and cultural experiences. As Giddens (1997) observes:

Unlike objects in nature, humans are self-aware beings who confer sense and purposes on what they do. We can’t even describe social life accurately unless we first grasp the concepts that people apply in their behaviour (pp. 12 -13).

Further, by employing a qualitative approach to the central research question (What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change?) the researcher is given license to “study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings that people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 3).

Thus it follows that the most appropriate ontological stance to take for this particular project, is one of interpretivism rather than positivism on the basis that “interpretivist ontology encompasses a number of different paradigms, all concerned with the meanings and experiences of human beings” (Williamson, 2006, p.84).

Moreover, an interpretivist ontological position allows the researcher the flexibility to follow unexpected ideas during research while also providing sensitivity to contextual factors and the ability to study dimensions and social meaning (Conger, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Merriam, 2002; Patton, 2002; Seale, et al., 2004; Smith, 2003; Weinberg, 2000).
Regardless of the type, a project’s ontological position has a direct bearing on the choices a researcher must make concerning the other component in the research design (Blaikie, 2000; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008). Hay (2002) proposes a model of interrelationships between the building blocks of research in order to provide the researcher with direction: What’s out there to know? (Ontology); what and how can we know about it? (Epistemology); How can we go about acquiring that knowledge? (Methodology); Which precise procedure can we use to adopt it? (Methods); and which data can we collect? (Data sources).

Figure 3: The Interrelationship between the Building Blocks of Research

![Diagram showing the interrelationship between the building blocks of research: Ontology, Epistemology, Methodology, Methods, Data sources.](source: Adapted from Hay, 2002, p.64).

Although the interpretivist ontological position of this work has been established, Crotty (2011) assigns a marginal role to ontology in social research. Instead he proposes the use of a hierarchy of research design in order to understand and justify the research process. Thus the chapter moves on from the study’s theoretical underpinnings and addresses the model of research design used in this body of work.
3.2.2 Hierarchy of Research Design

Crotty (2011) suggests as a starting point, considerable effort should be given to two main questions: “First, what methodologies and methods will we be employing in the research that we propose to undertake? Second, how do we justify this choice and use of methodologies and methods?” (p.2). Although helpful, one of the early challenges in the design of this research came as a result of the many scholars who disagree about the name, the order and the nature of the stages that should be undertaken in qualitative research.

For instance there an obvious discrepancy between Saunders et al.” (2009) Research Process Onion model (Fig 4) and Crotty’s (2011) Hierarchy of Research Design model (Fig. 2). The former classifies six stages of research consisting of philosophies; approaches; strategies; choices; time horizons; techniques and procedures. In this model epistemology and theoretical perspective are not viewed as separate tenants but rather are a combined in research philosophy.

Figure 4: The Research Process ‘Onion’

By comparison, Crotty’s (2011) model comprises of four stages which is perhaps, more in line with Hay’s (2002) interrelated building blocks of research. In defence of his model, Crotty (2011) explains:

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective and thereby in the methodology; the Theoretical perspective (the philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria);
the Methodology (the strategy, plan of action, processes or design lying behind the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes); and the Methods (the techniques or procedures used to gather andanalyse data related to come research question or hypothesis) (p.3).

Figure 2 (repeated): Crotty's Hierarchy of Research Design

```
Source Crotty (2011, p.4)

Crotty’s (2011) Hierarchy of Research Design model provides direction and the classifications appeared to provide the most transparency when justifying the decisions made in selecting the epistemology, theoretical perspectives, methodology and methods used in this study.

3.2.2.1 Epistemology

Epistemology is the theory or study of knowledge—how it can be known, acquired, justified, its extent, validity and limitations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The contribution that epistemology makes to qualitative research “is essentially theoretical: It has to do with theories of knowledge (Carter & Little, 2007, p.1319) and therefore is concerned with how knowledge is to be (or has been) acquired from the entities being examined. There are two contrasting epistemological positions - constructionism and objectivism.
Objectivism holds that “meaning, and therefore meaningful reality, exists apart from the operation of consciousness” (Crotty, 1998, p. 17). Proponents of this view propose that, if they go about their research in the correct way, it is possible to discover objective truth (Crotty, 1998; Dilthey, 1985; Rand 1967; Williamson, 2006).

Constructionism, on the other hand is one of the many interpretivist paradigms (Williamson, 2006) which rejects the objectivist view of human knowledge, contending that there is no objective truth waiting to be discovered but, rather, that truth exists only through interaction with the different realities of the world (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). In other words, meaning is constructed rather than discovered and different people construct meaning in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon (Burr, 1995; Crotty, 1998; Hacking 1995; Pavlovic, 2011).

Constructionism however should not be confused with constructivism. Both constructivist and constructionist paradigms move away from the positivist idea that the world is objectively knowable, and move towards the idea that there is no one true reality, rather that 'reality' may be multiple. The difference lies in the idea that constructivist paradigm views reality as constructed by the individual (thus there is a large emphasis on the individual's cognitive processes, viewpoints and so on in the literature chapter of this study) while the constructionist paradigm views reality as being constructed through interaction and through language. In constructionism, the idea of cognitive processes and so on is itself a 'reality' which has been constructed through interaction (Crotty, 2011; Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Williamson, 2006). Guba and Lincoln (1989) include among their primary assumptions of constructivism:

Truth is a matter of consensus among informed and sophisticated constructors, not of correspondence with objective reality; facts have no meaning except within some value framework, hence cannot be an 'objective assessment of any proposition; causes and effects do not exist except by imputation; phenomena can only be understood within the context in which they are studied; findings from one context cannot be generalised to another, neither problems nor solutions can be generalised from one setting to another; and data derived from constructivist inquiry have neither special status nor legitimation; they represent simply another construction to be taken into account in the move towards consensus (pp 44 – 45).
Because of the obvious confusion that these two terminologies can create, Crotty (1998, 2011) suggests that:

> Whatever the terminology, the distinction itself is an important one. Constructivism taken in this sense points out the unique experience of each of us. It suggests that each one’s way of making sense of the world is valid and worth of respect as any other, thereby tending to scotch any hint of a critical spirit (p.58)…

> It would appear useful, then, to reserve the term constructivism for the epistemological considerations focusing exclusively on ‘the meaning-making activity of the individual mind’ and to use constructionism where the focus includes ‘the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning (p.58).

Chapter two provided examples of both constructivism at work (e.g. triune brain, amygdala hijacking, the role of emotions, personal identity) and constructionism (e.g. social and organisational identities, group think, and leadership). These two positions will reappear later in this study, therefore in order to avoid confusion, the researcher will remain faithful to Crotty’s (op cit) contextual usage of these two terms throughout this body of work.

### 3.2.2.2 Theoretical perspective

Theoretical perspective refers to:

> The philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes. (Crotty 1998, p. 17).

One again the researcher had the choice of taking a positive or interpretivist position. However this time rather than such a decision impacting on the overarching philosophical stance of this study, it affects the theoretical perspective which informs the theories and therefore the methodologies and methods to be used. A positivist theoretical perspective suggests that it is not only possible to obtain objective knowledge about an external reality but also that individuals have direct access to the real world (Giddens, 1974; Carson, et al., 2001).
In alignment with that perspective, any data derived from sensory experience would have to be tested using logical and mathematical methods, because this is considered to be the only source of all authentic knowledge (Crotty, 2008; Myers, 1997). An interpretivist theoretical perspective holds that the social world is inherently different from the natural world, and therefore cannot be studied in the same way.

The consideration is that people construct and re-construct their worlds and that their knowledge of the perceived world has meaning in its own terms (Carson, Gilmore and Gronhaug, 1998). As Schwandt (1994) observes:

Proponents of these persuasions share the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live in it. This goal is variously spoken of as an abiding concern for the life world, for the emic point of view, for understanding meaning, for grasping the actor’s definition of a situation, for Verstehen. The world of lived reality and situation-specific meanings that constitute the general object of investigation is thought to be constructed by social actors. (p. 118).

Qualitative research is grounded in a philosophical position that is broadly interpretive in the sense that it is concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced, produced and constituted (Giddens, 1974.). It relies on studying phenomena in a natural environment because, as Mason (2002) suggests, the interpretive approach not only views people as primary sources of data but also seeks to reveal the meanings and interpretations that people attach to their social world.

After considering of the merits and suitability of each position, an interpretivist theoretical perspective was deemed to be most suitable to take for this study.

3.2.2.3 Qualitative Methodologies

Qualitative research methodologies are any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification (Strauss & Corbin, 1999). According to Cassell and Symon (1994),
the label qualitative methodology has no precise meaning in any of the social sciences. It is an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world (p.16).

It is also the logic through which the researcher addresses the research question (Mason, 2000) and encompasses the entire research process, from approach and procedures through to the data collection or sampling methods employed (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). This study incorporates a combination of organisational ethnography, case study and grounded theory which are compatible with the study’s ontology, epistemology and theoretical perspectives described previously.

Organisational ethnographic methodology was chosen for its ability to provide a variety of investigative methods and because it is essential that intensive field research occurs within organisations. This makes it the perfect methodology for this research project. Although organisational ethnology shares most of the similar approaches taken in anthropological ethnography, Eberle and Maeder (2011) explain that there one fundamental difference in approach which warrants highlighting here:

To research an exotic tribe implied that an anthropological ethnographer travel far from home, stay for two years, immerse him- or herself in an unfamiliar culture, learn a foreign language and live with a number of hardships. An organizational ethnographer does not need a toothbrush when leaving home (Bate 1997: 1150), as he or she usually returns for the night. Ethnographers can work regular hours and enjoy multiple leisure time activities in between as the other members of the organization do. It is even possible - and common practice - to enter the field only sporadically, to move in for short periods and to move out again (p.57).

Organisational ethnography has been used in social research for more than thirty-years. An early proponent in this field is Van Maanen (1979) who proposes that organisational ethnography is a means of providing a way for researchers to “come to grips with the essential ethnographic question of what it is to be rather than to see a member of the organisation” (p.539).
It should be noted that a central principle of organisational ethnography is that it works within the spirit of ethnography where the researcher is “required to set organisational activities within the broad societal order of which they are part” (Watson, 2012, p.15). The researcher is an organisational consultant with more than 20 years of national and international experience and is still regularly employed in this capacity. She works in organisations with leaders and managers in particular and therefore is part of ‘the broad societal order’ which Watson (ibid) speaks.

In conjunction with organisational ethnography, the researcher chose case study methodology primarily because of its ability to provide in-depth investigation (Yin, 2008; Stake, 1995; Feagin et al., 1991) and also because it provides the means to bring out details from the participants points of view which is so important to this study. Case study methodology also allows the use of multiple sources of data (see Travers, 2001; Stake, 1995) which has value in this study when considering the need for triangulation.

The decision to employ grounded theory methodology was made because of its ability to systematically gather, categorise and analyse all ethnographic data and because as a result of the interplay between the data collection and analysis phases, it allows the generation of theory that will ultimately addresses the central research question (see Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin 1994; Charmaz, 2006).

3.2.2.4 Methods

The terms methodology and methods are often used interchangeably in the literature. While methodology is the logic through which the researcher addresses the research question (Mason, 2000), methods are the techniques used by social researchers to obtain valid and reliable data (Bogdan & Bilken, 2006; Merriam, 2002).

Qualitative methods emphasise aspects of meaning, process and context. It could be argued that they are the ‘why’ and ‘how, rather than the ‘how many’ (Cohen, et al., 2000). They also permit depth, nuance, context, multi-dimensionality and complexity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Flick, et. al. 2004; Mason, 2002).
The qualitative methods used in this project link directly to organisational ethnography, case study and grounded theory methodologies.

Organisational ethnography follows the same tenants of ethnography in that it assumes that we must first discover *what* people actually do and the reasons they give for doing it before making any type of assumptions or interpretations. More specifically, the tools of ethnography are designed for discovery … the basic tools of ethnography use the researcher’s eyes and ears as the primary modes for data collection (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p.2).

With this in mind the organisational ethnographic methods chosen for this study do not differ from those used in other ethnographic typologies – namely they comprise of observations, interviews, narratives, digital recordings, field notes and memos (see Kostera, 2007; Watson, 2012 and Ybeba, et al., 2011).

Case study researchers (E.g. Yin, 1984, 2008; Stake, 1995 and Simons, 2009) each suggest methods for successfully organising and conducting case study research which include: case and sample selection, data collection and analysis, evaluation of data and reporting on findings.

Moving back and forth between data collection and analysis, grounded theory methods include coding, conceptualising, categorising and theory generation. During the coding stage, template, narrative and thematic analysis will be used to identify themes from collected data which in turn will be grouped into categories and sub-categories using NVivo8 software.

3.2.2.5 Triangulation

Regardless of the methodologies and methods used, validity and reliability are of utmost importance in all studies in if they are to be viewed as being accurate, dependable and credible. In qualitative research reliability refers to the ability to replicate a study’s results, however in qualitative research there is no expectation of replication.

Therefore ‘triangulation’ is used to check and establish validity by analyzing a research question from multiple perspectives (Flick, 2008; Denzin, 1970).
In so doing it addresses any validity and viability concerns though quality, rigor and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Cresswell & Miller, 2000; Stauss & Corbin, 1990).

However, Patton (2002) cautions that it is a common misconception that the goal of triangulation is to arrive at consistency across data sources or approaches; in fact, he suggests that such inconsistencies are likely according to given the relative strengths of different approaches. In Patton’s view, these inconsistencies should not be seen as weakening the evidence, but rather should be viewed as an opportunity to uncover deeper meaning in the data (ibid).

The benefits of triangulation include “increasing confidence in research data, creating innovative ways of understanding a phenomenon, revealing unique findings, challenging or integrating theories, and providing a clearer understanding of the problem” (Thurmond, 2001, p. 254). The more common forms of triangulation used in qualitative research are:

*Data triangulation:* this involves using different sources of information in order to increase the validity of a study (Patton, 2002). For this reason case study is acknowledged as a triangulated research strategy (Tellis, 2003).

*Investigator triangulation:* which involves the use of multiple observers, interviewers, or data analysts in the same study for confirmation purposes (Denzin, 1989).

*Environmental triangulation:* this involves the use of different locations, settings, and other key factors related to the environment in which the study took place, such as the time, day, or season. The key is identifying which environmental factors, if any, might influence the information that is received during the study. These environmental factors are changed to see if the findings are the same across settings. If the findings remain the same under varying environmental conditions, then validity has been established (Patton, 2002)

*Methodological triangulation:* this involves the use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative methods to study the program. For example, results from surveys, focus groups, and interviews could be compared to see if similar results are being
found. If the conclusions from each of the methods are the same, then validity is established (Denzin, 1970 and Patton, 2002).

*Theoretical triangulation:* which use of multiple theories in the same study for the purpose of supporting or refuting findings since different theories help researchers to see problem at hand using multiple lenses (Denzin, 1970 in Thurmond, 2001). Both related and/or competing theories can be used in formulating hypothesis for the purpose of providing broader and deeper understanding of research problem in hand (Banik, 1993).

### 3.3 Research Design Framework

Yin (2009) asserts that all empirical research has an implicit, if not explicit, research design. Simply stated research design is the logical sequence of stages and steps “which connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions” (Yin, 2009, p.26). However it is not enough to take a research project, as Yin (1993) colloquially describes “from here, to there” (p.26). Research design must be grounded in a framework which enables the researcher to build in credibility (trustworthiness of outcomes), transparency (clarity of process and ability to convey specific factors that impact the process), usefulness (ability to move the research through its process) and analysability (ability to analyse outcomes with a degree of confidence) (Roller, 2011).

The research design framework for this project comprises of four interrelated stages which allowed ongoing development of each stage based on reflection and refinement. The stages are:

- **Stage 1:** Design;
- **Stage 2:** Data Collection;
- **Stage 3:** Data Analysis and
- **Stage 4:** Reflections and Outcomes.
3.3.1 Stage 1: Design

This stage involves: Identify and design the appropriate case study; Develop case study and sampling strategies; Identify and secure suitable sites and subjects; Develop questions, interview guides and plain language statements for use in the field;

Gain any required clearances and approvals prior to commencing field work; Gather equipment and materials to be used in the field; and Undertake initial discussions with organizational with regards to the practical aspects of conducting interviews in their organisations.
3.3.2 Stage 2: Data Collection

The data collection stage involves: Conducting the field work: Collecting all various forms of ethnographic data (narratives, interview responses, digital recordings, observations, field notes and memos); and Transcribing all of the captured raw data into individual Word documents.

3.3.3 Stage 3: Data Analysis

When employing grounded theory methods in the data analysis stage, both deductive and inductive approaches are used. The deductive approach involves repeatedly referring to the research objectives and the literature reviewed, while the inductive approach involves systematically reducing complex raw data into summary themes in order to gain meaning and understanding (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Pedlar & Myres, 1999; Pope et al., 2000). The purpose of data analysis is “to develop categories from the raw data into a model or framework that captures key themes and processes judged to be important to the researcher” (Thomas, 2003, p.3).

In this study the data analysis stage begins by ensuring the anonymity of the subjects as presented in the Plain Language Statement (Appendix 5). The subject’s name, age bracket, organisation and organisation type are replaced with attributes known only to the researcher and attached to each corresponding transcript and set of field notes. From there the data analysis follows the following steps:

1) Create a priori template (see King, 2004) across all data using the four main themes in the interview guide;
2) Conduct a thematic, narrative and template analyses while continuously comparing the transcripts against each other, against the research objectives and the data reported in the literature review to allow supportive emerging themes;
3) Recognise and capture any emerging themes not found in the existing literature review (chapter 2);
4) Conduct further scholarly research into these newly found themes and add them to the literature review;
5) Create codes which express the emerging themes and sub-themes, (nodes) using NVivo 8 software; and
6) Organise and aggregate nodes for use in the next stage.
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Throughout the coding process multiple rigorous, systematic readings of the transcripts are required in order to consider possible meanings and how they fit into the main and emerging themes. Segments of interview text are coded when they appear to be common across the templates or if considered to link to key themes in the research objectives and/or the literature reviewed. Thomas (2006) suggests that there are five potential features which are the core of inductive analysis:

1. **Label for category:** Word or short phrase used to refer to category. The label often carries inherent meanings that may not reflect the specific features of the category.

2. **Description of category:** Description of the meaning of category including key characteristics, scope and limitations.

3. **Text or data associated with category:** Examples of text coded into category that illustrate meanings, associations and perspectives associated with the category.

4. **Links:** Each category may have links or relationships with other categories. In a hierarchical category system (e.g., tree diagram) these links may indicate superordinate, parallel and subordinate categories (e.g., parent, sibling or child relationships). Links are likely to be based on commonalities in meanings between categories or assumed causal relationships.

5. **Type of model in which category is embedded:** The category system may be incorporated in a model, theory or framework. Such frameworks include; an open network (no hierarchy or sequence), a temporal sequence (e.g., movement or time), or a causal network (one category causes changes in another). It is also possible that a category may not be embedded in any model or framework (p.230).

### 3.3.4 Stage 4: Reflections and Outcomes

The reflective coding employed in grounded theory can be likened to an investigation where the researcher asks **what, when, where, how, why, results and consequence** questions (Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) in order to assemble a multitude of coded themes into a coherent pattern. Scott and Howell (2008) elaborate:
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- What is [the category]? (Using a participant’s words helps avoid bias)
- When does [the category] occur? (Using “during . . .” helps form the answer)
- Where does [the category] occur? (Using “in . . .” helps form the answer)
- Why does [the category] occur? (Using “because . . .” helps form the answer)
- How does [the category] occur? (Using “by . . .” helps form the answer)
- With what consequence does [the category] occur or is [the category] understood? (p. 4).

The constant comparative nature of the questions being asked by the researcher and the deductive and inductive process of data analysis which is done in tandem with this stage, ensures that themes and sub-themes continue to emerge and that the patterns between them are not “merely two-dimensional pictures of the participants’ realities but, rather, the much more complex, multidimensional constructivist ecology revealing each participant’s characters” (Scott & Howell, 2008, p.4).

This process of constant comparison continues until there are no new properties or dimensions that emerge. At this point, a concept has been theoretically saturated. This ‘intense property development’ (Glaser, 2001, p.191) produces the conceptual density necessary to lift the theory above description and enable its integration through theoretical propositions (hypotheses) as abstract conceptual theory.

‘Once a category is saturated it is not necessary to theoretically sample anymore to collect data for incident comparisons. And of course, once many interrelated categories of a GT are saturated, theoretical completeness is achieved for the particular research’ (Glaser, 2001, p.192).

3.4 Design

3.4.1 Case Study and Sampling Strategies

3.4.1.1 Case Study

Cronbach (1975) suggests that case study is differentiated from other research designs because of its “interpretation in context” (p.123). By concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity (in this case, the role of leaders and leadership in the context of organisational
change), the researcher aimed to uncover the interactions of any significant factors which are characteristic of the phenomenon. The case study focuses on holistic description and explanation, and is “as Yin (2008) observes, a design which is particularly suited to situations in which it is impossible to separate the phenomenon’s variables from their context (Merriam, 2009, p.43). Further, according to Guba and Lincoln (1981), case study is the best reporting form for evaluations because it provides thick description, is grounded, holistic, lifelike and which according to Yin (2003), cannot be manipulated (p.7). It was for these reasons that the use of a case study was considered to be eminently suitable for this particular project.

The decision to conduct a single case study was made on the basis of the study’s examination of a singular group (organisational leaders) rather than of multiple groups of leaders (e.g. political leaders, sporting leaders, religious leaders etc.) which would have necessitated the use of a multiple case study. Baxter and Jack, (2008) warn “that one of the common pitfalls associated with case study is that there is a tendency for researchers to attempt to answer a question that is too broad or a topic that has too many objectives for one study” (p.546). However because the initial part of this study’s central research question is: ‘what is the role of leaders and leadership’, and is bound by context in its subsequent phrase: ‘in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change’ this problem is avoided.

This study is interested in not only investigating the role that leaders and leadership play in organisational change but also whether the nature of leaders, leadership and change differ depending on the level that the leader holds in their organisation or because of their organisation’s type, status and size. Consequently a single case study with embedded units enabled the research to best explore the case while considering the influence of the various organisations and their associated attributes on the leader’s roles.

The ability to look at sub-units that are situated within a larger case is powerful when data can be analysed within the subunits; separately (each of the individual leaders in the study), between the different subunits (individual leaders at the same level in different organisational types); or across all of the subunits (all of the leaders in the study). The ability to engage in such rich analysis only serves to better illuminate the case (Yin, 2003).
3.4.1.2 Sampling Strategy

The next step was to choose one of the 16 sampling strategies reviewed in the literature and reported in the previous chapter. The researcher was mindful of Patton’s (1990) assertion that regardless of type of sampling chosen, there is no strict sample size required in qualitative studies and that such decisions are left to the researcher. However it was understood that whatever sample type was chosen, it had to fit the purpose of the study, the resources available, the question being asked and the constraints being faced (Cresswell, 1998; Patton 1990, Stake 1995 and Yin 2003, 2008). After careful consideration, the choice of mixed purposeful sampling (also known as combination), was made not only because it allowed for the use of various sampling strategies (stratified purposeful, opportunistic and criterion strategies), all of which were useful in this study but also because it allowed for triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Patton, 1990; Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

3.4.2 Final Sample

Once the sampling strategy had been determined, the next step was to choose the contributing organisations that would make up the case study sample. In addressing the research question, the researcher was particularly interested in determining how much of a variance in participant response, if any, would occur as a result of the fundamental differences in nature of Private versus Public (Government) businesses. Therefore in researching potential contributors, it was concluded that the sample should represent the sub-categories of ‘for profit’ and ‘not for profit’ organisations, thus addressing any overlaps between those Government departments that were not wholly subsidised by Federal and/or State Governments (in other words, those which were expected to make a profit), and those privately owned organisations that received partial or full Government funding.

With this in mind, letters seeking involvement in this study were sent out to contacts within seven organisations in which the researcher had worked on projects for three months or longer either during the early stages of this study or in the preceding eighteen months. Each of the organisations agreed to be included in the study however five were selected because they not only represented government and private enterprises, and for their profit and not for profit status respectively but because together they created the best balance across these domains:
3.4.2.1 Organisation A: Private for Profit (PP)

Organisation A is a private, for profit company in the oil and gas Industry, located in the North of Australia. It has an external Board of Directors and an executive team of seven people. Four others have middle management responsibilities which they hold in conjunction with other (including leadership) roles. Of the additional 48 employees, six hold administrative and HR roles and 38 (including some middle managers) hold technical positions. This business is owned by and answerable to a parent company whose head office is in another State and which employs more than 3,000 staff. Organisation A is well established, with very little staff turnover, has revenue at time of research of $80 million Australian dollars and a depreciated optimised replacement cost of assets (DORC) in excess of $380 million Australian dollars.

3.4.2.2 Organisation B: Private, Not for Profit (PNFP)

Organisation B is a leading community benefits organisation located in the Western region of Australia. It has a not-for-profit status and is answerable to an external Board of Directors. The company has an executive management structure of six people and employs a further 58 full-time staff. At time of research was conducted, these 58 employees oversaw the work of 240 part-time workers whose ages ranged from 16 to 62 years and who varying levels of mental (and in some cases also physical) disabilities. The special-needs employees perform packaging and light manufacturing tasks across four separate geographical sites.

3.4.2.3 Organisation C: Private, Not for Profit (PNFP)

Organisation C is an amalgamation of two companies, each of which holds identical contracts for delivering Work for the Dole (WfD) programs on behalf of the Australian Government, in the western and northern regions of Australia. The Work for the Dole initiative is a Federal Government funded program that provides work experience opportunities and activities for eligible job seekers. The initiative involves local communities in activities that provide work experience for the unemployed and is designed to help the unemployed re-attach to the labour market. The Work for the Dole program is also intended to provide communities with quality projects/activities that are of value to them. Each of these companies that provide WfD services is answerable to its own Board of Directors. Each were created and defined by Federal Legislation. One of the companies has a staff of nine permanent and 12 contracted staff.
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The other company has a full-time staff of 38. The main difference in the make-up of these two organisations is that 20% of the employees in the second company comprise of indigenous Australians.

For the purpose of the present study, however, they are appropriately grouped together because their context, contracts and required outcomes are the same. The funding for these two organisations at time of research was in excess of $10 million Australian dollars.

3.4.2.4 Organisation D: Government for Profit

Organisation D operates in the communications sector and is one of the largest Federal Government organisations in Australia. The business employs 62 sales and marketing people, their ten managers and six senior executives, who in turn who had, at time of research, a direct impact on a further 1,730 staff. This organisation, although heavily constrained by Government legislation, operates on a for profit enterprise.

3.4.3 Initial Discussions

The researcher met with senior executives of each of these organisations to gain permission to recruit subjects for the study. Potential participants were required to meet four broad criteria:

(1) they should either be currently employed as leaders or have leadership duties as part of their role; (2) they should have held a leadership position for a minimum of five years over their careers (to ensure enough experience on which to draw during interview); and (3) they should have current responsibility(ies) for initiating or implementing change in their organisation, (4) inclusion in the study was entirely voluntary.

It was mutually agreed that the organisations should be responsible for choosing their own participants without any input from, or consultation with, the researcher, so as not to introduce avoidable bias into the study. Consequently the executives sent emails throughout their respective organisations seeking volunteers for the study which resulted in a total of 75 participants.
3.5 Fieldwork Preparation

As previously noted the use of semi-structured ethnographic interviews as a method of data collection has value to this study because it can result in obtaining rich, in-depth, contextualised, open-ended responses from participants about their views, opinions, feelings, knowledge and experiences (Cresswell 2009; Weiss, 1994). However the quality and quantity of responses given depend on the interviewer’s ability to engage with the respondents in a way that not only gains and maintains their trust but also ensures communication flow throughout the experience (Patton, 2002).

King and Horrocks warn that “[f]ailure to recognise the special requirements of a qualitative research interview can result in the elicitation of data that have serious limitations for a study” (p.1). Therefore preparation is required in order to meet potential challenges concerning “the process of contacting research participants works; the main challenges of social and physical interview environment, and the main challenges for the researcher during the interview” (Mikene & Gaizauskaite, 2013, p.50).

3.5.1 Ethical Considerations

The use of in-depth interviews is common in qualitative research however the process is subject to scrutiny by ethics committees to ensure the protection, confidentiality and anonymity of the subjects and their data as well as the appropriate handling, use and storage of the data collected (Allmark et al., 2009).

For this study this involved seeking and gaining approval to conduct this research from the Human Ethics Committee of Charles Darwin University. The process involved submitting a description of the research being undertaken, its significance and the processes being used; providing a copy of the plain language statement that would be given to each participant prior to commencement of the interview (Appendix 5); providing a copy of the consent form which would be signed by each subject (Appendix 6), and providing the list of questions which would be asked during the interview (which appears later in this chapter).
3.5.2 The Researcher as Learner

The researcher as a learner role involves having a sense of self from the very beginning the study. Acknowledging and considering one’s own bias and predisposition throughout the study assists the researcher in becoming a “curious student who comes to learn from and with research participants” (Glesne, 1999, p. 41). Therefore is vital that the researcher steps out of the role of professional expert and assumes the position of learner. As Lofland and Lofland (1984) explain “The naturalistic investigator is ‘ignorant’ and needs to be ‘taught’ (p.38). When it comes to fieldwork Merriam (1988) explains that

the importance of the researcher in qualitative case study cannot be overemphasised. The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, (the researcher), rather than through some inanimate inventory, questionnaire, or machines (p. 19).

Therefore the researcher must reside in this researcher as learner paradigm, particularly while in the filed in order to create and maintain open communication with the participants; allow insight to be gained; and to contribute to the validity of the research (e.g. Merriam, 1988; Stebbins, 1987). Glesne (1999) points out that when considering validity issues, it is important not only to recognise the researcher’s expertise in regards to the study, but also their “subjective relationship to the research topic” (p. 17).

Because the researcher is an organisational consultant, she had to be continuously aware of the need to be subjective and to self-monitor so as not to introduce unwarranted bias or interpretation into this part of the inquiry.

However in qualitative research, bias is not controlled in an attempt to keep it out of the study as such but rather as Glesne (1999) asserts:

When you monitor your subjectivity, you increase your awareness of the ways it might distort, but you also increase your awareness of its virtuous capacity. You learn more about your own values, attitudes, beliefs, interests, and needs. You learn that your subjectivity is the basis for the story that you are able to tell. It is the strength on which you build.

It makes you who you are as a person and as a researcher, equipping you with the perspectives and insights that shape all that you do as
researcher, from the selection of the topic clear through to the emphasis you make in your writing. Seen as virtuous, subjectivity is something to capitalize on rather than to exorcise (p. 109).

3.5.3 Role Responsibility

There is always a possibility that interviews can become emotionally intense if sensitive details are uncovered about the interviewees’ experiences which might otherwise have remained undisclosed. It was understood that participants can feel a high level of commitment to answering questions if they felt safe in speaking to the researcher. Therefore it was vital to the integrity of this study and out of respect to the subjects that the interviews were conducted in an ethical manner and that the subjects were made aware of how important their responses were important to this study (Atkinson et al, 2001; Fetterman, 2010).

One of the researcher’s responsibilities was to provide a safe environment for the participants where they would be motivated to freely respond to the questions being asked of them. This included preparing for the interviews, gaining permission to proceed, asking the major and follow-up questions in a neutral, non-leading, non-judgemental manner and recording their responses exactly as they were given without interpretation. Above all the researcher’s prime responsibility was to conduct the process in ethical, unbiased manner befitting the role of a researcher as a learner (Fetterman, 2010; Madison, 2012).

3.5.4 Sources of Evidence

Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) list six sources of evidence which are acceptable for use in qualitative research. They are; physical artefacts, archival records, interviews, documentation, direct observation, and participant-observation. Similarly Glesne (1999) and Creswell (1998) list also interviews and observation but suggest open-ended or surveys, and the more generic, document collection as sources of evidence.

The researcher chose to use the following evidentiary sources: interviews (more specifically semi-open ended ethnographic questionnaires, interview guides), digital recordings and documentation in the form of field notes to capture narratives and observations and memos.
3.5.5 Ethnographic Interviews and Guides

The use of ethnographic interviews in qualitative research may be used either as the primary strategy for data collection, or in conjunction with observation, document analysis, or other techniques (Bogdan and Bilkin, 1980). By utilising open-ended questions, often in a semi-structured format, it allows for individual variation which is important because, as Hesse-Biber (2006) offers, “individuals have unique and important knowledge about the social world that is ascertainable through verbal communication” (p. 119).

The researcher constructed an interview guide to ensure that the same type of information was obtained from each interviewee without predetermined responses. While the questions remained the same from one subject to the next, the responses were different and thus allowed the researcher the freedom to probe and explore each question with follow-up questions if required. The use of interview guides also ensured the best use of limited time and, as Lofland and Lofland (1984) suggest, made interviewing multiple subjects and data analysis more systematic and comprehensive.

The researcher used an approach in developing the interview guide based on Morse's (1994, p. 224) comparison of qualitative studies. This involved designating the overall thematic that would give direction to the subsequent questions in respective sections. The themes were chosen from the literature review and are: culture, change, learning and identity. They were deliberately placed in that order to ease participants into answering questions starting with those which were more external to themselves and ending with those which were more personal.

The themes and associated interview questions which follow in Table 8 were developed by first reviewing and taking into consideration the central research question and sub-questions and the literature review. A table of their inter-relationships appear in Appendices 7A and 7B.

In developing the interview questions, the researcher had to be careful not to infer judgment about the participant, their organisation’s culture, operational modalities or the way in which the organisations utilise their managers and leaders. Rather the questions were developed in a way that would seem innocuous enough so that the subject would be willing to answer them frankly but at the same time support the research and provide the illumination, understanding, exploration and the ability to be descriptive as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985).
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process resulted in the formation of forty broad questions in a simple format designed to encourage multiple memory retrieval attempts during the interview (Fisher and Geisleman, 1992, p. 99).

Table 8: Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Culture | 1.1 What do you think makes up an organisation's culture? Explain  
1.2 How would you define the culture of this organisation? Why?  
1.3 Do you think that there is a division that exists between management and staff in this organisation? If so explain and cite an example  
1.4 What do you think of this company as an employer? Why?  
1.5 How do you view the management of this organisation? Why?  
1.6 In your opinion what characteristics make a good manager?  
1.7 How do you view the leadership of the organisation? Why?  
1.8 In your opinion what characteristics make a good leader?  
1.9 What do you think is the difference, if any, between leadership and management?  
1.10 How is accountability and responsibility viewed in this organisation? Explain.  
1.11 How are rewards/discipline addressed in your organisation?  
1.12 Do you think that either is handled effectively in your organisation? Why? |
| 2 Change | 2.1 To your recollection what changes have occurred in your organisation in the last two years?  
2.2 In your opinion did your own leaders or managers create these changes or were they imposed on you by an external source?  
2.3 Please give me an example of when the leadership or management imposed a positive or negative change in this organisation  
2.4 How well did the leadership and management implement this change?  
2.5 How have these changes impacted on you specifically and the organisation?  
2.6 Should leaders/managers behave differently during times of change? If so, how?  
2.7 Do you think that your leaders/managers have given you enough on-going support of follow-up to ensure the changes were adequately implemented? If not, why |

Table 8: Interview Guide (cont.).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Learning</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Do you think that your work related opinions/ideas are listened to by the leadership/management of your organisation? Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 How do its leaders and managers view mistakes in this organisation? Give an example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 In your opinion is there more tolerance to mistakes being made at one level of the organisation over another? If so please explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 In your opinion how often does training occur when mistakes are made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 How well is knowledge passed on/shared in your organisation from the leadership/management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Tell me about on-going training in your organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 In your view are people usually promoted within the organisation or does promotion usually occur by bringing in people who are external to the organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 What would you like to see done differently in relation to learning/training? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9 What training/learning would you like to see re-enforced? Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10 Were you given an induction into your role? What form did it take?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11 Has this induction been followed up? Should it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.12 Do you think that leaders and managers should have induction training/on-going training in their roles? Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.13 How well is this done in your organisation? Explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Identity</strong></td>
<td>4.1 How would you describe yourself as an individual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 How would you describe yourself in your role in this organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 In your opinion is there a difference between how a person should behave in their role (including manager and leader roles) and how they behave as a private individual? If so please explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Would you say that the leaders and managers in your organisation behave in a professional manner? (Give an example explaining your definition of professional as the benchmark).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Are their cliques (a small exclusive group of friends or associates) in your organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 How would you rate trust within this organisation? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 Do you think that the management and leadership are trusted by their staff? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 How well does communication occur within this organisation. Example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5.6 Confidentiality

It was necessary to develop the guide in a way that would allow the respondents and their organisations to maintain anonymity because of the potential of some of the questions to trigger sensitive answers.

The intent was to protect the subject from possible workplace retribution as a result of any potential unfavourable responses should they somehow be overheard. Thus each interview
guide was numbered with the accompanying name and company kept separately from the guide and known only to the researcher.

3.6 Data Collection

3.6.1 Ethnographic Interviews

The majority of interviews were conducted face-to-face on site in a pre-booked board or conference room where the interview process would not be interrupted. Interviews took on average two hours to complete. Seating was arranged so that the subject and researcher could sit adjacent to each other. This configuration offered a more informal, relaxed atmosphere than would have been the case if the parties were sitting across the table from each other (which could make it feel like an interrogation). The rooms were furnished with a table and comfortable swivel chairs that allowed participants to change position and feel more at ease.

The researcher used audio recordings as a means of accurately capturing data (Patton, 1990) and all interviews were subsequently transcribed in full. The researcher also took field notes to serve as a memory aid (Lofland and Lofland, 1984). These contained descriptions of settings, people, activities, and sounds. All field notes were written up in full at the completion of each interview.

A digital recorder was set up and tested ahead of time to ensure both sides of the conversation could be picked up regardless of seating angle. The researcher also ensured that the lighting was suitable, the room temperature was comfortable and drinking water was available. Additional pens, paper and interview guides were on hand, along with a discreetly placed box of tissues. Subjects were welcomed on entering the room, at which time the researcher introduced herself and thanked them for their participation. Each was then given a copy of the plain language statement to read and asked to sign the consent form. After checking that participants felt comfortable and had allowed the full two hours for the interview, permission was sought for the digital recording of the interview and mobile phones were put onto silent mode.

The researcher then explained that, while in everyday conversation there was a general acceptance of equal communication between parties, in this situation the subject was encouraged to say as much (or as little) as s/he wished and that the researcher’s contribution
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would mostly be limited to questioning, prompting or seeking clarification. Once the preliminaries had been completed, a Do Not Disturb sign was put on the door.

The tone of the interview was one of friendly neutrality. The researcher mirrored the pace of the subject’s speech and body language in order to maintain rapport (Fisher and Geiselman, 1992; Rabon and Chapman, 2007; Prunckun, 2010). How much information each participant gave depended on numerous factors, such as their understanding of the questions, their personal communication style and how comfortable they were in answering the questions. Some participants needed coaxing while others gave a large amount of information without prompting. The researcher used her considerable experience and training in observation and analytical interviewing techniques to introduce probes, prompts and follow-up questions at appropriate moments (Keltner, et al., 2003).

The interview was ended when it became apparent that an interviewee had said all s/he wanted and/or all of the questions had been answered. At this point, participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add anything or if they had any questions. They were once again thanked for their time and given a verbal reminder of how their information would be used and stored. They were offered the researcher’s business card and encouraged to be in contact should they have any questions or if they wished to add to their comments. The researcher escorted them out of the room and returned to complete her field notes before locking all relevant material in a briefcase, ready for the next interview.

Eight participants worked more than 500 kilometers from base and agreed to their interview being conducted by telephone. Three of these interviews did not take place because of poor telephone coverage where they worked. Instead, they received a paper version of the interview guide which they completed and returned to the researcher. When these participants returned to base, the researcher contacted them to confirm their understanding of the questions and the completeness of their responses.

In summary, five subjects were interviewed by telephone, three filled in a paper version of the interview guide, and 58 took part in face-to-face interviews.

With one exception, all face to face interviews were digitally recorded. This participant had originally consented to a recorded interview but, for undisclosed reasons, asked not to be recorded once the meeting was already in progress. Instead, the researcher took hand-
written notes of the participant’s responses during the interview, attempting, as far as possible, to capture verbatim comments.

In addition to digital recording of the 58 face to face interviews, the researcher used allocated blank spaces on her own hard copy of each interview guide (and additional paper, as needed) to record participants’ responses and her own observations.

All interviews and field notes were transcribed into Word documents where each was assigned attributes. The names of individuals were substituted with numbers and further attributes were assigned according to the respondent’s public or private organisational status, its profit or not for profit status, and the respondent’s gender and age range.

3.6.2 Sample Completion

According to Guba (1978) qualitative researchers have strict guidelines about when to stop the data collection process. The criteria include exhaustion of resources, emergence of regularities, or going too far beyond the boundaries of the research (p. 97). Once all of the interviews were completed, the data was reviewed against Guba’s guidelines to ensure that the collected sample was sufficient and rich enough to meet both the research goals and to achieve depth through triangulation of data sources (different organisational types, industries, ages, ethnicities and responsibilities of subjects, time and place of interview). This outcome made it possible to move to the stage of evaluating and analysing the data.

3.7 Data Evaluation and Analysis

The purpose of qualitative study is to ultimately seek the generation of theory from data that contains both inductive and deductive thinking. The challenge was first how to weed through large volumes of gathered raw data in order to find significant patterns among the trivia.

The second challenge was to construct as Patton (2002) suggests, a framework for communicating the essence of what the data revealed. Glesne (1999), suggests as a starting point
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organising what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned. Working with data, you describe, create explanations, pose hypotheses, develop theories, and link your story to other stories (p. 130).

At this stage the researcher revisited the overarching purpose of Grounded Theory, Narrative Analysis and Template Analysis. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967) not only is the primary goal of evaluating and analysing data the generation of a grounded theory rather than theory testing or description, but the process is iterative where the analyst becomes more and more grounded in the data and develops increasingly richer concepts and models of how the phenomenon being studied really works.

Mishler (1999) describes narrative analysis as a form of case-centred, qualitative research which allows for the systematic study of personal experience and meaning. Further, during narrative analysis the researcher collects, reads and re-reads a textual database (field notes, interview transcripts and any other relative recordings) in order to ‘discover’ or label variables (categories, concepts and properties) and their interrelationships. The approach enables researchers to study the “active, self-shaping quality of human thought and the power of stories to create and refashion personal identity” (Hinchman and Hinchman 1997, p. xiv). When undertaking narrative analysis, Strauss & Corbin (1990) suggest the use of three types of coding - open coding, axial coding and selective coding.

In explaining Template Analysis, Miller and Crabtree (1999) opine “researchers can develop codes only after some initial exploration of the data has taken place, using an immersion/crystallisation or editing organising style. A common intermediate approach is when some initial codes are refined and modified during the analysis process.” (p.167) Expanding on this view King and Horrocks (2010) assert:

Template analysis does not stipulate a fixed number of hierarchical coding levels. Researchers are encouraged to use as may levels as they find helpful to capture and organize the meanings they identify in the data (p.166).

3.7.1 Coding

As previously identified, the overall analytical approach adopted in this study largely follows the conventions of Template Analysis and Grounded Theory. Template analysis approaches
qualitative data analysis with a ‘start-list’ of themes or categories that are anticipated from the outset (Crabtree & Miller, 1992; King, 2004). In this case the researcher produced a list of categories which reflected the interview guide and questions asked during the ethnographic interviews. Because the use of coding in Grounded Theory is not only to describe, but also to acquire new understanding of any phenomena of interest that might arise from the narrative (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), additional codes were created which branched from these main categories when they were common across the narratives. While they indicate the use of three types of coding, Strauss and Corbin (ibid) warn that these are analytic types that do not necessarily sequence from open coding, through axial coding and on to selective coding in a strict, consecutive manner. Nor are these analytic types confined to a specific number of levels across each category. Rather some questions attract more sub-categories than others as is the expectation in Template Analysis.

3.7.1.1 Open Coding

Open coding refers to that part of analysis that deals with the labeling and categorising of phenomena as indicated by the data -the product of which are the basic building blocks in Grounded Theory construction.

Although labeling and categorizing was once done by hand, it is now permissible to use computer software programs to attach keywords or tags to segments of text which permit later retrieval (see Weitzman and Miles, 1995; Agar, 1996; Bogden & Bilken 1992; Lincoln & Guba 1985; Lofland & Lofland 1995). To this end the researcher used the qualitative data analysis software package NVivo 8 as a useful organisational tool which allowed the researcher to index segments of the text to particular themes, carry out complex search and retrieval operations quickly, and link research notes to coding.

Accordingly during the open coding stage, the researcher identified and tentatively named or evaluated the conceptual categories into which the phenomena observed was grouped. The goal was to create descriptive, multi-dimensional categories which would form a preliminary framework for analysis.

3.7.1.2 Axial Coding

Where open coding fractures the data into concepts and categories, axial coding puts the data back together in new ways by making connections between a category and its sub-
categories. According to Neuman (2003), axial coding is a multiple review of the data where the researcher begins with an organised set of initial codes or preliminary concepts and focuses on the initial coded themes more than on the data — which is the focus of open coding. During axial coding, the researcher questioned causes and consequences, conditions and interactions, strategies and processes and looked for categories or concepts that cluster together. By organising ideas and themes the key concepts became available for further analysis (Neuman 2003, p. 322-323).

### 3.7.1.3 Selective Coding

Categories identified in the open and axial coding process are descriptions of data and themes rather than the theoretical framework, therefore various types of categories were required to be integrated in order to develop the study’s theoretical framework. The process used to achieve this is known as selective coding (see Pandit, 1996; Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Creswell, 1999 and Goulding, 2002). The aim of the selective coding process was: first, to discover a theory; second, to validate the relationship between concepts; and third, to detect any categories which may be in need of further refinement (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In order to achieve this step, Visual Mind software was used to structure in a logical fashion a theoretical framework, and then aggregate information found in the preceding coding steps was ready for reporting in the following chapter.

### 3.7.2 Synthesis

As previously identified, a Qualitative research approach was adopted in this study in order to achieve its aims and objectives. Constructivism was employed as the research epistemology; interpretivism as research theoretical prospective; organisational ethnography, embedded single case study and mixed purposeful sampling were used in the first phase of the research methodology.

The case study comprised of a sample of 61 participants, 35 of whom worked in a Government for profit enterprise at middle and senior level positions. 26 actors represented the private sector, with 13 working for profit businesses and 13 working for a not for profit enterprise. Ethnographic field work and interviewing using semi-structured questionnaires, digital recordings, narratives, reports, field notes and memos were used in the second phase
of the research methodology. Running concurrently with the second phase, Grounded Theory, template, narrative, and thematic analysis were used as the adopted methodologies and methods in the third stage. This approach ensured that the researcher had enough rich raw data to analyse and meet the requirements of triangulation.

Attributes were assigned to each of the sixty-one respondents according to their type of organisation, gender, position within their organisation, age bracket and interview guide number. Using template analysis (King 2004), the transcripts were coded into forty broad themes based on the research objectives and interview questions to create an initial template. Each broad theme was then subjected to a more detailed manual analysis by which led to the formation of 348 subcategories using the NVivo 8 software program which mirrored the subjects’ responses and narratives. The various codes were arranged into hierarchical order so as to allow the researcher to analyse texts at different levels of specificity. Broad higher-order codes helped provide a general overview of the data while detailed lower order codes enabled fine distinctions to be made (King 2004). As categories became more tightly defined, text stored in free nodes was moved into ‘tree nodes’. This type of node was particularly useful because it allowed the researcher to split up these broad categories through the use of interlinking sub-categories under the broader headings.

While the use of separate categories allowed the exploration of the data and a comparison of the similarities and differences, Corti and Bishop (2005) warn that the separation of categories can destroy the bigger picture unless the categories’ relationship with each other is depicted and the overall perspective maintained.

Therefore the researcher heeded Dey’s (1993, 2005) assertion that codes must be not only be meaningful with regards to the data but also in relation to other categories. Further analysis occurred resulting in logically structured and aggregated emergent themes ready for the fourth stage of the research design which will be addressed in the following chapter.
Chapter Four: Results
4 Results

As previously noted the research takes place in four stages:

- Stage one addressed the research design;
- Stage two dealt with the ethnographic field work, interviews and data collection;
- Stage three (which ran concurrently with stage 2) involved template, narrative and thematic analysis of the raw data; and
- Stage four involved coding the found themes into categories and sub-categories in order to creating a final template ready for reflection and discussion.

This fourth chapter reports on the results of stages three and four.

4.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of Participants

The coding process began by assigning attributes to each of the 61 transcripts on the basis of its identification number, the organisational type in which the subject worked the participant’s gender and their age group. The information was stored in dedicated folders in the data mining software program NVivo 8. This initial method of coding and the use of the NVivo software assisted the researcher in storing and quickly retrieving not only routine information about the subjects’ narratives but also allowed the identification of, and access to, emerging themes and their connections as the analysis progressed.

The attributes assigned to each individual transcript as shown in the Table 9, are as follows:

- Subject’s name: identified by number 1-61
- Type of organisation: Government Profit (GP); Private Not for Profit (PNFP); Private Profit (PP) – reflecting the classifications of organisations described by the Australian Institute of Company Directors (2011) which reflect current legislation.
- Gender: M, F
- Age group: 20-30; 31-40; over 40, unknown – reflecting the multi-generational workforce found in contemporary Australian workplaces (see page 14).
Table 9: Assigned Attributes of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>PNFP-F-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PNFP-F-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>PNFP-F-over40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>PNFP-F-over40-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>PNFP-F-over 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>PNFP-F-over40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>PNFP-M-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>PNFP-M-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GP-F-20to30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>PP-F-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GP-F-31to40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PP-F-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GP-F-31to40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>PP-F-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GP-F-31to40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>PP-F-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GP-F-31to40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>PP-F-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GP-F-over40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>PP-F-over40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GP-F-unknown</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>GP-M-over40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>PP-M-20to30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>PNFP-F-20to30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>PP-M-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>PNFP-F-20to30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>PP-M-31to40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>PNFP-F-31to40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>PP-M-over40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>PNFP-F-31to40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>PP-M-over40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GP-M-31to40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PNFP-F-31to40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>PP-M-over40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary demographics:

Government Organisations: 35  
Private Organisations: 26  
For Profit Organisations: 48

Not for Profit Organisations: 13  
Male Participants: 28  
Female Participants: 33

Age of participants 20-30: 19  
Age of participants: 31-30: 19  
Over 40: 22 with one unknown

See Appendix 8 for the breakdown of individual demographics summarised above.
4.2 Quantitative Analysis of Qualitative Data

In order to draw conclusions from qualitative data, it is first essential to quantify the data (e.g. Boyatzis, 1998; Miles 1994). Bernard and Ryan (2010) suggest that quantitative analysis of qualitative data involves turning the data from words into numbers. They elaborate:

In the social sciences, we are interested in people’s thoughts, emotions, and artefacts (the physical residue of people’s thoughts, emotions and behaviour) and the environmental conditions in which people behave, think, feel and make things. When we reduce our experience of those things to numbers, the result is quantitative data. And when we reduce people’s thoughts, behaviours, emotions, artefacts and environments to sounds, words, pictures, the result is qualitative data (p.5).

Thus the researcher began by determining the percentages of responses relative to the sample size of 61 (as shown in Table 10). This serves two purposes: “1) It simplifies the data by reducing the numbers to a range from 1 – 100 and 2) it translates the data into a standard form for relative comparison” (O’Neil, 2009, p.7).

**Table 10: Percentage Relating to Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Transcripts</th>
<th>% of 61</th>
<th>No of Transcripts</th>
<th>% of 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Coding Strategy

Coding is a subjective rather than an exhaustive process (Silverman, 2001). It is dependent on theoretical sensitivity which, according to Glaser and Strauss (1967), is the insight and ability of the researcher to take meaning from data; their capacity to understand it; and their capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn't.

The researchers own theoretical sensitivity underpinned the choices made regarding what to code and later aided in the researcher in the development of a theory that is grounded, conceptually dense, well integrated and formed more quickly than if this sensitivity were lacking (Glaser, 1978, 1998, 2001; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

The coding strategy taken in this study involved using NVivo 8 software to add the forty categories (nodes) which mirrored the questions in the interview guide to the a priori template (see King, 2004). As more data were collected and the coding process progressed, sub-categories for each node were created and refined. Key word reminders within various nodes were created rather than attempting to code every word of text to every single node possible. This approach resulted in 348 subcategories which comprised the final template (see Appendix 7A and 7B).

While this strategy resulted in occasionally capturing more content than might initially appear necessary, it was done in order to "open up the text and expose the thoughts, ideas, and meanings contained therein" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.102).

Once the final template had been created, the researcher looked for ways in which the coded text related to other coded text elsewhere - either for the same person or across the whole data set. This involved grouping the frequency of responses in an organised fashion.

4.4 Organising Percentages and Frequency Counts

Strauss and Corbin (1998) advise that in the course of coding, more than one code may come out from the same text. This is a truism in this study. In all but four questions (2.2: In your opinion did your own leaders or managers create these changes or were they imposed by external sources; 3.2: How do leaders and managers view mistakes in this organisation?; 3.3: In your opinion is there more tolerance to mistakes being made at one level of the organisation over another; and 4.6: How do you rate trust within this organisation?)
the responses given were so rich that parts of their content also had relevance to different questions. Thus the same question usually resulted in multiple coding.

In qualitative studies, it is essential that reports are read and evaluated qualitatively rather than relying on frequency counts alone (e.g. Creswell, 1998; Goede & Villers, 2003; Goulding, 2002; Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Randall (2008) warns that interpreting reports with respect to percentages can be misleading when using small samples:

> In general, percentages should not be used when the denominator is less than 30”. The exception to this rule is when at least 95% of the target population have responded” (p.5).

Although this study employs a sample size of 61 with a 100% participation rate, it warrants repeating that these findings cannot be generalised to a larger population. Even so, the findings displayed in this way (percentages) are useful because it allows an unbiased view of the frequency of responses given rather than getting caught up in the emotional content of the narratives. Therefore although frequency counts point to particular directions, they are used with discretion.

Rather than each question being reported in the sequence in which it occurred in the interview guide, the results are shown in the following groupings:

- Where the frequency counts added to more than 100% (Table 11)
- Where the frequency counts were greater than or equal to 50% (Table 12)
- Where the frequency counts were less than 50% (Table 13)

### 4.4.1 Frequency Counts Adds to More Than 100%

It is important to note here that while each interview was only counted once within the subcategory, frequency counts can only add to 61 (or 100%) when the responses are mutually exclusive. In this study none of the questions resulted in mutually exclusive coding because the respondents tended to discuss either both sides of an issue or originated content to a question being asked later in the interview.
The responses to interview questions 1.12 *Do you think rewards/discipline are handled effectively in your organisation?* and 1.11: *How are rewards/discipline addressed in your organisation?,* and question are shown in Tables 11 and 12. The frequency count in each table added to more than 100% within the subcategories because multiple coding had been used.

Table 11: Frequency Count Adds to More Than 100%  1.12  *Do you think either (rewards or discipline) is handled effectively in your organisation? Why?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 1.12 Are rewards/discipline handled effectively?</th>
<th>No. of Docs (61)</th>
<th>% of 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here forty-three leaders (70%) answered No to this question, 23 leaders (38%) answered Yes and 4 leaders (7%) were unsure.

The frequency count added to more than 100% because some participants discussed examples of both effective and ineffective handling of rewards and discipline in their organisations in different parts of their narratives. This information was deemed by the researcher to have potential importance, therefore rather than coding such responses as a “mixed” category, the researcher allocated each response to the relevant “yes” or “no” category in order to later be able to look at these responses and the frequency count in relation to other questions.
Table 11 (cont.): Frequency Count Adds to More than 100%: 1.11 How are rewards/discipline addressed in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards &amp; discipline in your organisation</th>
<th>No. of Docs (61)</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfair or poor handling</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal processes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal processes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or none</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table provides additional insights to explain the results in question 1.12 (Table 11) with over 50% (35 of 61 or 57%) indicating there is unfair or poor handling of rewards and/or discipline in their organisation. Twenty-four leaders (39%) thought that rewards and discipline were handled through the use of formal processes in their organisations, and twenty (33%) thought that they were handled informally. Fourteen leaders (23%) complained that there were few, if any instances of rewards and/or discipline metered out in their organisations and three (5%) were unsure how rewards and discipline issues were addressed.

4.4.2 Mutually Exclusive Frequency Counts

It warrants repeating that frequency counts add to 61 (100%) only when the responses are mutually exclusive. None of the questions resulted in mutually exclusive coding because respondents tended to discuss both sides of an issue.

4.4.3 Missing Data or Misplaced Coding

Frequency counts can help to determine whether additional information should be obtained due to missing data or misplaced coding (Enders, 2010). This is typical in this set of responses where some of the questions remained unanswered due to respondents either feeling uncomfortable in answering; fearing repercussions should their views be known or
simply not having an opinion about the question. One such example is question “4.1 How would you describe yourself as an individual?” All of the answers given to this question related to individual attitudes, attributes, and skills which were relative to other questions. Therefore the answers given do not appear against this particular question. Further, while the answers given were not particularly helpful in the main, they did provide general characteristics and traits which spoke to the individuals’ perceptions about (and confusions between) their personal and role identities which were of more use when comparing these answers to those given to other questions (such as question 4.2 How would you describe yourself in your role in this organisation?).

4.4.4 Frequency Counts Greater Than or Equal to 50%

Many subcategories had frequency counts greater than or equal to 50%. This is an arbitrary cut-off, but these frequency counts were nonetheless useful when reviewing and analysing responses across the entire data-set to determine meaning and provide illumination.

Table 12: Frequency Counts Greater Than or Equal to 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.06 Characteristics good manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills - communication</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable &amp; skilled</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.09 Difference between leadership &amp; management roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires motivates empowers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational oversight &amp; applications</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-two leaders (69%) commented about how important interpersonal skills and in particular communication skills were to being a ‘good’ manager. However only 35 leaders (57%) of the 61 in the study raised the issue that knowledge and skill is an important to being a good manager. In explaining the difference between leadership and management roles, 45 leaders (74%) suggested that a manager is responsible for the oversight of work and for generally performing managerial functions. Thirty one leaders (51%) said that the function of leadership role was to inspire, motivate and empower others to do good works.

Table 12 (cont.): Frequency counts greater than or equal to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Accountability &amp; responsibility viewed in this org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent or low accountability</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Rewards &amp; discipline in your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair or poor handling</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Are rewards/discipline handled effectively? Why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Changes last two years in your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural &amp; systems</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Who created change – leadership &amp; mgmt or external?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Does leadership and management support follow-up to ensure adequate implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes supportive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (cont.): Frequency counts greater than or equal to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 Your opinions/ideas listened to by leadership and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05 Knowledge shared in organisation from leadership and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05 Knowledge shared in organisation from leadership and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-three leaders (54%) indicated inconsistent or low levels of accountability and responsibility in their organisations. As previously noted, 35 leaders (57%) thought that rewards and discipline matters were poorly handled with 43 leaders (70%) specifically stating that discipline was the least well handled. Major change was viewed by 36 leaders (70%) as being initiated internally with 38 leaders (60%) citing external reasons for change within their organisations. Thirty-three leaders (54%) said that they were content with the follow up given (either by themselves or other leaders) during the change process and 34 leaders (56%) said that their ideas and opinions were listened to by others. However 46 of the 61 leaders in the study (75%) complained that knowledge sharing between leaders and managers in their organisations needed improvement. This was in contrast to the 57% who earlier considered knowledge and skill to be an important managerial trait (Table 16).
Forty-three leaders (70%) said that there was ongoing training available in their organisations; however 38 leaders (62%) wanted more training opportunities for themselves. While a large percentage said that they had undergone some form of induction training, this took the form of safety procedures or other technical aspects rather than it being relative to their leadership role. Thirty-three (54%) said that they had not received any form of induction for their role at all; 43 leaders (70%) said that there had been no follow up to their induction and 32 leaders (52%) spoke of wanting more knowledge and skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.06 On-going training in your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.08 Like to see done differently with respect to learning/training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training opportunities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Form of induction given to you in your role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Has this induction been followed up – should it be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (cont.): Frequency counts greater than or equal to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Describe yourself in your role in this organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Should people behave differently in leadership and management roles vs private individual explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Do leaders and managers in your organisation behave in a professional manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Are there cliques in your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Are leaders and managers trusted by their staff why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were some apparent dichotomies which occurred through these answers. Thirty-two leaders (52%) defined themselves by their leadership role or organisational knowledge and skill sets. Forty-three leaders (70%) said that people should behave differently in their leader or manager roles to how they behaved privately;
Fifty-one leaders (84%) believed that the managers and leaders in their organisations behaved in a professional manner, even though 31 of them (51%) indicated that they (and other leaders and managers) were not trusted as opposed to the 37 leaders (61%) who said they were trusted. Added to this was the 61% affirmative response rate affirming that cliques existed in their organisations.

Table 12 (cont.): Frequency counts greater than or equal to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 How well does communication occur within organisation example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative or needs improving</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty leaders (66%) felt strongly enough to say that communication is either negative or needs improving in their organisations, while 32 leaders (52%) gave a positive response to the same questions.

4.4.5 Frequency Counts Lower Than 50%

Because of the large number of sub-categories, most of them had frequency counts lower than 50%. This illustrates the fact that qualitative studies typically generate a variety of opinions that do not easily fit into neat, predetermined boxes.
## Results

### Table 13: Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.01 Define organisational culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes beliefs behaviours</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values &amp; ethics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose &amp; goals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production or services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational purpose mission vision</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; motivation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal policies and procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems &amp; structure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of employees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand - reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leaders gave multiple answers which could be attributed to this question (what defines and organisation’s culture?). The top third answers related to people (43%), attitudes/beliefs/behaviours (36%), values/ethics (33%), shared purpose/goal (26%), leadership (26%) and history (26%).
The middle third of the answers relate to management (21%), the levels of production and services delivered (16%), the organisation’s vision/mission (16%), support and motivation (13%), formal policies and procedures (13%), customers (13%) and the organisation’s systems and structure (11%). The bottom third comprised of communication (10%), diversity of employees (8%), brand and reputation (7%), trust and decision making (5%) and work ethic (2%).

These answers roughly indicate that the leaders consider that personal characteristics and attributes of people define an organisation’s culture more than the organisation as an entity or its leaders and managers and more than its brand and reputation.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02 Culture of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee dissatisfaction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented fractured dysfunctional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse - reactive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the negative cultural aspects of organizational culture, centred around employee dissatisfaction (25%) and the organisation being risk adverse (20%), fragmented and dysfunctional (20%), having poor leadership and management (18%), poor policies and procedures (13%), unclear purpose (11%). These added to communication issues (7%), the organisation being slow to react (11%) and being conservative (5%) appeared to point to the leaders’ organisations being viewed negatively. On the other hand the positive aspects of the organisational culture as shown on the next page include organisational purpose/vision/mission (21%), its people (21%), production and services (21%), shared purpose (21%), values (18%), customers (15%), leadership and management (13%),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order (61)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow to react</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism – old fashioned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational purpose mission vision</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community minded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
diverse culture (11%), community minded (10%), supportive (10%), brand image/reputation and other (7%).

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.03 Division between management and staff - example</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational structure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism cronyism nepotism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support motivation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing purpose and knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes beliefs behaviours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and rewards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although only 2 leaders (3%) considered there was generally a division between management and staff in their organisations and 20 leaders (33%) considered that there was not, on deeper reflection the interviewees raised specific issues as concerns.

Communication issues again appeared as being problematic (28%) as was the opinion that there was a hierarchical (almost clique) separation between management and staff (23%). The 21% response rate concerning a lack of support/motivation was directed at the leaders not feeling supported by their own seniors or staff and that this had a negative impact on their own motivation. Twenty per cent considered that their organisation’s structure contributed to a division between management and staff, particularly when it came to being able to access communication from other departments or more senior leaders and managers. Lack of shared purpose between management and staff and lack of shared knowledge again was raised (20%) as was poor decision making (13%) which caused these leaders and anecdotally others, to have less faith/trust in management. Divisional aspect due to issues with policies (10%), attitudes/beliefs (11%), salaries (10%), cultural issues (8%) and favouritism/cronyism/nepotism (7%) were also raised.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.04 Opinion this organisation as an employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production &amp; services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes beliefs behaviours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.04 Opinion this organisation as an employer (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were too many variables raised to report a simple yes or no answer to the question of whether the organisation was a good employer. The responses to what needed improving in the organisation caused the respondents to consider a wide range of issues as shown in this part of table 17. However these responses had a frequency count of 10% or below indicating that the responses were specific to a particular context and organisation which was verified on further investigation.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.04 Opinion this organisation as an employer (Cont.).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Positive</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent or good overall</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits &amp; pay</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and pay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics values</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness trust</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opinion of their organisation as an employer drew a 48% positive response, with 30% happy with the pay rates (although this was largely representative of those in the oil and gas industry, rather than in the Government and PNFP organisations). Positive opinion concerning job security and training and development opportunities each drew a 20% frequency rate, closely followed by opinions concerning a positive work environment at 18%. Positivity concerning ethics, trust, diversity, flexibility, people, trust and communication rated 13% and below.
Although all respondents were leaders they preferred to think of themselves and others by their management title.

Twenty-six per cent considered that their own and their contemporaries would benefit from improved decision making skills and 18% spoke of the need for improving their people skills and their formal qualifications and knowledge,. Sixteen per cent indicated a need to improve theirs or others’ knowledge of how to implement change. Somewhat interesting was the reoccurring theme concerning the need to improve communication (information sharing) at 13% which also came up in table 16 at 75%.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05 Opinion management this organisation (cont.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good in general</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable - good interaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational purpose vision mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents opinion of management in general was ‘good’ (28%) and that managers were approachable (28%). However considering that these figures represent 17 and 14 respondents of the 61 interviewed and that the opinion of management could be considered as being either generally positive or negative, these figures are not high. Twenty-three per cent considered that management was positive because of a shared purpose; 13% because they were motivational; only 10% because of their knowledge and skill; 8% because of the organisation’s purpose and mission and only 8% because of trust. Again the issues of knowledge and skills and trust are raised.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06 Characteristics good manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose vision goals mission of organisation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports - motivates</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity courage conviction fair ethical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly approachable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible &amp; objective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these respondents were all leaders who were actively responsible for change, 36% considered leadership to be a characteristic of a good manager. Forty-six per cent spoke of the need to uphold the purpose, vision, goals and mission of the organisation and to be supportive and motivate others although these responses came either from leaders in senior positions or those at middle management who were over 40 years of age. Integrity, courage, conviction, being fair and ethical as characteristics of a good manager came in at 41% and was represented across all responses. Being friendly (31%), decisive (28%), flexible and objective (18%) tended to come across in the interviews as managerial aspects during interactions with others rather than good manager characteristics in general.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</strong></td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.07 Characteristics good leader</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose vision mission</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-serving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability, skills, knowledge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fairness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management vs. leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachability accessibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism, cronyism, nepotism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were a variety of answers which fleshed out the need for leadership improvement in the respondent’s organisations.

Some such as working to the purpose of the organisation’s purpose, vision and mission (18%), leadership ability, skills and knowledge (15%) understanding the difference between management and leadership (11%) and providing leadership support (3%) are attributional to the leadership role.
However being self-serving (16%), trust and fairness (13%), ability to communicate (8%),
decision making (8%), being approachable/accessible (5%) and
favouritism/cronyism/nepotism all spoke to personal traits of individuals holding leader
positions which required improvement or change.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.07 Characteristics good leader (cont.).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - motivation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good overall</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable - interaction with staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose vision mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic - energetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive progressive flexible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a 23% response to the notion that leadership in their organisations was overall,
good. Leadership support and motivation came in at 25%; good decision making came in at
13% in comparison to 8% commenting on poor decision making in 1.07.

Again the subject of communication came up with 15% response to positive communication
by leaders in their organisations. Only 8% considered leaders to be approachable (including
themselves) although the reasons were self-justified (too busy) but accusatory (never
accessible when you need them) of senior leaders and board members.
Only 7% considered knowledge and skill to be relevant to positive leadership, suggesting rather that personal traits such as decision making (13%) and working to the organisation’s purpose and mission (8%) were more important. Attributes such as being energetic and enthusiastic (5%), proactive/progressive/flexible (3%) and having strong values and ethics (3%) were raised but were not highly rated as positive leader characteristics.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continue 2.5 Impact of changes on you & the organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job assignment - responsibility</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products &amp; services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits pay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One third of those interviewed reported the impact that change had on their organisations, their role and responsibilities, was positive (34%). However there was a significant drop (18%) when considering the impact that change had on their career development or on the products/services produced or delivered by their organisations. Fifteen per cent indicated than recent changes had no impact on their organisations at all. Three per cent indicated that
changes were positive in their organisations and change impacting on job security (3%), policies, benefits and pay, communications and environment each at 3%, tended to be contextual and specific to two people in a shared organisation.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Should leaders and managers behave differently during times of change? Why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire &amp; motivate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-five per cent of respondents suggested that leaders and managers should not behave any differently during times of change than they do usually. Of those who considered that they should, 48% commented on the need for different styles, forms and amounts of communication including feedback and information sharing across the organisation. Thirty-four per cent considered that leaders and managers should be more supportive to others during times of change; 16% considered the need for leaders and managers to be more
inspirational and motivational, 15% suggested the need for more flexibility and 10% suggested the need for more accessibility during these times. However only 5% thought that leaders and managers should be more proactive and 2% considered the need to be even more professional during times of change.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7 Does leadership &amp; management support follow-up to ensure adequate implementation?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; follow-up</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there were no responses which indicated that leadership and management support and follow-up did not ever occur in their organisations, 33% had concerns about the way in which this occurred. The issue of communication arose again with 13% wanting better communication or more frequent follow up (from others to them and them to others) and 10% spoke of various issues which were contextual to their individual situations.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.01 Are your opinions ideas listened to by leaders and managers?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eleven per cent of respondents reported that their ideas were not listened to by their own leaders and managers. However when further questioned it appeared that there were specific instances that individuals were thinking about rather than this phenomenon occurring all or even most of the time.

Twenty-eight per cent suggested that whether their ideas were listened to or not depended on a number of varied circumstances and therefore this question was too general to provide a definitive yes or no answer.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.02 How do leaders and managers view mistakes in this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair policies &amp; procedures in place</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent - little or no consequences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not tolerate mistakes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of the respondents admitted that there were policies and procedures in place in their organisations to address mistakes made by themselves and others.

They further considered that these policies and procedures were fair. However 23% suggested that these policies and procedures were used inconsistently either by themselves or others and that there was little or no consequence when they were employed. Eighteen per cent of responded that their organisations did not tolerate mistakes, however when further questioned it appeared to come down to particular leaders or managers within the organisation rather than it being part of the organisation’s culture.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.03 Does the tolerance of mistakes vary at different levels of org?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know or unsure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an affirmative response to this question (49%). On further investigation, senior leaders thought that they were more harshly treated if they made mistakes because of the greater impact those mistakes potentially had on the wider organisation. They considered that the mistakes made by the more junior leaders were more easily tolerated if not forgiven. Conversely the more junior leaders considered that the mistakes made by senior leaders were tolerated more and that some got away with serious mistakes without assuming any accountability and without any correction occurring. Twenty-six per cent considered that there was equity across all levels as to tolerance of mistakes and 18% were unsure.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts &amp; percentages in descending order</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.04 How often training occurs when mistakes are made?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently – on-going</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure or none</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although 44% indicated that infrequent training occurred when mistakes were made, on further questioning it was revealed that the training was rarely related to management or leadership skills and knowledge. Rather training occurred to improve the any technical or productivity mistakes. Ongoing training (38%) tended to be focused at the middle to lower levels of the organisation rather than further up the organisation. Twenty-one per cent of respondents were unsure or had no opinion about this question.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.05 Knowledge shared in organisation by leaders and managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-nine per cent commented that the level of knowledge that was shared by leaders and managers in their organisations was good despite repeated previous comments about poor communication in their organisations (e.g. 66% suggested the need for improved communication in question 4.8).

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.06 On-going training in your organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied - very little - none</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninformed or have to request</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although 23% of the respondents commented that on-going training was encouraged in their
organisations, this view was focused more at those in the more junior levels. The 21% who
considered that very little on-going training occurred in their organisation or was denied them
contextualised this question to their own training needs. Sixteen per cent wanted to see more
structured and relevant training across their organisations. Seven per cent commented about
the formality of requesting training and one person was unsure as to how ongoing training
occurred. However this individual was new to the organisation.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.07 Promotions within or external</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While 44% of the respondents commented that promotions occurred mainly through external
hiring, this view came from the more senior leaders and/or those within Government
organisations where hiring policy dictated external advertising for senior positions.
The 5% ‘other’ response reflected promotion on the basis of networking or cronyism.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.08 Like to see done differently with regard to learning training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the way it is</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine effectiveness of training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question as almost considered to be too broad and too complex to answer. After reflection 15% answered that they were satisfied with regards to (wrt) how training was currently conducted and accessed. Seven per cent wanted further examination into the effectiveness of training in their organisations, 3% did not have an opinion and 8% brought up issues which were outside the scope of this question.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.09 Training learning like to see re-enforced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job skills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership skills</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know or no additional training needed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.09 Training learning like to see re-enforced (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values ethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-six per cent of respondents wanted reinforced or updated training in the technical side of their roles (such as accounting, HR etc.) while 31% saw a need for further management and leadership skills. Communication skills came up again at 15% and people skills at 11%. Ten per cent of respondents commented that their training levels were fine as they were and did not need re-enforcement. The other issues such as purpose vision mission, organisational structure, products and services, team building, technology, values ethics and customer related skills each rated below 9%.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Form of induction given to you in your role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal induction was given to 39% of the respondees and 8% was delivered informally. However induction uniformly involved specialist safety related knowledge and processes rather than indoctrination into their organisation, department or their leader role. Seven per cent reported that they had first aid training which was part of a wider Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) related indoctrination programme.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.11 Has this induction been followed up? Should it be</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be followed up</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed up</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be followed up</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty per cent of respondents were required to receive and did receive follow-up induction in OH&S matters. Thirty-one per cent acknowledged that such induction should be followed up, while 16% thought it unnecessary particularly when they held desk jobs and 4% either did not know or made comments about specific issues contextual to them only. The concept of induction into their organisation, department or role was a foreign concept to all and was not a part of any of their organisation’s culture.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.12 Should leadership and management have induction &amp; training in their roles? Why</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay updated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job skills &amp; role</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general yes or other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12 (cont) Should leadership and management have induction & training in their roles? Why

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 3% thought that induction and training was not necessary for leadership and management positions. Of the 21% who thought it was a generally good idea, 33% said that there was value in keeping their leadership knowledge and skills updated, 23% though it would be of value in their roles and performance of job skills, 13% had an expectation that this would occur, 3% thought induction and training would well support their organisation’s values and one person was unsure.

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13 How well is this done in your organisation Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done well</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-six per cent of respondents thought that induction and training was done well but again this was within an OH&S context and 10% did not know.
Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Describe yourself in your role in this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision maker - problem solver</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge - motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible accountable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest rating responses given to this question related to more personal identity than to the respondents organisational identity. The identification of themselves as a manager (11%) and leader (8%) fell well below the personal attributes of decision maker and problem solver (30%), liking a challenge and being motivated (16%), being a people person (15%) and a team player (15%). There was a 7% response regarding having an appropriate attitude for the role and being a responsible leader, while 5% commented on having a good work ethic, and 3% saw themselves as being a good coach.
Results

Table 13 (cont.): Frequency counts lower than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODES</th>
<th>No. of Docs</th>
<th>% of 61 Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Rate the trust within this organisation – why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low or none</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies greatly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Are leaders and managers trusted by their staff? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know or neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers to question 4.6 appeared to be split along organisational lines. Those who rated trust as being high (43%) belonged to the same organisations and those who responded that trust was low in their organisations (48%) also shared the same organisations. The 16% who gave ‘average’ as a response were represented across all of the organisations. Two people suggested that trust varied greatly within their organisations and three did not know.

Only three people specifically raised the issue that leaders and managers were not trusted in their organisations.
4.5 Summary Discussions of the Coding Process

4.5.1 Context

It is worth noting from the outset that although discernment and familiarity with the issues and concerns raised were required in order to interpret these statements, draw conclusions, and consolidate the following findings; it was done so from the viewpoint of the researcher as a learner, rather than assuming expertise (see Merriam, 1988).

Each of the subjects interviewed, held (at time of research) leader positions at either a middle or senior level in their organisations. Their roles were either exclusively devoted to leadership or they held significant leadership responsibilities in combination with their managerial or technical duties (e.g. accounting, human resources, information technology etc.). All of the leaders had undertaken some form of formal leadership education or training within the previous ten years and each had a minimum of five years’ experience in a leadership role where they were responsible for developing or implementing change within their department or across their organisation.

Throughout the interactions the terms ‘leadership’ and ‘management’ and ‘leader’ and ‘manager’ were often used interchangeably by the subjects. The term ‘management’ was used by the subjects to indicate a collective of leaders and/or managers who hold leadership responsibilities.

Although lower than anticipated, the 61 participant sample size was, as discussed in chapter 3, an acceptable for purposes of validity. The following results were obtained from the 61 interviews and associated narratives, observations, field notes and memos. It is important to note however, that the results are not classified by organisational background (private, governmental, for profit and non-profit), but are rather viewed holistically as part of the single case. The selection of the four organisational types was an embedded, single-case strategy used to ensure a proper cross-section of organisational values and to assist in data triangulation. As a result, in some scenarios, the way in which the subject responded revealed their type of organisation and with it some cursory variation of leadership and cultural perception.
This outcome is entirely consistent with Patton’s (2009) warning that it is a common for inconsistencies to occur in (data) triangulation because of the relative strengths of different approaches.

To best illustrate the results of the interview instrument, the results have been divided into their four subsections that include: culture, change, learning organisations and identity and then again to address the questions therein.

### 4.5.2 Culture Results

Culture in the workplace, by its very nature, has a great deal of variance from one organisation to the next (Caproni, 2005). Consequently, the variance in the responses given to the culture related questions cannot be viewed as a peculiar phenomenon. However a general perusal of the data collected from this section does reveal some trends (particularly in those situations where definitions were required) as well as the expected variances.

Unlike the coding section, the results and trends related to the research have been broken down into a question by question format reflecting each of the 12 questions in order.

*What do you think makes up an organisation's culture? Explain.*

There were more varied responses to this question than in any other in this section. Some subjects gave an almost textbook definition of the term ‘culture’ (e.g. Kotter & James, 1992; Schein, 2010), others gave their own competent wording of the phenomenon and some showed little understanding about what is workplace culture. In terms of the textbook perceptions, one respondent eloquently stated, “Organisational culture is made up of the company’s mission and the people who strive to achieve the company’s goals” (Subject 36). In terms of using their own wording to describe workplace culture on a very accessible level, another respondent stated that it is “accepted norms both formal and informal” (Subject 11). A high number of respondents chose to list the traits that make up good organisational culture rather than to define the term. However the top third of these answers related to personal characteristics and traits of individuals who worked within the organisation over the attributes of the organisation as an entity or its reputation or brand which were only mentioned by two CEOs.
One respondent (Subject 12) gave a somewhat esoteric definition stating that an organisation’s culture is “an individual process that can’t be dictated.”

The ambiguity present in the responses and the hostility of those who disagreed with workplace common culture suggested to the researcher that they either had heard the term but were unfamiliar with what it actually meant or it had been heavily promoted in their organisations only in positive terms and consequently was received with some scepticism. To further back this assumption, one middle level leader actually called organisational culture a popular “buzzword” thus suggesting that it is perceived by some as simply a fad or organisational mandate with little real life translation (Subject 17). Although some misunderstanding of the term was present in the responses to this first question, there is a strong suggestion that most of the respondents did not associate their role as a leader in with the organisation’s culture. Another key point which came out of the narratives is that although leaders understood an organisation’s culture as being ‘good’ or ‘bad’ they did not consider that an organisation could experience a mediocre or any other type outside of these two extremes.

_How would you define the culture of this organisation? Why?_

Even though the responses to the first question were somewhat ambiguous, this second question revealed that the respondents had clear opinions about the overall pulse and attitude of their organisation’s employees. As a result, it can be stated that the majority of leaders believed that their respective organisational cultures were directly linked to, and were driven by, the attitude of their employees, even if defining the term was somewhat difficult for them. This raised questions about who were the major influences in their organisations and how prevalent was unsanctioned, informal leadership (e.g. Subjects, 9, 21 and 27). Regardless, there was a stronger demonstration of the term ‘culture’ than the first question would suggest if isolated.

It seemed that the respondents naturally categorised their workplace as being good, bad or variable/neutral, even if they did not link this to a ‘culture’. In the responses to this question culture was inferred if not stated. Most respondents suggested that their workplaces could be improved - even in those scenarios where the overall pulse of their organisation was thought
of as being favourable. There was a relatively even split between those who viewed their organisations as being positive or negative (see Table 13 q.1.02).

While some respondents remained neutral, most had an opinion about where their organisation lay on a favourable/unfavourable continuum (see Table 13 q.1.02). Those individuals who believed that their organisations were favourable cited the prevalence of good leadership, teamwork, flexibility, respect and empathy at the leader and managerial levels. In contrast, those who viewed their organisations as being unfavourable noted the absence of these factors. Additionally, specific negative responses included causes such as “leadership by fear”; “misuse of power”, “threats”, “fear of getting fired” “discriminate” and were “hypocritical”. These types of responses were given by subjects representing each of the organisations with the only difference being whether such instances occurred at the top of the organisation [as with one organisation] or occurred in pockets across the organisation. Where the respondents were neutral, the main reasoning reflected some manifestation of division. One respondent looked at their company as being a collection of individual departments that each had their own culture which was dependent on the personality of the leader in charge (Subject 19). In this particular response, the respondent also makes it clear which organisational genre his/her organisation belongs to:

The culture within [name of industry] is dictated by the group or department you belong to. It is very much a “stove-piped” organisation of some 17 different groups and services that each plays a different role in enabling or supporting the Government’s mandate. There is a huge cultural difference between the [named sector] of members and the public service, as well as between the different departments. For example, [named section] rightly sees itself as the one that is mostly on the front-line of conflict in conditions that most others would not accept, yet they have a “can do” attitude that prevails (Subject 19).

This response suggests that a division between departments keeps this particular organisation from operating under a common culture. In terms of those organisational cultures that were deemed poor, many different ways of referring to such divisions were articulated throughout the interview questions.
Do you think that there is a division that exists between management and staff in this organisation? If so explain and cite an example.

This particular question provoked unambiguous, straightforward answers with the vast majority of the respondents stating that there was a clear split between the collective of management and staff (see Table 12). This view came through even more strongly from the participants who worked for Governmental organisations than those from private enterprise. However it is also important to note that most of these same respondents saw a division between management [remembering that this is how all of the participants described their job title and the job title of other leaders in their organisations] and staff as being favourable to the organisations’ general operation and therefore such a division was not viewed as a negative attribute. While some saw a division between management and staff as being necessary, many of the respondents articulated that they were “over” the type of divisions which led to or were caused by, their own or other leaders and managers being too far out of touch with staff needs (or those of other departments with whom they interacted) and daily operations. Only a few respondents said that there was either no division; that there was only a perceived division; or there was minimal division between management and staff in their organisations. Those respondents who viewed division between management and staff as being positive considered that smaller divisions created a more team oriented environment.

On the negative side, respondents indicated that where there was a large division, it led to cliques, conflicting power bases and individuality which ultimately reduced a singular organisational culture.

What do you think of this company as an employer? Why?

Overall, the majority of respondents either felt that theirs was a good employer or they were neutral to this dynamic (see Table 13, q. 1.04). Some respondents however, clearly indicated that they did not like their employer organisation. In these few scenarios, the respondents cited that they once enjoyed working there but subsequent organisational changes or changes in leadership led them to become demotivated and angry. These respondents spoke of becoming more stressed over time and behaving in ways which was out of character. One mentioned the without meaning to they had started behaving more like their unpopular leader and then justified it by saying “you have to if you want to survive in this place” (subject 23). In each of these cases the respondents personalised their organisation by equating it directly with the leader in charge. One respondent mentioned that their organisation was “terribly wrong” on an operational level, and that this dynamic could be proven through high turnover
rates (Subject 22). When questioned further, the respondent suggested that this situation was a result of poor leadership and leaders operating on a level of self-interest rather than the supporting or promoting the organisational ethos.

This response brings to the forefront an important consideration. If an employee has a heightened dislike for the company that he/she is working for, it is unlikely that they would continue to work there unless they considered that it would be difficult to gain equal employment somewhere else. As a result, it is not surprising that while the majority of the respondents liked working for their organisations those who did not felt increasing resentment in having to work for an employer whom they either disliked or mistrusted. In terms of both sides of the response, high turnover was cited as a perceptual variable that indicated something was wrong with their organisation, their leader or themselves as a leader. In one of the neutral responses, the subject stated that even though they liked working for their organisation, it was unstable and therefore they could not say without reservation that their organisation was a great employer.

How do you view the management of this organisation? Why?
The responses to this question were largely split between favourable and unfavourable views, with very few respondents providing neutral answers (see Table 13, q 1.05). In the few that were neutral, the typical answer reflected that some leaders were good and others were bad or that they [themselves and their leader or themselves and their junior leaders] simply did not work together effectively. Most of the neutral responses boarded on being negative. In terms of the outright negative responses, the answers tended to be more spirited and seemingly more overt than those given to describe good management. Under the negative responses, respondents stated that some in management were out of touch; that there were poor managers who were dysfunctional and who were interested in their personal agendas over organisational values; and most having poor interpersonal skills. Several respondents who worked for the same organisation lamented that the upper echelon in their organisation was “a pile of gimme gimme”. They indicated that they felt overworked and underappreciated and that while mistakes were quick to be noticed; their good leadership work was rarely acknowledged. This clearly indicated an in and out crowd perception. Another respondent stated that management was cliquey and ran their sections solely by personality- but they didn’t care as they were no longer interested in climbing the corporate ladder (Subject 47).
Two others from the same organisation stated that their efforts to lead effectively were not supported by the CEO who regularly and unnecessarily bypassed them and gave directions directly to their staff. Both leaders complained that they were now demotivated and one was considering leaving.

Even in those instances where the management was deemed to be favourable, most of the respondents still gave advice or originated ideas that could help improve their managers' or their own functional efficiency. Among the traits that were highlighted as being positive were: fairness, empathetic and incorporated stronger leadership skills. The positive response reasons were virtual opposites of the negative responses thus showing symmetry between what qualities the vast majority of the respondents felt were beneficial in a leader.

*In your opinion, what characteristics make a good manager?*

The answers to this question were foreshadowed by the responses of the previous. The traits listed by the respondents included but were not limited to the following skills:

1. Strong listening
2. Diplomacy and conflict resolution
3. Fairness and ethics
4. Solid understanding of the organisation (content knowledge)
5. Inspiration of common goals
6. Team oriented
7. Courage (Table 13)

However the focus on these traits was typical of the problems being spoken of in their organisations therefore indicating a personalisation of those problems. Essentially, autocratic rule, bureaucracy and hierarchal mandates did not enter into any of the subjects' responses about what they considered to be requisite managerial skills.

*How do you view the leadership of the organisation?*

This question, although slightly leading as it operates on the contingency that there is a difference between leadership and management, still yielded responses that were virtually the same as when the respondents were asked how they viewed the management of the organisation. One subject (Subject 15) asked if I had already asked this question, in other interviews this question was simply answered with “see earlier/other response” or some other
indication that the question was already answered. This offers the conclusion that most of the respondents viewed leadership and management interchangeably or that leadership was viewed as a component under the role title of manager.

Two respondents (Subjects 41 and 42) however spoke more specifically and indicated that leadership could be strong even in situations where their persuasion was not in the best interest of the company. One stated that their organisation’s leadership is strong but [the leader] is on a “massive” power trip (Subject 41). When asked for clarification, this subject stated that strong leadership referred to their leader’s strong, almost bullying personality and tactics. The other stated that the leadership is strong because of the fear that he invokes in the staff. These last two respondents are executives who work for the same leader (Managing Director). There was a general theme in the answers to this question which suggested that leadership refers to the leaders’ qualities or traits and how powerfully they display those qualities or traits. Further the suggestion is that such leader behaviours are not always used for the best interests of the staff or the employer organisation.

*What characteristics make a good leader?*

As with the previous question, the vast majority of respondents said that the qualities of a good leader are trait or character based. Vision, communication and values were reoccurring responses. One of the respondents clearly outlined the attributes of a good leader as being:

1) Integrity.
2) Honour.
3) Knowledge & Skills.
4) Courage.
5) Confidence & strength of character
6) Empathy.
7) Charisma/Personality (Subject 1).

This particular response was comprehensive and had sufficient detail to represent the responses put forward by the other subjects.
What do you think is the difference, if any, between the role of leadership and management? The vast majority of the responses suggested that subjects viewed this question on a trait level rather than considering the functionality of leadership and management (see Table 13, q. 1.06 and 1.07 and q 1.09). Some respondents explained that the difference functions of leadership and management in their organisations is so minute that it is a moot point. In contrast, those respondents who did indicate that there was a difference between leadership and management generally held senior leadership positions within their organisations and held university degrees. They typically viewed managers as being responsible for the details or day to day operations and associated leaders with inspiration and vision citing the duties of specific managers and leaders in their employer organisation. In these cases leadership was associated with power and second order change. Some said that leadership as a single role was a step beyond management on the career ladder and others indicated that managers relied on leaders to sell organisational ideas. In each case the respondents at some stage of their answers personalised leadership and management and equated both with the identities of specific leaders/managers within their respective organisations rather than solely identifying the functional differences between the roles.

How are accountability and responsibility viewed in this organisation? Explain? There were very few who gave favourable answers to this question (see Table 12, q. 1.10). Those who did mostly came from government organisations, held senior positions and typically indicated that rigid guidelines made for accountability and responsibility. The unfavourable responses cited bias in the form of misuse or intermittent use of power and authority; different rules for different people and no formal guidelines present. The biases reported by these respondents took the form of favouritism or position in the organisation’s hierarchy. Some of the respondents who claimed bias indicated that there was an accountability problem at the both the bottom and at the very top levels of their organisations. More specifically they considered that while the lower level was held accountable for certain outcomes they were also not given the power or the authority to make decisions relating to outcomes for which they were held accountable.

At the most senior level respondents commented that although they were given all of the power and authority required, they thought that some more junior subjects did not know if the seniors were actually held accountable for their performance/behaviour. Other respondents claimed that accountability was a problem at the senior level and considered that
management tended to take credit for positive staff performance but avoided personal responsibility or accountability when outcomes were less than the expected. At the senior level the respondents claimed that accountability was built into their roles. In each of these situations, accountability and responsibility were viewed as shades of blame.

The neutral respondents explained that they either did not know whether the situation was improving or indicated that while there were new programs in place to address issues relating to responsibility and accountability, that they are still too new to their organisation or role to be evaluated.

*How are rewards/discipline addressed in your organisation? Do you think either is handled effectively?*

For ease of reporting, these two interview questions have been combined (see Table 11, q 1.12). Essentially, the rewards discipline processes of the organisation were either deemed by respondents as being formal or informal. Those situations that used informal rewards/discipline also included bias – that is those who were rewarded were people who were liked and those who were not liked were rarely rewarded for good works. Where there were formal rewards and discipline were used, far less bias and dissatisfaction was recorded (Subject 2). The responses to this question were virtually the same as the accountability question.

Those respondents who indicated positive firm guidelines also overwhelmingly felt that rewards and discipline were handled well in their organisation. The firm guidelines, according to these respondents, ensured that fairness occurred and biases were not present. In the same paradigm, those who saw reward and discipline problems largely complained of not being allowed to discipline staff, not being supported by HR in disciplining staff or being afraid of the consequences (legal or union action). Some cited bias, lack of written procedures being used or their not having the time to employ written procedures, or that they did not know because a new system was just being implemented. Essentially, informality in rewards and discipline was the reoccurring reason given by respondents for viewing rewards and discipline as being unfavourable in their organisations. Some of the respondents who already had judged their organisations to be riddled with bias mentioned ineffective “schemes” that
were initiated but actually had very little effect as they were awarded sporadically and with the same bias they already disliked about the organisation.

4.5.3 Recurring Themes: Culture

As a result of the data collected in the cultural portion of the interview instrument, the following constructs were identified by the researcher as being reoccurring themes in the subjects’ responses:

1. Respondents were aware that organisational culture exists and could accurately identify the mood of their own organisational culture. Most linked culture to the personal behaviours of the staff. Only a few senior leaders considered that it was their responsibility to set and drive the organisation’s culture in line with its goals and values. Defining the term was problematic for many.

2. A clear delineation between management and staff is present in most organisations and this is deemed to be favourable in those instances where it does not prohibit management from being out of touch with staff needs.

3. Even in organisations which were deemed to be favourable, leaders still had room for improvement.

4. Effective leaders demonstrate values, respect, and understanding of the business, flexibility and communication.

5. Leaders were required to display vision, have a broad range of effective communication skills and strong interpersonal and influencing skills.

6. There is much general confused between leader and manager and leader and leadership, particularly at the middle levels of these organisations although the term management and manager were regularly used as a job title which usually included leadership as a subcomponent.

7. Managers who aren’t leaders are not viewed as being as efficient as managers who are leaders. Leaders were viewed on the basis of the power that they were given and by the personal traits and characteristics rather than by their organisational identities.

8. Bias and accountability can be reduced by having firm guidelines and organisational structure in place to keep the processes fair.
9. Rewards and discipline are only effective when they are consistent and governed by strict policies or rules but only if those on the receiving end view them as rewards or discipline.

10. Leaders who are in the job for their own means and not for their organisation or staff create resentment and contribute to a poor organisational culture.

In terms of general understanding of the positive variables related to organisational culture and leadership the vast majority of the respondents were in agreement about what are positive and negative attributes for organisational function. The majority of the answer deviation was perceptually based according to how the respondent viewed their particular organisation. This phenomenon suggests that universal organisational guidelines for leaders and leadership are possible.

4.5.4 Change Results

The change portion of the interview instrument was aimed at allowing respondents give their perceptions on the overall thematic of change in their respective organisation and also encouraged narratives concerning specific examples (see Table 13, q 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7). The subjects’ attention was largely divided between how change was handled, how they thought it should be handled and the results of those changes. It was interesting to note that the responses in this section did not have the same definition based ambiguity that was present in the cultural section of the interview. The following is a results analysis which again has been taken on a question by question basis to illustrate trends and specific attributes, this time of the change section.

*To your recollection, what changes have occurred in your organisation in the last two years?*

It was clear by the responses given that in the last few years, many changes had occurred in each of the subject organisations. Every one of the respondents stated that there had been significant changes during this time either at an operational or technical level. Even so, and although this question was rooted in specificity, virtually all of the respondents answered in general terms despite being prompted for examples. One of the senior respondents rolled their eyes and answered “too many” (Subject 12). This construct again illustrated the high propensity of change in organisations that was demonstrated throughout the review of literature. Apart from operational and technical change, some cited examples of pay structure
changes, regulatory and standards changes, organisational restructuring, new business acquisitions and general market and business growth when prompted for examples.

**In your opinion, did your own leaders or managers create these changes or were they imposed on your organisation by an external source?**

The answers to this question were split. Some respondents indicated that the changes were imposed internally and others cited external imposed change. In some instances the respondents indicated that external changes prompted them to make organisational changes in order to effectively adapt to the new situation. There was however significant comment from subjects across all of the organisations about enforced external regulations although the associated change was inferred rather than specifically indicated. Whether this had a positive or negative impact is unknown as the subjects commented more about how many regulations came in or changed during their time in their roles and the associated ‘nuisance factor’ of having to report against the regulations rather than whether those regulations were of an overall value to the organisations.

The nature of this question suggests that change has a propensity to occur on internal, external and blended levels and the further data collected suggests that neither have an advantage over the other in terms of respondent perception. In the internal manner, however, it was thought that the organisation does have control and therefore can put a ceiling on the amount of change that an organisation can handle effectively or on how to better prepare the organisation for change. If all of the changes are internal, the phenomenon of “too many” changes could be rectified.

This question also had a subsection that asked to give an example of when the leadership or management imposed a positive or negative change in the organisation. While many of the respondents gave examples, most did not specify whether or not the purpose of the change was positive or negative. Positive change was viewed as a part of normal organisational life and therefore did not particularly stand out as being exceptional. However there was a lot of comment about how well the change was planned at senior level and by external regulators, how little preparation time they had been given to implement change, and how much these changes inhibited their ability to perform their routine work.
In these cases change was viewed as mostly being negative and a knee-jerk reaction to a trigger that was either unknown to them or had not fully embraced. There was no differentiation made between first and second order change or how proposed change was linked to the organisation’s goals and purposes. The data gathered, however, illustrated examples that ranged from expansion to bringing in a new training officer or project manager. In the case of expansion, the respondent (a CEO) asserted that the expansion was a positive construct and that it overall helped the agility of the firm and strengthened its place in the market (Subject 1).

*How well did the leadership and management implement this change?*

This question suggested that the majority of respondents felt that they were mostly effective in implementing change but this was more on the basis of how many people went along with the change rather than whether the change was linked to improved performance, sales or the like. Again these responses spoke to limited time to think through the implementation phase of change and in particular how to bring others on board. This suggests a passive view of influence rather than deliberate intention of influencing others to accept the change and support the implementation process. On the other hand, further questions suggested a number of improvements that would have made a smoother transition that will be discussed at length in later sections. This perceived duality suggests that the respondents were aware of how difficult change is to lead and manage in theory – particularly when they were responsible for the change process- and therefore viewed this favourably.

Some middle level respondents acknowledged that they thought that their leaders did a good job with implementing change in their organisations but they stated that this was not the general consensus among more junior staff. Some stated that the senior leaders and managers did a “pretty good” job and one suggested that a rating of 5 out 10 best defined their transition and again this was “pretty good” (Subject, 16,). Again no differentiation was made between first and second order change and the role that leaders play in each. Regardless, the answers given were important in that it showed a low expectation level in the constructs related to change. Witness the 5 out of 10 score given by the earlier cited respondent who considered the manager’s implementation ability to be a “pretty good” (Subject 16).

Another respondent gave critical insight into why s (he) though their leadership team did a good job. In this example, the respondent cited keeping close knit teams and information flow
from the executive level to middle level and on to these teams and back as the reason it was successful (Subject 1).

Very few respondents overtly stated that a poor job was done in implementing the change in their organisation. In addition to possible low expectation levels for change management, it is also plausible that these leaders are either aware of the difficulties related to change, were not aware that they has in fact delivered a poor outcome or did not want to put themselves in a bad light.

None of the subjects had been involved in change review processes in order to determine what had and had not worked well. Focus was more on whether targets had been met rather than how well the change processes were implemented. Thus there was no learning from real-life change situations or reflections which could be used to improve the implementation of future change projects. Subjects 19 and 33 both spoke of some resistance to change in their organisations and said that resistance was not specific to a particular level. They gave examples of actors’ comments ‘we tried that before and it didn’t work’ and ‘it won’t work’ which they said illustrated open resistance to change in their organisations. Neither of these two leaders found out what ‘it’ was or why ‘it’ did not work previously, rather individuals were told that change steps had to be achieved regardless of their views.

*How have these changes impacted on you specifically and the organisation?*

Although this question was multifaceted (see Table 13, q 2.5), the majority of the respondents stopped at the question portion that asked how the changes impacted them personally. Few of the respondents went on to explain what this meant to the organisation. While some inferences could be made based on the first part of the answer, the second part was virtually lost, despite prompts. The researcher concluded that a division of these two questions would have been more suitable for symmetrical data and information on both personal impact and organisational impact. The personal data, on the other hand, was quite candid and extensive. Very few of the respondents said that they were doing less work or that there was no effect on their respective situation. Most of the respondents indicated that the change left them with more responsibility and accountabilities and the need to be more risk adverse in their decision making. Without exception they all complained about the number of meetings that they had to attend and how much time seemed to be wasted on ancillary issues which took them away
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from their core work. Here the emphasis was in the change process rather than the nature of
the change itself.

There was no correlation between the assessment of more or new responsibility and
unfavourable perceptions on change. This suggested an objectivity and a reinforcement of
validity in the responses as it would have been quite human for respondents who were given
new or more responsibilities to have a negative perception on the respective change in
question. Some respondents readily articulated positive outcomes that included more
potential for rewards and efficiency through integration. One (Subject 45) even stated the
change allowed them to get an office, which was something they did not have prior to the
change. The lack of unfavourable responses could again return to the assumption that
conditions deemed very unfavourable ultimately would result in staff leaving the
organisation; particularly in those situations where the discussed change was more than a
year old and still poorly handled.

Should leaders/managers behave differently during times of change? If so how?
This question was one of the few interview questions which resulted in almost unanimous
responses. A majority of the respondents stated that managers and leaders should behave
differently in times of change (see Table 13, q 2.6). While they did not suggest that the traits
they mentioned shouldn’t be employed at other times, the common thematic among
respondents was that more care and exaggeration of favourable leadership and managerial
traits should occur during times of change. Some of the specific examples cited were:

1. Two way information distribution (listening and explaining)
2. Taking staff suggestions seriously and adapting based on the input from people actual
   in the proverbial trenches.
3. More proactive approaches to daily operations
4. More focus on staff support
5. Better modelled behaviour
6. The perpetuation of positive attitudes
7. The consideration of long term implications
8. More planning before roll-out
9. Better co-ordination between innovations and routine work
10. Taking the time to communicate in a way that everyone understood.
These same attributes were essentially outlined during the portion of the interview when respondents were asked what qualities make good leaders and managers. The answers to this section suggest that further care in using these qualities and the way in which these qualities are used are necessary during times of organisational change and arguably more in instances of major or wider impacting change (second order).

*Do you think that your leaders/managers have given you enough on-going support or follow-up to ensure the changes were adequate?*

The answers to this question were also overtly favourable. Since the interview was given to leaders, it is possible that this data is bit skewed and that the respondents were more forgiving as a result of understanding the leadership and managerial aspect of change. On the other hand, even leaders have seniors so it is quite possible that they did not figure themselves into this equation and simply looked at the individuals they regarded as leaders and managers and rated their organisational performance. Each respondent reported instances of follow up through meetings, even if the follow up was not much more than a “talk fest” (Subject 12). Some rated the follow up ‘adequate’. In those few instances where negative or poor feedback was given, the primary reason was that despite meetings, there was no follow up of the type of information they needed and therefore information was not flowing.

Those middle level respondents who stated that they did not understand the new disciplinary and rewards system also reported that they were not satisfied with the follow up given by more senior leaders and managers. Their lack of information suggests that some degree of stoppage is present in the information flow. Whether or not this is perception, self-induced or if it external is irrelevant as it is present and therefore a problem that is not being attended to is present. These situations can potentially create larger rifts or cultural problems in the future if left unattended.

**4.5.4 Recurring themes: Change**

1. All of the respondents reported being familiar with the concept of organisational change and many were familiar with multiple instances of organisational change in their organisations. However none could definitively explain how change should be
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rolled out to make it more acceptable or could give examples of change models or theory even though they all confessed to having responsibilities for change to a greater or lesser degree in their organisations;

2. Responsibility for the change process was often passed on as belonging to another department/section/leader. Here responsibility was viewed as blame;

3. Change is costly to the organisation both in monetary and lost productivity terms;

4. Respondents viewed committees and meetings as the usual (and the best) vehicle for rolling out change, however they often interfered with routine work;

5. The respondents saw the same propensity for success or failure in instances driven by internal and external change;

6. Rarely was the rationale behind change communicated, rather it was assumed that it was something which had to be achieved;

7. Respondents agree that too much change is not good for their organisations but could not explain what constituted ‘too much’;

(The researcher believes this to be a correlation between the previously mentioned perceptual attributes of instability. As with high turnover rates, too many changes can be perceived by staff as being tumultuous and the organisational culture can in turn reflect this).

There was no reflection on past change initiatives to view what did and did not work well; situations were addressed with new changes as solutions rather than checking whether parts of previous change projects were poorly implemented or could be used to address future situations. Thus the ‘uncertainty’ factor (see Knight, 1921, pp. 30-35) of organisational change is an inherent problem in these organisations.

8. Leaders must exaggerate and use the effective leadership with specific regards and care during times of organisational change;

9. Preparing for change is difficult and there was a high degree of empathy amongst the respondents when reporting on how well they and other leaders and managers did in implementing various changes;

10. Even in situations where positive change has occurred, not all leaders were pleased with the results;
11. Change without understanding and adhering to change models particularly in prior planning, set-up and explanations, follow up and training is far more likely to be perceived as unsuccessful than change with extensive follow up and long term care;
12. Communication synergy between staff and management is central for creating a climate conducive to change. If the staff believes information is being withheld from them or that their ideas are being disregarded, this will be reflected in the culture and in the way they perceive the change;
13. Change should not always occur as a response to a knee-jerk reaction to an external situation. Rather more time should be spent in fixing existing initiatives rather than taking on new ones.

Although not specifically stated in all instances, the word or context of flexibility was present on numerous levels throughout the responses of this interview section. As a result and although not on the list, it is important to note that the respondents seemed to value flexibility in leaders as being central to positive organisational change.

4.5.5 Learning Results

The learning organisation portion of the interview instrument was designed in an effort to learn more about the subject perspective on how leadership education and training is provided and viewed in their respective organisation. This section seemed more difficult for the respondents to answer and stay focused. Many respondents indicated under certain questions that they did not know or that it was not applicable to their situation. It was noted by the researcher that no specific question received more “I don’t know” or “It is not applicable to me: responses than any another question in this section thus suggesting that this was not an interview tool related issue. These answers did however seem to illustrate that formal training in their sections was not planned or co-ordinated with the leaders as a regular occurrence but was rather a reactive rather than proactive activity.

Despite these issues, a number of critical contexts were revealed in this section, particularly one perceptual dynamic that necessitates discussion. In this regard, some respondents viewed leadership training on sliding continuum of necessity. Some felt that such training was important in some circumstances but the individual should be self- motivated to better themselves. In these instances the notion of leadership was connected to personal identity and
that training was only necessary if there was something “wrong with the leader” (Subject 13). Other individuals were quite ardent that it was the organisation’s responsibility to provide leadership training and to make sure that they and other leaders were qualified to perform their positions, preferably before they were put into a position. In all cases training was viewed as being something outside of their normal routine, rather than considering that learning from the successes and failures in their leadership work or that coaching or mentoring within their organisations was also legitimate forms of leadership learning in the same way that it is in the technical side of their work.

It is important to note however that no one suggested that leadership training/education was entirely unnecessary; rather it was the stock that they put in the training’s value that differed. This was sometimes dependent on the training course and sometimes on the person delivering the training. The general view was that most of the external leadership training that they had received, although usually interesting, did not translate well into the workplace. However two leaders who had graduated from a University course, in which leadership was taught, were satisfied with their acquired knowledge and its relevance to the workplace (Subjects 1 and 2). As in the previous sections, the results have been broken down into a question specific format to illustrate trends and other relevant considerations.

*Do you think that your work related opinions/ideas are listened to by the leadership/management of your organisation? Example?*

The answers to this question was essentially split between yes, no and sometimes, and revealed a critical cultural perception rather than an analysis of its propensity amongst these organisations. However none of the subjects thought that failing to listen to staff ideas and suggestions was a favourable leader practice although it often happened in reality. Those who stated that their leaders (including Board Members) did not listen to them when it was needed tended to also reflect a negative outlook about their organisation’s leadership and culture stating that it was discouraging and unfavourable to overall morale. Alternately in the situations where the respondent indicated that their leaders did in fact listen to their ideas, they also had a positive attitude about their leadership and organisational culture. One respondent went so far as describing the process of leader/staff criticism and dialogue as being positive and that it was the catalyst for positive change rather than misunderstanding (Subject 38).
How do its leaders and managers view mistakes in this organisation? Give examples.

Most of the respondents reflected that they felt mistakes were dealt with properly in their organisation (see Table 13, q 3.02), although in follow-up, many respondents confessed to not owning up to mistakes because of fear as to how they would be subsequently treated or viewed. In terms of proper dealing, however, the following characteristics reoccurred in how the respondents defined positive handling of mistakes: understanding not yelling, response with adequate mentoring or training, and direct action when necessary. Alternately in those dealings that were deemed ineffective included instances of yelling, blame and lack of training follow up. Some respondents suggested that the mistakes were dealt with better when the area in which the mistake was recorded was close to the management rather than in a satellite or remote location. Equitable, consistent, professional communication seemed to be the overarching factor in this articulation and it was suggested by the respondent that communication was more difficult in remote areas even with modern technology.

In your opinion is there more tolerance to mistakes being made at one level of the organisation over another? If so please explain.

Most of the respondents did not feel comfortable answering this question as they were not present at all levels and thus thought that it would not be fair to make judgements about this matter. However, even amongst these respondents, there was a suspicion that some asymmetry in tolerance did occur on levels other than their own. Few respondents had any pertinent examples to back this claim however and four were not willing to have examples documented for fear of reprisal. In reality, this perception could breed mistrust. Even if no preferential tolerance is occurring in the organisation but it is perceived that it is, a cultural malignancy is present that would necessitate remedy or better lines of communication or exposure.

In your opinion, how often does training occur when mistakes are made?

The answers to this question were split and showed very little coherency. Some respondents reflected that because leadership training happens regularly, it makes it impossible to distinguish whether it is because of mistakes having been made or not. Others stated that in theory this idea was expressed by the management but in practice it was not utilised or not utilised with the necessary propensity to be effective on any level. Many respondents simply stated that they just did not know and therefore could not answer the question.
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How well is knowledge passed on/shared in your organisation from the leadership/management?

As in the case with other responses, the answers to this question were split with some respondents saying that it is done well and others saying that it is not done at all well. The important commonality however, is that when knowledge was not passed down or shared across leaders, it was viewed as being negative.

One respondent said knowledge is shared well at the most senior managerial level but on the middle and particularly lower levels it was “like extracting teeth” (Subject 28), thus illustrating that sometimes merely modelling positive behaviour is not enough to initiate positive attributes in the organisational culture. Even in the situations where it was deemed fair or good, many of the respondents still suggested that knowledge sharing could be improved.

Tell me about on-going training in your organisation?

This particular question was far more open ended than many others. Overall, it was useful as previously pointed out, many of the questions in this section were answered with I don’t know or not applicable to me. Despite the open ended nature of this question, some critical details were provided. The vast amount of answers followed the pattern that reflected whether or not on-going training was present or was not present in the organisation.

Some respondents saw the lack of on-going training as being negative and cited previous companies they worked for as having the same problem. Other respondents stated that on-going training was not present and that it was only used when major situations arose. The view was that under-staffing, increased work levels, diminishing budgets and escalating targets did not allow much time out of the workplace. Of these individuals, some felt this was positive and others felt it was a problem. The individuals who saw this as positive were the same individuals who placed a high value on being self-sufficient and motivated.

However the general consensus was that training was usually provided in a hap-hazard like manner below University level. Short courses were given as a knee-jerk reaction to change or as one respondent suggested ‘a poly-filler’ for missing work skills and thus a soft punishment. There is no pre-planned order of education or training that is planned ahead of time within any of these organisations. Where it exists is usually because organisations have paid for them or their staff to attend external courses provided by TAFEs and Universities.
Senior leaders however said that they were able to attend several industry conferences each year and this provided them with their ongoing learning.

In your view, are people usually promoted within the organisation or does promotion usually occur by bringing in people who are external to the organisation?

As with many of the other responses in this section, how the individual perceived their company to handle the outlined matter varied. The relevant thematic that surfaced in almost all of the answers was that when organisations only promote from the outside, the internal culture suffers. One particular respondent stated that his/her organisation never promoted from within the company and staff saw this organisation as being a stepping stone since there was no corporate ladder. This particular situation resulted in a culture of high staff turnover.

Another respondent suggested that overlooking internal staff members for promotion sends a message to the leader that not only are they are ill equipped to handle the rigours of higher positions and but not worthy of development (Subject 14). This could also be a reflection of the lack of pro-active training for succession planning. This phenomenon also brings to fruition the self-fulfilling prophecy cliché. Leading researchers and those in the trenches on the organisational level have reported correlation between high expectations and high performance (Ancona, et. al., 2005). Not ever promoting from within or doing so not on a regular basis is more akin with low staff expectations than high staff expectation.

On the other hand, some respondents made it quite clear that it is not always possible or advantageous to promote leaders from within the organisation. They also made it clear that the opposite held true and that promoting from outside is not always the best organisational manoeuvre. Balance in the promotional strategy and attention to the message it is sending permeated the thematic of the respondent answers.

What would you like to see done differently in relation to learning/training? Why? Most of the respondents did not have suggestions to what they would like to see done differently. Many responded N/A, that they felt the situation was fine as it was or adequate and others still insisted that no change is required as individuals should drive themselves (e.g. Subjects 1, 3, 14, 57, 58). Overall, this question produced no correlative data that necessitates critical reflection in terms of the greater purpose of the work. With the question being relatively straightforward, it is the opinion of the research that the phrasing of the question was not
problematic but it appeared that the respondents had not thought critically about change on the training level or knew there was any other approach to training than the one that they experienced.

*What training/learning would you like to see re-enforced?*

Though quite similar to the first question, this one seemed to prompt more responses. The top re-enforced contexts that were suggested in some articulation by the respondents were the following:

1. Training existing leaders to take over more senior leader positions (leadership training for succession). This would encourage promoting from the inside and give a favourable corporate culture.
2. Organisation specific training courses for skills such as influencing techniques, conflict resolution, networking, human relations, writing, communication and general people skills – although this last aspect was not elaborated for clarity.
3. Training that explains the importance of the daily business operation and how decisions today can affect the organisation in the long term.
4. Planned training programs that allowed a career path.
5. Leadership training should better reflect the needs of the organisation

These responses suggest that contrary to the low response rate on the previous question that the majority of respondents had thought about training and how it should be employed by the organisation.

*Were you given an induction into your role? Has this induction been followed up on? Should it be?*

This section is a combination of two questions in the interview instrument that pertain to the same topic so they were listed together for better articulation of the data results. Virtually all of the respondents claimed that they had some sort of induction before they came into their leader role but that it was both informal and minimal and without follow up. Most felt that a follow up would have been advantageous and even comforting. Some of the inductions were reported as being as minimal as being handed a policy binder and some respondents described their induction as being “sink or swim” (Interview, 20). Even the individuals who believed in self-motivation and self-drive reported that some follow up would have been
better than nothing. However those leaders requiring induction on the technical side of their role where safety was paramount reported that it was rigorous, regular and structured.

*Do you think that leaders and managers should have induction training/on-going training in their roles? Why? How well is this done in your organisation?*

These two questions provided an almost universal response amongst Interviews. Most of the individuals felt that leaders and managers should have an induction and on-going training to develop their leadership and managerial skills (see Table 13, q 3.09 and 3.11).

Many commented that it would be helpful because what they have learned elsewhere did not always translate into their current roles. Induction and follow up training or education was considered especially important to those higher in the organisation although they were concerned as to how that could occur without them ‘losing face’ or confidence from their Board or juniors. However these leaders also admitted that as much as they would benefit from such ongoing training they did not have the time to attend courses. This suggests that leadership training in their minds equates to correction rather than development. There was a common thematic that more is expected from leaders and that their job requires more education and support than regular staff members but how that should occur is unclear. The nature of this special consideration necessitates on-going training and education according to respondents. Overall, the respondents felt that training should be more in depth for leaders and managers the higher up the organisation they are; that constant change required leaders to be ahead of the curve and that on-going training is more apt to help keep leaders and managers in the know about macro and micro dealings in the organisation.

While virtually all of the respondents said that leaders need more extensive training than ordinary staff, most of them admitted that whatever training or education they had was as a result of attending University or TAFE courses prior to being hired. Some expressed quite ardently that ongoing training simply was not done in their organisation and that more attention was placed on staff training at the lower levels than at leader level. They considered that this was an innately flawed view of staff development in their organisation.
4.5.6 Recurring Themes: Learning

Although some response ambiguity was present and some of the questions were not answered by every respondent, there was sufficient overall attention to the question to point out important thematic for the study. Specifically, the data collected from the respondents regarding learning organisations can be summed up as follows:

1. Leaders (and managers) who pay attention to their staff’s concerns perpetuate a more positive cultural reflection than those who do not;
2. The opinion on leadership training and its necessity is split between proponents of organisational responsibility for training and individual responsibility for learning necessary leadership tasks;
3. Mistakes that are dealt with by yelling, finger pointing or using humiliation tactics are inferior to dealing with mistakes through understanding, training and group accountability;
4. It is advantageous for knowledge to be passed both up, down and across an organisation;
5. Promoting should be done from both within and externally depending on the situation using the knowledge that constant outside promotions are bad for morale.
6. The companies under study have a minimal induction program for leaders with an even more minimal follow up program and virtually no succession planning/training;
7. Higher expectations are placed on leaders and managers – but particularly leaders - thus necessitating that more attention should be placed on manager and leader training than is currently occurring;
8. Responsibility for leader training should be planned, co-ordinated and monitored within organisations and these activities not just abdicated to external providers, TAFEs and Universities;
9. Leadership training should be relevant to the organisation’s needs;
10. Ongoing leader education (at all levels) should be promoted and delivered as a routine part of staff development.

This particular section was valuable in that it extended information from beyond the review of literature. The employee perception of learning was obviously different from the theoretical view of on-going training which typically reflects the context as being both
necessary and positive. The waning and fluctuating staff perception of training necessitates that leaders have an accurate understanding of their organisational pulse before they attempt to train to fix problems.

4.5.7 Identity Results

The identity section of the interview is perhaps the most subjective of the four, however its inclusion is both necessary and advantageous to the overall scope of the research in that it provides a critical insight to how the individual views themselves and how this may have affected the answers in which they gave at other intervals in the research. After collecting the data, it was clear that the respondents were not afraid to give self -criticism in this format. Perhaps the nature of this discourse being a bipartisan third party made this possible. In terms of research validity, this was helpful in establishing sound results. The results discussion has been included on a per question basis following the same order in which they were asked on the interview instrument to best establish correlation and possible inconsistencies.

*How would you describe yourself as an individual?*

Given that this interview targeted leaders, the importance of this particular question was whether respondents would make a distinction between personal and organisational identities. It was however, impossible to access whether or not the respondents were favourable or negative leaders based on the self- evaluation in this and subsequent questions. Some of the responses to this question included: friendly, honest, co- operative, happy, strong, focused, reflective and workaholic (Subject 19). Most people stuck to aspects of their personal identity. Some however went straight to their social (organisational) identities in stating that they were good at their job. One person in particular demonstrated a great deal of confidence in their social identity, ignoring the personal and answered that he/she was in fact a good leader (Subject 32).

*How would you describe yourself in your role in this organisation?*

While identification of one’s personality does not lend itself to embellishment or falsehoods, this question provides a possible asymmetrical attribute in that the way in which the individual sees their role in the organisation may be different from the way in which staff, other leaders or their own managers view them in their role as ‘leader’. Since there is no way
to access their credibility, the way in which they perceive themselves in the organisation is taken by the researcher to be the case but it is necessary to note that this is a self-perceptive.

Most of the respondents deemed themselves to be necessary and a vital part of the organisation [in-crowd]. Some individuals, rather than accessing their own corporate value chose to articulate that they have a high degree of accountability for their actions and their sub-ordinates actions (Subject 4). However most were reticent in directly answering the question, preferring to have others make that judgement call. Whether the limited response to this question comes about because of modesty, embarrassment is deemed to be culturally inappropriate or because of a lack of self-awareness, is unknown. Regardless there was little information gained.

In your opinion is there a difference between how a person should behave in their role (including manager and leader roles) and how they behave as a private individual? If so please explain.

Many of the respondents suggested that there was a difference between home and work behaviour but not a difference between personal and social identities.

This response occurred mostly on the level that the workplace required different manners and trait emphasis. One respondent (subject 24) explained that leaders often do not have to lead outside of work and are therefore not called upon to use the skills that they have to at their job and inferred that leaders are made and not created. This respondent explained:

There are likely to be differences, although it is very difficult for any one person to be a different being at work. Leaders require special skills, that are not easily or sub-consciously developed outside of work. A good leader who is the same person in or out of work is likely to be a very special and unique individual. Therefore, it is not a case of there should be differences – it really doesn’t matter – but generally it is a case of there being differences because most people have to work at being a leader (Subject 24).

Although many individuals believed that there was a difference between the ways in which one behaves at work as a leader and the way in which they do at home, many stated that there is no difference or that in a perfect world there should be no difference - thus inferring that the role of leader is entirely personality based. One respondent stated that roles shouldn’t
make the individual and that the individual should make the roles while another person stated quite overtly that there is no difference (Subject 5).

Holistically, the asymmetry in the responses suggests that the division between private and public leadership lives is an interesting debate between the nature of leadership and whether it is a personal or social identity and whether leadership it is contextual. What is of great interest however is that none of the subjects interviewed, even when prompted, considered that they (or any others) ever behaved at work from the constructs of personal identity. All equated personal identity as being something assumed when external to their organisations. A further view being that any displays of emotion in the workplace was justified and acceptable in an organisational role if it came from the interviewed leader but was criticised it as being unprofessional when viewed in other leaders.

*Would you say that the leaders and managers in your organisation behave in a professional manner? (give example explaining your definition of professional as the benchmark)*

Most of the respondents indicated that there was a degree of professionalism expressed by the leaders and managers in their organisations. While most chose not to give a specific example, many of the underlying speech patterns suggested or overtly mentioned the word “respect” in regards to professionalism. Although many of the respondents indicated that professionalism was present in their organisation, many also admitted to observing first-hand circumstances where they and/or other leaders did not behave in a professional manner. Alternately one respondent suggested that they thought that their leader was always intent on behaving professionally even if sometimes their behaviour fell short of this goal (Subject 2). Perhaps further research would be required to identify a common definition of the term *professionalism* to ensure that this question measures the same concept in all of the respondents.

*Are there cliques (a small exclusive group of friends or associates) in your organisation?*

Most of the respondents indicated that cliques were present to some degree in their organisation. Some, however, did stress that no cliques were present and these individuals felt this was a testament to smooth organisational operation and professionalism (Subject 7). On the other hand, most respondents saw cliques as being a natural part of any and every organisation. While they felt cliques could be problematic, they also felt they were unavoidable. As a result, many of their answers tended to minimise the problems which were
related to or caused by cliques. Some felt that cliques in themselves were not problematic unless they reached a level where they undermined their leadership, excluded individuals, became discriminatory or affected other employees in a negative manner such as bullying or sexual harassment. While the veracity of those respondents who indicated that no cliques were present at their work is not being questioned, it is also possible that they simply are not aware of them for a variety of reasons.

*How would you rate the trust within this organisation? Why?*

While the responses to this question varied in terms of how the individuals judged their own workplace, there was a common thematic that trust was important. Trust, according to the respondents, was a favourable cultural and leadership aspect and was a vital component in smooth running of organisations. One respondent specifically cited trust as being the opposite of micromanagement, which they suggested was a threat to organisational success and positive workplace culture (Subject 24). Many of the respondents spoke of trust in terms of reciprocity which was addressed in the next question.

*Do you think that the management and leadership trusted by their staff? Why.*

Most of the respondents indicated that the same general trust level reflected in the previous answer was applicable to this answer as well. Some subjects noted that the natural division between leaders and staff made some staff members hesitant about fully trusting their leaders for fear that it could somehow affect them adversely. But the same people thought that this situation could minimised or not occur at all if leaders were transparent in their intent and communicated openly to staff. In those situations where fear was present, the propensity for mistrust was also present and therefore represents a potential organisational malignancy. In giving trust it was suggested that it will be given back in return and if leaders and managers do not trust their staff they should not expect their staff to trust them. (Subject 1).

*How well does communication occur within this organisation? Example.*

Most of the respondents reflected a general positive correlation between their organisation and communication but also suggested that it could be improved. No one suggested that less communication should occur in their respective organisations. However almost all did suggest that there were too many formal meetings in their organisations which were counterproductive on the basis of excessive time away from necessary daily tasks and that there was too much gossip which occurred – however what constituted ‘too much’ was not
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defined. Overall the answers to this question seemed to reflect a generalist thinking. Several times during the interview in response to earlier questions, subjects raised the topic of lack of communication about meaningful operational and change related issues; of senior leaders not communicating appropriately with each other; and leaders ideas not being given due consideration by other leaders and at times their staff. However none of this was reiterated in the answers to this question. This construct illustrates that while most of the respondents deemed communication to be highly important in organisational culture and in leadership roles, the answers to this question were addressed from a theoretical perspective and more specifically addressed in earlier questions.

4.5.8 Recurring Themes: Identity

Although there was the potential for a bias in this section - perhaps even more so than in the other sections - a fair amount of critical correlative thematic was present that is useful for understanding the nature of leadership in organisational change. In this regard, the following themes manifested with strong prevalence in the subject responses:

1. There was no distinction made between personal and social (organisational) identity when it came to the leader role;
2. Most of the respondents felt that their position in the organisation was a necessary and important one and that a leader role was a reward for work done well;
3. Many leaders felt discouraged because of the lack of authority and support given to them by those at either senior or Board level and therefore ceased to ‘try as hard’;
4. Some individuals thought that leader roles are constant in organisational life and life outside the organisation while others consider humans occupy different roles and identities;
5. Cliques and gossip are present in virtually all organisations and are viewed as ‘normal’, however, the way in which they are handled can make the difference between them being a phenomenon that does not affect organisational operations or their being an organisational malignancy;
6. Trust is an important part of organisational operation and leader and manager roles
7. In those situations where leaders use fear tactics to rule, there is a higher propensity for mistrust, poor performance and mistakes to also manifest;
8. Lack of information, direction and updates are each viewed as a negative attribute that is not good for the organisation or the organisation;
9. Leaders should be visible and highly communicative to help build the trust of their subordinates, however it is largely unknown how to make this happen;
10. Communication is a valuable tool in organisational function and it can always be improved to help operational efficiency.

Overall, the expressed thematic of the identity section of the interview research remained consistent with the review of literature. The responses given indicate that there is confusion in organisations about the differences between leader and manager functionality and whether leader is a personal or social construct. While leaders and leadership also occur outside the workplace, in terms addressing the research question and building a leader and leadership guideline tool, it is not necessary to consider these roles and responsibilities outside of the organisational context. As a result, such out of organisation findings have been noted but it will not affect the guideline tool that will discussed at length in the next section, although this is not to say that it does not have value outside of the organisation, rather it was not designed specifically for that purpose.

4.6 Chapter Summary

The narratives, recordings, field notes and memos associated with the 61 participants who comprised of the single embedded case (see Yin, 2003, 2008) were transcribed verbatim into Word documents. These were imported into 61 corresponding NVivo 8 software files. To ensure anonymity, prevent bias and to allow ease of analysis, obvious forms of identification were removed and replaced by the following codes: Name – identified by number 1-61; Type of organisation: Government Profit (GP); Private Not for Profit (PNFP); Private Profit (PP); Gender: Male (M), Female (F); and Age group: 20-30, 31-40; over 40.

In order to describe and acquire new understanding of the transcribed narratives, NVivo 8 software was used in open, axial and selective coding (see Stauss & Corbin, 1990) and in the development of a final template (see King, 2010) of comprising of codes relating to four themes, forty categories (nodes) and 348 subcategories.

In order to organise the data ready for analysis, the coded data were grouped into three tables:
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- Where the frequency count added to more than 100% (Tables 11)
- Where the frequency count was greater than or equal to 50% (Table 12)
- Where the frequency counts was less than 50% (Table 13)

The results of the analysis were then reported against the questions used in the interview guide and summarised at the end of each theme. This allowed the emergence of a grounded theory (see Strauss & Corbin, 1990) which will be reported on in the next chapter.
Chapter Five: Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications
5 Summary, Conclusions and Implications

It is important to begin this chapter by emphasising that while seeking answers to the central question, the researcher encountered many exemplary leaders who made regular positive contributions to their organisations. The underlying factors which contributed to their successes were carefully examined in this study and found to be the antithesis of those also examined and which contributed to ineffective leadership. However there is nothing of value that the researcher can give the reader by merely adding to the plethora of existing literature concerning what constitutes successful leadership and organisational change. What came out of this study which was both intriguing to this researcher and is of value to the knowledge pool were the conclusions as to why, despite leaders’ best intentions and the vast amount of available scholarship and education regarding leadership, organisations and organisational change, so many leaders still experience difficulties in these areas.

In order to frame the study’s conclusions, this chapter will commence by taking a summarised journey through the central arguments and points raised in the previous chapters. These not only gave rise to the study’s conclusions but also supported the final proposed recommendations, opportunities for further research and the wider implications associated with this study.

5.1 Chapter Summaries

5.1.1 Chapter One

Chapter one established that Australian workplace of the late 1980s was very different from the one we know today. The workforce at that time comprised members of the Silent Generation (those born between 1925 and 1945) and Baby Boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964), whose values were primarily those of duty and hierarchy (Babb & Parlett, 2002; Sayers, 2006). Multiculturalism was still finding its feet and it was much less common for Australian women to hold senior positions than it is today (Sayers, 2006). Prior to the internet becoming commercially available to Australian organisations in the early 1990s, prospective leaders and managers were afforded the time to learn how their organisations worked before being promoted/hired into those roles (Babb & Parlett, 2002; Sayers, 2006). Two decades later and Australian organisations now operate in an environment where change is a constant and where the demands for immediate productivity and instant information have
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become the norm. Today’s organisational leaders can comprise of any or all of the three represented generations. Thus it is not uncommon to find actors being led by individuals of their children’s generation (Sheehan, 2005). Modern organisations face a tsunami of technological and associated changes, competition is now global rather than localised and the potential opportunities and threats are far greater than they were twenty years ago. Leading organisations in the second decade of the new millennium is certainly not for the faint hearted.

One of the first casualties in this frantic new environment is time. This includes enough time for leaders to learn their craft, time for leaders to make mistakes and time to handle those mistakes made. Modern leaders are now either hired internally or externally but always with the expectation that they have already acquired leader and leadership skills and can hit the ground running. More than ever before organisations put their faith in educational qualifications or in the hope that leaders have acquired leadership skills and knowledge from previous organisations. And they expect that the recruitment agencies who hire on their behalf have the skill to be able to find them suitable leaders. In so doing organisations are not just hoping for the best when they hire or promote leaders into new positions, they are gambling with their futures.

As noted in chapter one, regardless of how similar organisations appear to be, no two organisations - even those in the same industry, are the same (Selznick, 1957; Senior & Fleming, 2006). What works in one rarely translates fully to another. As noted this is because each organisation is at a different point in its evolution; each has a different culture, or has different policies, procedures, social and environmental impacts, staff and histories Therefore just as organizations differ so too do their leadership requirements (Draft, 2010; Adler & Gundersen, 2008).

Chapter one also established that in Australian workplaces it is not uncommon to promote people into leadership positions on the basis of their technical/professional experience and/or skills (e.g. Doctors, Accountants, Engineers, IT Specialists, Labourers, Customer Service personnel etc.). However, having skills and experience in a core field does not automatically translate into leadership competence and so leaders are often left floundering once promoted.

As a result, inexperienced leaders run the risk of either focusing on the technical/professional parts of their work which are more familiar to them than their leadership duties, or interfering with the work being done by their reportees for the same reasons.
The first chapter also made mention of the more enlightened organisations using performance measures to assess how well a leader is doing their job. However choosing the ideal measurement tools is not always easy as most tend to be popularity or financially based - particularly at the more senior levels. Rarely are leaders given performance indicators that take into account the wider impact that their behaviours and decision making has on their reportees’ performance. The general organisational stance is that as long as the company is making a profit (or receiving the appropriate funding or support), then a leader must be doing a good job. This could be summarised as being “The end justifies the means” form of leadership assessment. However history has shown that figures can be manipulated and irregularities covered up. Solutions which might make an organisation look financially healthy in the short-term, may not be revealed until years later as being devastating (E.g. Quintex, Bond Corp, Bank of South Australia, Banksia Securities to name but a few).

Consequently it was suggested that financial KPIs are not always a reliable measure of how well a leader is leading and neither is how well they are liked.

Chapter one also established that an organisation is an entity in its own right and noted that the leader role comes with responsibility and the attitude of service to the organisation and its dependents. Further the exchange for leading an organisation into the future and through the rocky travails of everyday life are the salaries, support mechanisms and opportunities afforded to such people. However it was also noted that some leaders may not be living up to their organisation’s expectations and thus we have the feeling that some are being paid more than they are worth.

The first chapter revisited the earlier notion that the modern Australian workplace is almost unrecognisable from what it was two decades ago. Apart from the obvious technology advancements, it is increasingly common to find three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y) working alongside each other in organisations comprised of a melting pot of diverse ethnicities, associated cultures, religions and varying educational standards and skill sets.

With this diversity comes a range of widely varying realities concerning every aspect of working life – including leadership meaning and application. It was posed that one of the positive aspects of this phenomena is that multidirectional thinking and realities can result in innovation and fresh approaches.
However from her role as an organisational consultant spanning more than two decades, the researcher commented on increasing instances of leadership confusion, frustration and conflict arguably caused by competing realities in the workplace. Added to this, numerous leaders have voiced their concerns to the researcher about how they should lead in work environments where the demands to succeed seems to be escalating, and where internal and external organisational change is the norm and diversity is a given.

These voiced concerns not only challenged the researcher’s thinking at the time but also sparked the central research question now being posed – “What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary organisations undergoing change?”

5.1.2 Chapter Two

Chapter Two began with an explanation as to why this study is anchored in sociology and social theory. An examination of possible approaches to this study revealed that Grand Theory (see Mills, 1959) is an overarching approach to Critical Theory, Structuralism, Structural Marxism and Structuration Theory. The central premise of Grand Theory approach is that “No matter the phenomenon investigated, it could always be slotted into a wider theoretical scheme. Nothing would be left out; everything would be explained” (Gregory et al, 2009, pp.315-316). As a comparison Middle Range Theory was also found to be theoretical approach but to such theoretical constructions as Reference Groups, Social Mobility, Normalization Processes, Role Conflict and the formation of Social Norms (Merton,1968,p.39). This is an approach by which measurable aspects of social society can be studied as separate social phenomena. Because it begins with an empirical phenomenon rather than a broad abstract entity such as an entire social system as espoused by Grand Theory, and allows for general statements to be abstracted and verified by data, Middle Range Theory was determined to be the most suitable approach to take in this study.

Continuing down the path of Sociology and Social theory, Identity and Social Identity Theories were examined. According to Identity theorists such as Stryker, (1968), Burke (1980), and Wiley (1991), not only do we accumulate numerous role identities in our lives but some identities are more salient than others.

A deeper examination of the literature revealed that individuals classify themselves as belonging to and not belonging to various social groups and this is known as their Social
Identity (E.g. Turner, et.al 1986; Tajifel, 1978 and Haslam, 2004). To this end when an individual identifies with a particular social group(s) it becomes their ‘in-group(s)’ and their ‘out group(s)’ are those social groups that they do not identify with. Taking this concept one step further, members of an ‘in-group’ will seek to find negative aspects and even vilify members of an ‘out group’ in order to enhance their self-esteem (see Hogg and Abrams, 1988). This led the researcher to wonder whether this phenomenon could possibly have a connection to workplace bulling and favouritism.

The chapter then progressed to a particular form of Social Identity known as organisational identity which, according to Hall et al, (1970) is "the process by which the goals of the organisation and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent" (pp 176-177). It was at this point that the researcher sought to understand why some actors assume an organisational identity and others do not.

This led to understanding an important distinction made in the literature between organisational identity and organisational commitment (see Reichers, 1985). Organisational commitment was characterised as being the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, a particular organisation. However it was also noted that commitment does not always mean that the individual has formed an organisational identity. Rather commitment could also occur because the organisation is a convenient vehicle for the individual to achieve their career goals.

Having anchored the research to sociology and social theory, it was time to focus more clearly on the first of the study’s core components— the organisation. Thus this section began by seeking a definition of ‘organisation’ that would be suitable for use throughout study. After reviewing the merits and limitations of several definitions, the Pride et al.(1989) definition was chosen - "a group of two or more people working together in a pre-determined fashion to achieve a common set of goals" (p.5). This definition spoke to four pivotal points which were important to this study. First it was the only definition found to acknowledge that an organisation can comprise of as little as two people and thus would be applicable to small businesses. Next, it acknowledges that organisations have to operate within already established boundaries (predetermined fashion) and finally that all within the organisation are working to a common set of goals. This final point assumed the earlier notion of organisational identity and commitment.
The predetermined fashion part of Pride et al. definition of organisation was determined to include the way in which the organisation is formally structured so that it can best achieve its common set of goals. Unfortunately the research revealed that formal structures are sometimes overridden by informal structures (see Senior & Flemming, 2006). This occurs when actors fail to pay attention to their organisation’s structures, policies, procedures, job descriptions, communication channels and so on and is known as strategic drift (see Johnson, 1987; Handy, 1989). One of the dangers of strategic drift is that it creates the perfect environment for group think to manifest which according to Jannis (1972) is a mode of thinking that people engage in when congruence-seeking becomes so dominant that it overrides “a realistic appraisal of an alternate course of action” (p.42).

Following on from the irrationalities of group think, the nature of money was then examined (not so coincidentally) because money is central to the operation of all organisations whether through payments, investments, funding or donations. A review of the literature revealed that there are four functions of money in modern society: (i) as a form of exchange for the goods/services made/delivered by organisations; (ii) a measure of value identifying cost or value; (iii) a standard of deferred payment (credit) and (iv) a store of value for future use (see Veblen, 1898; Keynes, 1930; Schumpeter, 1954; Smithin 2000; Dwivedi, 2009). Thus an important distinction was made between money as a form of exchange and the organisation’s end product which are the goods or services that the organisation produces or delivers. Thus the purpose of most organisations (excluding a country’s Mint, Investment or Currency Trading organisations) is not to make money. Rather the purpose is to produce its goods/services in a manner that makes it valuable enough to others that they will pay for those goods and services on a repetitive basis.

Having addressed the wider issues of social and identity theories and approaches, and the nature of organisations and money, the review then honed in on the organisation’s leaders and leadership followed by management and organisational change which are the other core components of this study. To this end the next section began by reviewing the following prominent leadership theories: Great Man Theory; Group and Trait Theories; Behavioural Theory; Contingency Theory and Contemporary Theory (including Situational, Participative, Transformational, Transactional and Excellence).

Unfortunately the literature revealed a vast number of often conflicting definitions of the term leader and leadership as well as numerous instances where scholars and practitioners used
these terms and management interchangeably. Mindful of Rost’s (1993) lamentation that “researchers routinely confuse leader with leadership and leadership with management” (p.43) the researcher paused to examine what if anything differentiates leader with leadership and management and what definitions could be used as benchmarks throughout this study. After considerable research and consideration, the following Rost (1993) definitions of leader and leadership were chosen as being the most suitable for this study - not only because it is a comprehensive definition but because it positioned leaders and followers with change and purpose where other definitions did not:

Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. From this definition, there are four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists or is occurring… [one] The relationship based on influence … [two] leaders and followers are the people in this relationship… [three] Leaders and followers intend real changes… [and four] Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. (pp. 102-103).

With leader and leadership definitions addressed the review then examined the literature relating to popular management theory and explained that because the following Mullins (1990) definition of management was both comprehensive and allowed for the modern concept of self –management, it would be used as the benchmark definition in this study.

Management takes place within a structured organisational setting with prescribed roles; is directed towards the (set) aims and objectives; is achieved through the efforts of other people (or self); and uses systems and procedures (p. 166).

Thus the appropriate definitions were in place and distinctions made between leader, leadership and management. The researcher then posed the question “why study leaders and leadership?” The literature revealed numerous scholars who agreed with Burns’ (1979) assertion “that we fail to grasp the essence of leadership and its relevance to the modern age, hence we cannot even agree on the standards which measure, recruit and reject it” (p.1).However leadership theorists (e.g. Bennis 2009; Hare 1993; Kakabadse et al., 2001; Kotter, 1996; Puth, 2002; Rost,1993), proposed that in order to better understand leadership there should be less emphasis placed on the traits of the leader and more given to understanding the nature of influencing.
In order to understand how actors are intentionally and unintentionally influenced, the researcher delved into the fields of neuroscience and neuropsychology where it was determined that influence is largely reliant on biology.

Happily, there is a growing movement to bring brain understanding into the social sciences and thus the researcher was fortunate to have access to a respectable amount of resource material written by neuroscientist and neuropsychologists for non-medical understanding. Basic brain make-up, including the roles of the triune brain, amygdala, feelings, emotions with their associated triggers and purposes and moods were discussed in order to determine how a leader’s influence can be either deliberate or unintentional and how each impact on followers.

The literature review then turned to ‘change’ and revealed that change is classified as being first or second order in nature. First order change is reversible, is characterised by linear change within existing organisational structures and is often associated with the theoretical perspective of organisational development (Levy & Merry, 1986). Second order change is associated with crisis or rapid growth, is irreversible at its core and requires new learning and transformation to ensure that people behave or operate differently (Bateson, 1979; Bergquist 1993). It soon became apparent that there are hundreds of change models within these two typologies but that they generally fall into Van de Ven and Poole’s (1995) four basic theories of change – those which reflect life cycle models (start-up, growth, harvest, terminate); evolutionary models (variation, selection and retention); teleological models (formation, implementation, evaluation and modification) and dialectic models (conflicts - thesis and antithesis). A further review of the change literature identified Diffusion as a change strategy rather than an overall approach. Diffusion occurs when change actors note trends or seek to capitalise on already established good ideas (Ellsworth, 2000). This was included in the literature review in case it appeared in the field work.

Because there is often risk associated with any form of organisational change understanding the nature of risk, uncertainty and ambiguity was important to this study and thus these aspects were examined as was the notion that knowing what should be preserved in organisations is just as important to leaders as knowing what and when to change.

The literature review also delved into the relationship between leadership and regulation. While regulation was seen as being necessary for the protection of organisations and consumers alike, the review noted that over-regulation could and often does according to
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Scholars and practitioners, hinder innovation and leadership function. Over-regulation was opined as being detrimental to an organisation's ability to achieve its long-term goals. This view was endorsed by Google's CEO, Eric Schmidt in his 2012 address to regulators when he warned “If you have to regulate, try to regulate the outcome not the technology” as “the unintended cost of regulation is often the loss of innovation”.

Moving from the broader concepts of organisation and change, the review then focused more specifically on leader and leadership application. While there was an enormous body of scholarship concerning the traits and habits of 'good' leadership and what it means to be an 'effective leader', there was also small but growing emphasis in the literature that leadership can fail because of the nefarious nature of the leader. *Destructive Leadership* (Einarsen, 2007), *The Dark Side of Leadership* (Semann and Slattery, 2009) and *Dysfunctional Leadership* (Lombardo, 1983; Lombardo et al., 1983; McCall), Mulford (2008) and Mulford and Silins (2002, 2011) all concentrated on leadership failure caused by the flawed personality of the leader.

As Conger (1998) asserts quantitative research alone cannot produce a good understanding of leadership because “the extreme and enduring complexity of the leadership phenomena itself” (p. 108). Accordingly and because the focus of this study centered on social actors who work in an organisational context, the study reviewed the tenants of social research as part of the qualitative approach. Crotty's hierarchy of research design (1998) which includes various theoretical perspectives, methodologies and methods available to the researcher was examined and found to provide the most useful ‘backbone’ approach for this study.

Various research design methodologies and methods were reviewed in order to determine which approaches would best capture the unique differences of the individual actors under study as well as permitting the essential sameness of each of these actors (Ashworth 2003 and Gergen, 1999). Because the researcher hypothesised that there would not likely be one single truth revealed in the study but rather would be decided by human judgement, the researcher examined interpretivist approaches, Grounded Theory and Triangulation to allow for multiple methodologies and methods which would allow the culmination of the emergence of a theoretical model.

With an examination of research design theory in place, this concluded the literature review and allowed the researcher to move to the next stage of the study as outlined in the summary of Chapter three.
5.1.3 Chapter Three

Chapter Three outlined the adoption of a three stage research approach. Stage one addressed the research design, stage two dealt with data collection methods and stage three with evaluating and analysing data.

Following on from the investigation into research methodologies in Chapter Two, the researcher chose to employ a single embedded case study comprised of mixed purposeful sampling as the means of the data collection stage of this study. Four sites were chosen from two capital cities in Australia. These sites represented the Public and Private Sector and profit and not for profit statuses. The details are as follows:

Organisation A is a private, for profit company in the Oil and Gas Industry comprising of 48 full time employees. At time of study it had an 80 Million dollar revenue and was answerable to a Publicly listed parent company in another city.

Organisation B is a private, not for profit community benefits organisation that has a not-for – profit status. It has a management structure of six people and employs 58 full time staff who oversee the work of 240 (at time of research) part-time workers.

Organisation C is a not for profit, amalgamation of two companies each of which held, at time of this study, identical contracts for delivering Work or the Dole (WfD) programs on behalf of the Australian Federal Government. One of the companies has a full time staff of nine people and 12 contracted staff employed on a part time basis, the other has full time staff consisting of 38 full time employees of which 20% are Indigenous Australians (including the CEO and all but one of the Managers).

Organisation D is a for profit Federal Government Department comprising of 62 sales and marketing people and six Senior Executives.

While 75 people were initially targeted for the study, sixty-one interviews were conducted using ethnographic techniques (Moll and Greenberg, 1990; Johnson 2000) with 14 people not taking part in the case study for various reasons as explained in Chapter three.

The interviews were conducted using semi structured questionnaires, an interview guide comprising of 4 themes and a total of 40 questions. Field notes were taken and digital tape recordings were made of the 61 narratives.
5.1.4 Chapter Four

Chapter Four addressed the 61 narratives and recordings which were transcribed verbatim into Word documents. To ensure anonymity, prevent bias and to allow ease of analysis, obvious forms of identification were removed and replaced by the following codes: Name – identified by number 1-61; Type of organisation: Government Profit (GP); Private Not for Profit (PNFP); Private Profit (PP); Gender: Male (M), Female (F); and Age group: 20-30, 31-40; over 40. The demographic breakdown reflected the classifications of organisations as defined by the Australian Government and which can be found on the Australian Institute of Company Directors website, the sex of the subject and by the three generations which as discussed in the literature review (p 14) make up the current Australian workforce.

The data was sorted alphabetically by type of organisation, by gender within the organisation and then the number given to the interview guide used in the interview. In order to describe and acquire new understanding of the transcribed narratives, three types of coding – open coding, axial coding and selective coding was undertaken in accordance with Stauss and Corbin (1990) assertions regarding Grounded Theory. The software program NVivo 8 was used to code the responses to each of the questions in the interview guide. Forty categories (nodes) with 348 subcategories were created in an attempt to provide reminders rather than to attempt to code every line of text to every single node possible. Once the codes were assigned seven tables were eventually developed as follows:

- Where the frequency count adds to more than 100% (because of multiple coding (Tables 3, 4 and 5)
- Where the frequency count is greater than or equal to 50%
- Where the frequency count is less than 50%

The coded data was then analysed and concluded as follows.

5.2 Conclusions

The research question under study is “What is the role of leader and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change”. While a seemingly straightforward question, it took on kaleidoscopic proportions particularly in the analysis stage when each piece of the puzzle seemed to change emphasis when viewed in relation to every other piece.
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That is, until one strips away all of the moving pieces – leaders, managers, staff, leadership, identities, cultures, change, human emotions, reactions, opinions, hijacking, technology and all the associated secondary and tertiary problematics.

When all of these aspects are temporarily removed, what is left is the one constant if not inviolate premise - the organisation as it was intended to be is an entity in its own right with its own reason for existing. Further it must produce certain end products which are exchanged for these things that the organisation needs or wants in order for it to exist into the future. However just as actors create organisations, they can also bring about organisational change which either contributes to or detracts from the organisation’s purpose and its ability to function in an optimum manner. With this in mind the aims of this study were to:

1. Demystify the role of leaders and leadership and their change related responsibilities in contemporary organisations;
2. Provide a means of identifying when leaders and/or leadership are diverting from their intended purpose;
3. Provide a research-based set of guidelines for use across all sectors of industry that will allow the correct use of identity, authority, accountability and learning in the process of leading and change.

The objectives were:

1. To document participants’ understandings of leader, leadership and management;
2. To describe their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of leaders and leadership in modern organisations undergoing change;
3. To assess the impact of personal identity in leader and leadership function;
4. To establish whether leadership can diverge from its purpose and, if so, how and why this occurs;
5. To describe how change occurs in contemporary Australian organisations;
6. To discover whether there a relationship between learning and successful leadership in a change environment;
7. To identify a model of leadership and management interaction that is suited to contemporary Australian workplaces.
This chapter begins by summarising and discussing the key findings in relation to culture, organisational change, learning organisations and identity.

5.2.1 Conclusion 1: Organisational Structure

The experiences, memories, opinions, biases and thinking styles discussed in Chapter Two are only some of the things that make a person unique. The problematic of bringing numerous unique individuals into a workplace which is not or does not remain formally organised is that there is there is a very real risk of having competing human realities weaken the organisation’s structure by repeatedly diverting it away from its intended purpose and ways of working.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the purpose of formally organising an organisation is to bring order into what could otherwise become a chaotic environment. As Mullins (2005) suggests, organisations must establish relationships between individuals and groups, provide order and systems and direct efforts to carry out goal seeking activities (p. 32). An organisation’s formal structure provides a predetermined, third party agreement by which different actors are required to work together (Pride, et al., 1989). Yet for a variety of reasons, actors do not always work according to their organisation’s predetermined structure. When this becomes widespread in organisations, and when leaders and managers cease to notice that their formal structure and strategies are gradually and subtly being eroded, ignored or by-passed, the effect is termed ‘strategic drift’ (Hardy 1989; Johnson, 1987; Mintzberg, 1994).

The findings of this study show that strategic drift is rife in each of the participants’ organisations. This occurs through informal structures, informal leadership, biases, cliques, favouritism, conflicts and negative emotional behaviours and the more insidious phenomenon of job descriptions and organisational structures being developed around individual actors and their personal strengths. Further, the data suggest that strategic drift leads to significant confusion among leaders in these organisations about what level of authority they are allowed to employ on a daily basis and who is allowed to instruct or give directions to particular groups of staff. Arguably the most frustrating effect of strategic drift on the participant leaders was the increasing amount of repetitive, additional and avoidable work it generates associated with sorting out personality clashes, attitudinal problems, cliques, backstabbing,
rumours, bypassing communication channels, use of company time for non-work related activities—the list goes on. All of this wastes leaders’ time and distracts them from their core functions.

Even in contemporary, creative workplaces, the data strongly suggest that adhering to a formal organisational structure (of whatever type) is still vital for an organisation’s overall stability. Further, the more an organisation is battered by the high seas of competition, speed of communication and production expectations, the more it needs the support of a formal structure to prevent it from collapsing under such pressures.

It follows that leaders must not only influence others to use the organisation’s formal structure but must also be seen to be doing so themselves—even if they do not personally agree with it. A formal structure includes (but is not limited to): following the organisational design; following communication channels; working to job descriptions, policies and procedures; commitment to organisational identities; using KIPs to determine work achievement and standards; and the appropriate use of training, education, mentoring, correction and discipline.

From a humanistic point of view, the organisation’s structure provides a level of certainty and predictability which if adhered to deters limbic hijacking (see Goleman, 2005). Uncertainty (see Knight, 1921, pp. 30-35) or inconsistent use of or support for the organisation’s structure, (including performance and behavioural standards and expectations) can create emotional triggering in the limbic brains of actors (see Matsumoto, 2013). Such triggering including any in the family of fear, anger or sadness can present in such ways as resistance to change, inactivity, backstabbing and leadership hijacking – all of which can contribute to structural drift. It is proposed that creating certainty and predictability through the consistent use of standard work practices and organisational structure creates a safe culture which is more likely to foster goal attainment, creative thinking and innovation than one which is uncertain and fearful.

The researcher does not suggest that organisations always have the most suitable structure for its needs or that a structure should not change, as several leaders in this study pointed out. However until formal change to an organisation’s structure occurs, the existing structure must be upheld in order to avoid weakening it through strategic drift.
Only by adhering to the formal structure can genuine structural weaknesses become apparent and, therefore, be addressed.

5.2.2 Conclusion 2: Confusing Terminology

A second key finding was that the confusion between leader and manager and leader and leadership is not confined to the literature but extends into the workplace. This in turn contributes to a wide range of other organisational problems, some of which are addressed in this chapter. Specifically, the study has shown that leadership and management are not viewed as separate disciplines, particularly when the same actor is expected to apply both in his/her role. Leadership and management, like leader and manager, are merged in organisational thinking as well as in most job descriptions and duty statements. The data suggest that this waters down both disciplines and leaves actors confused about the purpose and responsibilities connected to their manager and/or leader roles, as well as confusion between work roles and the rights of the individual. This confusion is manifested in a variety of ways. Participants expressed uncertainty, for instance, about how much power they had to make decisions; whether their work would be supported or undermined by other managers or leaders; what work was being duplicated by others; what authority and accountability their role had; and even what pay rates they should receive. Further this phenomena caused much angst and avoidable emotions and stress in areas concerning production, co-ordination, communication, education, career development and career progression to name a few. It was determined that each of these issues could be potentially costly to these organisation through wasted time, effort, duplication of work, incomplete work as well as from the fall out which can occur as a result of actors becoming less committed to their work or demotivated as a consequence of this phenomena.

5.2.3 Conclusion 3: Leaders and Personal Identity

The data suggest that actors regularly move between their personal identities and the social (organisational) identity of leader and that personal opinions, likes, dislikes, emotional outbursts and biases often override the attitudes, values, decisions and activities that are associated with the leader identity and role in their particular organisation(s). When leaders operated from the position of their personal identity or from the networks that inform their personal identity, their ability to lead in a professional, unbiased manner and to carry out their
leader and leadership responsibilities was more likely to be compromised. This phenomenon was found to be particularly detrimental to the employer organisation in cases where an individual’s personal identity and self-interests were at odds with their organisation’s values and required behaviours.

The data further suggest that, when a leader’s personal opinions, values and attitudes do reflect those of their organisation, the negative impact is less, but there is always the potential for personal bias to intrude or emotions to trigger. Examples of this came up time and again during the interviews when leaders commented that, at times, their own behaviours or those of their leaders were non-leader like.

Despite these concerns, there is danger in thinking of leadership and leaders in absolute terms. In all but one instance the subjects made positive as well as negative comments about their own and/or others’ ability to stay focused on their role. Clearly, organisational leaders do not always act entirely on the basis of their personal identity and, when they do, this is not always detrimental to the organisation. Neither do leaders always act entirely on the basis of their organisational identity. Rather, they seem to move along a continuum which could be described as having the organisational identity of leader at one end (the leader role and associated activity and behaviours) and the personal identity (the complete absence of leader role and associated activity and behaviours) at the other. While it is not assumed that actors work from either extreme, the nature and frequency of movement towards or away from the leader identity seems to explain respondents’ perceptions that a leader is good, bad, poor or inconsistent.

A related problem occurs when leaders form close friendships in the workplace with their subordinates or with other leaders/managers who are most like them in personality, attitudes, opinions and values. This phenomenon is understandable, given the nature of the limbic brain (see Chapter 2). However by entering into friendships (or romantic/sexual relationships) in the workplace, leaders run the risk of contributing to further strategic drift because their ability of to act impartially or impose discipline is likely to be compromised. Conversely the study also found that it was equally common for subordinates who were somehow different—in behaviour, thinking, communication or personality style, or even age, appearance or ethnicity—to be overlooked for training, rewards and promotion.
Personal friendships in the workplace can have negative effects that are not always immediately apparent.

Friendships create an in-crowd made up of those to whom the leader relates easily. However in so doing, they also create an *out-crowd.* The resulting biases, though subtle, can influence leaders to lose sight of the purpose and impartiality of their role and, hence, contribute to strategic drift in their organisation.

Outbursts of negative emotions—an amygdala hijack (Goleman, 2002)—and the intrusion of personal opinions, attitudes and biases are more likely to occur when the leader is already disengaged. As previously discussed (Chapter 2), this phenomenon is explained by such concepts such as cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1957; Meyers, 2006) and emotional triggers (Matsumoto, 2013) and an understanding of brain structure (Gazaniga. 2008; Le Doux 1996). The researcher hypothesises that the following action/reaction cycle can occur in a matter of seconds:

1. A leader encounters a situation for which her/his organisational identity does not provide the necessary knowledge and management skills;
2. There is a gap between what the leader is supposed to do and what s/he is able to do (cognitive dissonance);
3. Leader disengagement occurs;
4. If the situation and ensuing pressure is registered in the limbic brain as emotionally or physically harmful, an amygdala hijack will occur. As discussed in Chapter 2, the specific type of amygdala hijack is an emotional response (Ekman, 2003; Ekman & Friesen, 2003; Matsumoto, 2009) that will be in line with specific emotional triggers and purposes. For instance, a goal obstruction, norm violation and/or perceived injustice will trigger any of the family of ‘anger’ in an attempt to remove the offending obstacle. Inaction, avoidance and submission are the types of behavioural responses connected to a real or perceived physical or emotional threat (fear) (Matsumoto, 2013).

If the situation and ensuing pressure is not deemed to be emotionally or physically threatening but is still intolerable to the leader, and if s/he does not have the knowledge or skill to handle the situation from his/her leader identity (stage 1), the leader will disengage from her/his role and fall back on attitudes, opinions,
behaviours, experiences or solutions that are familiar and comfortable (personal identity). The duration of leader disengagement varies according to how long the period of addressing the situation of cognitive dissonance lasted.

5 After the emotion recedes or the situation passes, the leader will justify her/his behaviour as being appropriate or acceptable in the circumstances (cognitive dissonance) before reverting to her/his normative leader state;

6 If either behaviour ‘solves’ the problem at the time (makes it go away), the behaviour is further justified and stored in the hippocampus with an emotional marker ready for recall and re-action in the future (Damasio, 1994, 2005; Gazzaniga, 2008).

7 A similar situation in the future may trigger the stored memory and the sequence will be repeated. This cycle of leader action and reaction, it is proposed, contributes to the creation of an habitual set of behaviours and attitudes.

It is further proposed that, in the absence of appropriate leadership knowledge and skills, leaders are more prone to this phenomenon. The data, however, suggest that leaders are not always aware that they lack knowledge of certain aspects of leadership or change—you don’t know what you don’t know. Alternatively, they may be unaware that they are more comfortable addressing situations in terms of their personal identity rather than what is expected in their role as leader. In either instance, this lack of awareness can result in leader disengagement (through the hypothesised mechanism) as well as in emotional contagion among their reportees (Gazziniga, 2008).

It is preferable, then, to keep leaders engaged in their role rather than to attempt to bring them back once disengagement has occurred. Reengagement may involve a transformational rather than transitional change in leader behaviour and thinking (Burns 1984; Tichy and Devanna, 1986; Bass 1986). The data suggest that this requires not only cognitive acceptance of an alternate set of leadership behaviours and knowledge but also an emotional acceptance that any new behaviours are more favourable to the leader’s survival in the role than the existing set (Gazziniga, 2008; LeDoux, 1996; MacLean 1990; Ramachandran, 2011). This can take significant time to achieve.
If the emotional feeling and cognitive reasoning are not in harmony, the hypothesis is that it will continue to create cognitive dissonance in leaders, with the consequences described above.

5.2.4 Conclusion 4: Informal, Unsanctioned Leadership

The findings showed that the Australian workplace is also rife with informal, unsanctioned leadership where non-appointed leaders at times exert more influence on others than those who hold the leader position by right. Informal leaders gain prominence because they are perceived by other actors as being worthy of their attention and following. This prominence is not always deliberately sought, but can be bestowed on an actor because they are more trusted or because they inspired more confidence in others than the rightful leader. Informal leadership can also occur when the informal leader attracts followers on the basis of shared personal realities or beliefs. In both cases, informal leaders and leadership can be of significant value to the organisation and to rightful leaders when they support the rightful leader and the goals, purposes and organisational structure or initiative.

Informal leadership can also be destructive. The data included examples of negative informal leadership that was recognised in the organisation but not corrected, mainly because the leaders did not know how to address the issue. Instead, the situation was justified as being typical of all workplaces and was allowed to continue. In the absence of correction, informal leaders develop more influence and a greater power-base over time. This can lead to serious secondary and tertiary problems, including a leadership spill (that is, when the informal leader attains a greater sphere of influence than the rightful leader).

The findings suggest that negative informal leadership can only occur in a work environment where strategic drift has already taken hold and where the rightful leader has disengaged from her/his role. Accordingly, it can be concluded that:

a) If there are instances of negative informal leadership in an organisation, there will also be instances of strategic drift and leader disengagement and justifications/excuses will be found for that behaviour.

b) In the absence of correction, the non-appointed leader’s influence can grow to the point where it starves support to the rightful leader, making her/him a ‘lame duck’. Yet the data show that inappropriate influence in organisations by non-appointed
leaders is not only tolerated but justified as being a “normal” workplace phenomenon and is largely allowed to continue.

c) Arguably of greater concern is the finding that this phenomenon appears to be more common among leaders than at staff level. The study revealed a lack of unity among leaders, including examples of leaders gossiping and backstabbing other leaders; leaders from other areas bypassing the rightful leader and giving directives to the rightful leader’s reportees; and senior leaders not encouraging junior leaders/staff to follow the correct reporting lines. Such behaviour is often referred to in organisations as “power play”. While not universal, the data contained sufficient evidence to suggest that it is a common occurrence and is rarely corrected. After all, who corrects the leaders, particularly those at senior level?

It can be concluded that, for the sake of the organisation and the wellbeing all its employees, is vital that instances of inappropriate leadership (that is, influences that are counter to the organisation’s goals and/or structure) must be corrected as soon as they are discovered and steps taken to prevent reoccurrence. Again, this is because the organisation cannot afford strategic drift.

5.2.5 Conclusion 5: Commitment

The data suggest that the role of leader is commonly viewed by Australian workers as an entitlement rather than a responsibility of service. Further, actors defined themselves in relation to their role and the status it conferred. One very senior leader, for instance, was more concerned about what would happen to his reputation and status in the industry should he be fired than he was about his substandard work performance and the impact that this had on his juniors and his employer organisation.

The data also showed that weight is given to a leader’s personal opinions and views because they hold the position or title of leader. Conversely, views and opinions do not hold as much weight when the individual is not a leader. Because the actors’ organisations equated leadership primarily with personal identity, organisations could not always correct negative leader traits and behaviours without fear of also losing the positive ones. Additionally some behaviour while inappropriate in some situations could be beneficial in others, thus posing the problem of how to make contextual corrections.
Regardless the lack of correction, particularly if it occurs at higher levels, contributes to the development of cliques whose members either respect and emulate the leader’s behaviours, opinions and actions, or reject and undermine them.

While some personality traits and behaviours might enhance the organisation, there can be no guarantee that the positive aspects of a leader’s personality will be the only ones used. The possibility of negative traits and behaviours, including limbic hijacking and personal biases, can run counter to the wider organisation, its goals, culture and reputation. Further, a leader cannot remain credible if s/he discourages the same behavioural or attitudinal changes in others that s/he personally displays.

A fifth conclusion to be drawn from the findings of this study, accordingly, is that an actor must commit to and be required to maintain the organisational identity of leader so that leadership by personality does not become the dominant factor. This can be achieved by developing job descriptions and performance indicators that do not just reflect financial outcomes but also include demonstrable leader and leadership outcomes.

5.2.6 Conclusion 6: Change

The leaders in this study were not familiar with the concepts of first and second order change (Watzlawick et al., 1974; Goodman, 1982; Levy and Merry, 1986). They reported, however, that change was a constant in their organisations and that some aspects of change received more attention than others and that some were left unattended due to lack of clarity, time and resources.

Three particularly problematic change issues emerged from the data. The first issue concerned senior leaders who delegated aspects of their higher level change initiatives (second order change) to more junior leaders without also giving them the authority to successfully effect change. The second was the regularity with which leaders bypassed their middle or junior level leaders and managers and micro-managed or ‘interfered’ in others’ routine work—a practice which many participants considered justifiable. The third and, arguably, the most dangerous was the propensity of senior leaders to focus on first order change at the expense of proactively identifying and instigating much needed second order changes. The data suggest that not only did each of these practices negatively impact on leaders and managers but they also caused unnecessary confusion when actors received conflicting directions and priorities from a number of uncoordinated sources.
Thus opportunities were often missed or killed off before proper investigation and the chance to be innovative went unsupported in favour of organisations being risk adverse.

**5.2.7 Conclusion 7: KPIs and Leaders**

The key performance indicators (KPIs) for each of the participants were found to be financially based, even when a leader had no direct control over her/his unit’s finances or no authority to make financial decisions. Surprisingly, few KPIs reflected other aspects of the leader’s role or responsibilities. It was also revealed that leader and leadership behaviour was not addressed as part of performance reviews, even though participants reported that several senior leaders operated at odds with the values of their employer organisations.

The conclusion is that, when leader KPIs are purely financially based, it is possible for poor leadership behaviour—including bullying, intimidation and sexual harassment—to be overlooked or justified in the wake of (positive) financial results.

When negative behaviours are not corrected they become the ‘accepted norm’ and can lead to emotional contagion and a negative workplace culture.

**5.2.8 Conclusion 8: Education and Training**

The findings showed that the way in which leader and leadership skills are formally taught through some non-accredited programs and, specifically, the nationally accredited Frontline Management course perpetuates the confusion between management, leader and leadership as well as that between personal and organisational identity. These causes make no connection between the leader role and the process of implementing change. Generally the participants’ organisations were generous in providing ongoing training opportunities, particularly to middle level managers and leaders even if, as some respondents suggested, such opportunities were based on favouritism. Leadership training however was usually outsourced to external providers who, according to the informants, did not always understand the nature of the participants’ workplaces, the difference between leader, leadership and management and their relationship to first and second order change.
Middle level leaders and managers complained that what was taught in these courses (particularly Frontline Management) was either of little value to them in practical terms or was not well supported in the workplace. The data suggested that this was because either the leaders did not have the authority to lead in a way that the training material suggested; that there was a large gap between the theory and real life situations; or that their organisations did not support them to behave as leaders in the way that was described in the courses. These issues were not as salient among those leaders who held degree qualifications (such as MBAs), especially when the respondents were able to put into practice what they had learned and were supported in doing so. Unfortunately, the study suggested that leaders with postgraduate qualifications rarely attended further educational courses, apart from conferences, so there could be some concern about the currency of their knowledge.

A related issue concerns the promotion of technically or professionally skilled personnel into leader roles with little, if any, supportive leadership education or training. The organisational stance was that, if these people were proficient in their technical roles, then they should automatically know how to lead teams of similarly skilled people. Without the appropriate knowledge, findings suggested, some leaders either micro-managed their reportees (because the work was familiar to them) or maintained personal friendships with former colleagues in order to show they were still one of the in-crowd even though they held more senior positions. Thus they were not always taken seriously by those whom they were now supposed to lead.

Organisations are, and will continue to be, reliant on external educational providers and institutions to deliver their leadership and change education. Educational institutions are uniquely placed to establish not merely a symbiotic relationship with Australian organisations but a true partnership where ideas are exchanged and mutual needs are met. However this requires the delivery of up to date, relevant, usable knowledge that meets the changing needs of modern organisations rather than an attempt to fit organisations into predetermined competency standards and curricula. How this should or could occur is beyond the scope of the present inquiry. It should be noted, however, that in the absence of accessible and appropriate education around leadership, identity and change, Australian organisations are potentially creating risk through ambiguity and uncertainty (Knight, 1921). This is because most leaders are largely managing, and are therefore risk averse, rather than applying much needed leadership and innovation.
5.2.9 Conclusion 9: Over-Regulation

Overregulation was another issue that was frequently raised by the participants. The complaint was that the ‘true’ leaders of many organisations have, by default, become extensions of the Government and regulatory bodies that impose their will on targeted industries. Regulation is problematic because it impacts on all leaders and organisations, including those that had been performing well in the absence of regulation. Regulatory controls remove the capacity for autonomous decision making from competent leaders engaged in second order change and thus limit the potential for innovation and growth.

Respondents lamented that, once introduced, regulations are all but impossible to remove. One CEO suggested that this is because there are associated financial costs in the form of licensing and audit fees, charges and other compliance costs which governments and industry bodies rely on in their own financial planning.

The study concludes that regulation has both a positive and negative impact on leaders and their organisations. On one hand, there is a need to protect the public from the impact of spectacularly poor decision making. Here regulations provide a risk averse, known set of laws or guidelines that define the limits within which leaders can work. On the other hand, leaders can become demotivated because of the difficulty in making major decisions or being innovative in a heavily restricted environment.

5.3 Recommendations

The final task for any researcher is to draw together the various empirical findings and their theoretical underpinnings into a comprehensive explanation of the observed phenomena. In the following discussion, I describe how I developed such an explanation.

The starting point was the confusion between leader, leadership and management. It was clear that, in Australia, leadership is conceptualised as having the same functions at each organisational level. The only differences revolve around which professional/technical sphere is involved (e.g. Financial, HR, IT, Hairdressing, Policing, Teaching etc.) and how much authority—and therefore how much status and power—accompanies each role (e.g. executive leader, divisional leader, middle level leader, frontline leader, team leader, etc.).
Further in the current leadership model, the more junior leader roles are viewed as ‘pared down’ or ‘smaller’ versions of their more senior counterparts. This model is taught, reinforced and perpetuated in Australia through various curricula and teaching practices. In addition, it would appear that, because leadership is commonly viewed in Australia as a component of management (Davidson, et.al, 2009, pp.10, 375; Shermerhorn, 2001, p.315), title of Manager (and management) does not generally separate the subsumed leadership functions from the management ones.

Close inspection of the data suggested to the researcher that not only is leadership different from management but leadership is not one discipline as we have been led to believe, but rather two disciplines which are closely linked, largely interdependent and usually combined—and thus confused—with each other and with management functionality.

Therefore, the researcher proposes that each leadership discipline has its own distinct purpose, function and focus, and each largely relies on different knowledge and skill sets. The two leadership typologies are difficult to identify when thought of in hierarchical terms, but the distinction becomes clear when one revisits the notion that the leader role is all about change and that change can be first order or second order.

To address the conceptual and terminological lacuna in the literature, the researcher proposes a new typology for the two leadership disciplines and their connections with management functions. By identifying and linking the types of responsibilities associated with first and second order change to leader and manager responsibilities, the model provides greater clarity of leader and leadership functionality, responsibility, accountability focus, education/training and assessment

5.3.1 The First and Second Order Leaders and Manager Taxonomy

It should be noted from the outset that this proposed taxonomy:

a) is not dependent on organisational hierarchy although, if an organisation wishes to be, or is already formally structured in this way, the model could serve as a hierarchical guideline. The assumption is that typically a single job description will comprise of a composite of first and second order functions which will be described by this model;

b) allows the organisation to name (or retain) the title of any role and use this model in the description of its associated functions/duties;
c) is intended to typify the responsibilities found at each level in the model rather than suggesting that it is a complete list or that all inclusions in the model must be present;

d) allows for as many first and second order leader and manager roles or composite functions within roles as required by an organisation; and

e) allows for first and second order change to be co-ordinated and occur concurrently without the loss of focus on either. Thus this model provides the flexibility required of modern organisations and the means to adapt to changing organisational conditions while working on the attainment of its long-term and short-term goals simultaneously.
Table 14: Borgelt's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Order Leader and Manager Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of leader/manager</th>
<th>Indicative Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Order</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leader function or role</strong> (wide impacting change &amp; influence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2<sup>nd</sup> Order** | Focus is on wide impacting change and influence  
Responsible for identifying issues such as the organisation’s structure, vision, mission values, security, technologies, short and long –term goals.  
Identifies the need for 2<sup>nd</sup> order change; Networks at high levels external to the organisation to gather intelligence and contacts which are of benefit to the organisation; Identifies new trends, potential acquisitions, markets, technologies, innovations or threats or other influences which could impact the organisation/department/section; Liaises with Legal, Regulators and/or other high end internal or external stakeholders on major second order change issues which may affect the organisation. Liaises with 2<sup>nd</sup> order manager (function or role) to develop 2<sup>nd</sup> order change implementation strategies. Relies on ability to influence, set standards and create culture. |
| **2<sup>nd</sup> Order** | **Manager function or role** (implementation of second order change in co-ordination with routine work)                                                                                                                                 |
| **1<sup>st</sup> Order** | **Leader function or role** (change within existing parameters)                                                                                                                                                             |
| **1<sup>st</sup> Order** | Focus is on change within existing parameters. Liaises with, and addresses issues found by 1<sup>st</sup> order manager (function or role) using appropriate investigative, communication, influence and change strategies to bring any substandard performance, production or behaviours back to the required level(s). Responsible for continuous improvement of production, behaviour and performance; responsible for any other 1<sup>st</sup> order change strategies; liaises with 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order manager ((functions or roles) regarding the co-ordination of 2nd order change with routine work. |
| **1<sup>st</sup> Order** | **Manager function or role** (routine oversight)                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **1<sup>st</sup> Order** | Focus is on the status quo. Monitors, evaluates & articulates performance, behaviours and production against established levels and/ or standards. Liaises with 1<sup>st</sup> order leader (function or role) on issues requiring first order change due to less than acceptable performance, behaviour and/or production, or any other change issues. |
5.3.1.1 The Purpose of First Order Manager Role or Function

The first order manager role or function is primarily responsible for monitoring, evaluating and articulating their own and their reportees’ production, performance and behaviour within their organisation’s existing formal parameters. This involves an understanding of organisational identity, role commitment, production and productivity and understanding why adherence to organisational structure on a daily basis as well as ensuring that actors do not fall into negative behaviours or practices in the first place is important. The first order manager, in liaison with the first order leader, ensures that any obstacles are addressed so that actors are able to do their work in a safe, professional environment where they are being respected, well supported and well treated and so that the structure of the organisation is upheld while work is being done.

When first order change is required, the first order manager advises the first order leader of any evidence-based substandard behavior or performance or production for auctioning. Liaison occurs with the first order leader in order to co-ordinate any changes strategies (i.e. training, mentoring, correction, discipline) with routine work and production in order to ensure that any transformational or transitional change does not detract from the ability of the target to achieve their required outputs.

Once again, this function does not have to be a singular role but can form part of a role, regardless of the level at which that role is located in the organisation.

5.3.1.2 The Purpose of First Order Leader

The primary purpose of the first order leader is to initiate and implement change within the already established structures and standards to ensure that standards are met and continuous improvements (including appropriate support, staff development, correction, or discipline) are occurring as and when required. The ‘already established structure’ includes such things as the organisations design, responsibilities and accountabilities as described in job descriptions or duty statements, targets, organisational standards, policies, procedures, values, impacting legislation, communication channels, professional behaviours and the like. Standards may refer to quality, safety, legislative or any other standard adopted by the organisation.
The gap between what should be happening and what is happening is the current state or practice. First order leaders are responsible for addressing change which moves the individual or collective from the current state or practice, over time, closer to its optimum state (i.e. its own best practice), within the established organisation’s already established structure.

While these are usually viewed as managerial responsibilities, the key focus is actually on change and therefore falls under the heading of leadership activity and function. First order leadership can just as easily be performed by a board member, CEO or MD as it can by a departmental, divisional or team leader, project manager or consultant. The issue is not the level at which first order leadership is being applied or received; it is the type of leadership being applied which classifies it as being first order. Therefore whenever this form of change is being implemented with the aim of restoring an individual or collective to its expected level of behaviour or performance, or for purposes of continuous improvement – regardless of the time it takes, or at the level in the organisation where it is occurring - then it is considered to be a first order leadership activity under this model.

5.3.1.3 The Purpose of Second Order Leader Role or Function

Second order leaders are responsible for identifying and strategising change that will have a wide impact on their organisation. Activities such as identifying new trends and markets and understanding the impact that emerging technologies and political, environmental and competitive forces might have on their organisation (or branch, division, department, unit, team) all fall under second order leader functionality. Second order leaders need to be visionary, influential and able to network at the appropriate level, form alliances and position their organisation (or department or section) so that it is well thought of in the markets or environments in which it operates or wishes to operate.

The focus here is usually (although not always) external to the organisation and concerns broad issues - although second order leaders may also be involved in unique organisational development or performance, standards, restructuring, education or design. Second order leaders might also look to such things as Best Practice Elsewhere, ISO and other trends in security, standards, knowledge and technology in order to identify what should be brought into their organisation to help it achieve its long-term goals and position the organisation for the future.
Second order leaders might also be involved in an advisory or business development capacity and thus be required to write board papers, Ministerials, or While Papers relating to second order change matters or lead projects. Second order leaders could be heavily involved with making decisions about new directions, fund/capital raising, acquisitions or business modeling. They could be involved in decisions or strategies concerning whether to privatise or buy back shares, open new offices or markets, introduce of new technological or communications systems or they may be involved in how new regulations or legislation should be brought into the organisation.

Regardless of their involvement in any or all of these activities (or others like these), second order leaders are not dictators and rarely have the authority to make final decisions on such matters without approval from their boards, Ministers, or other internal or external stakeholders. However what they will be involved in will have a major impact on their organisation or sections.

Once again it should be emphasised that the second order leader role or function is not exclusive to those at the top of the organisation. Actors further down the organisational chart may well find themselves responsible, for as an example, networking or identifying innovations, for determining direction or engaging new technologies for their sections or any other form of second order change.

5.3.1.4 The Function of Second Order Managers

The main function of second order managers is to liaise with both first and second order leaders so that neither first nor second order change takes precedence over the other and each is introduced in a way that does not harm the organisation or prevent it from achieving its short-term and long-term targets and goals. It is expected that this role or function will be the most difficult in this model since it requires an understanding of any new changes as well as the organisation’s (department/section’s) existing operations.

Second order managers do not initiate change, rather they liaise with second order leaders in order to translate second order approved change concepts and strategies into reality through the use of a wide range of communication and influencing skills as well as standard management practices, including project and change management processes. They liaise with first order leaders and managers to ensure a seamless integration of second order change with
staff’s routine work. They form positive working relationships with first order leaders, managers and staff in order to influence them to move the organisation/sections/staff over time, closer to its own best practice and to achieve the results of implemented second order change.

5.3.1.5 Who are first and second order leaders and managers?

This model addresses leadership and management functions and not the so called technical skills or professional core skills and knowledge associated with of such disciplines as Finance, IT, HR, Hairdressing, Medicine, Policing, Building and the like. It is important to re-emphasise that the proposed model links first and second order change responsibilities with first and second order leader and manager functionality or roles rather than associating them with a particular title or hierarchical level within an organisation. Thus it is possible for a junior member to perform some or all of the second order leadership functions if required by the organisation (as is sometimes the case with specific projects).

Alternately the job title of HR Manager (for instance) could comprise of a composite of first and second order level leadership and management responsibilities where L = leadership, M = management, 1 = first order and 2 = second order. Thus some of the associated duties could be classified in the following way: team leadership (1L), networking (2L), Human Resources responsibilities (2L, 2M, 1L and 1M), training (2M), strategic planning (2L) and so forth.

By identifying the levels of leader and manager responsibilities within this model, it is proposed that neither leadership or management activities can be overshadowed, overpowered or assumed by the other and in so doing their particular types of associated activities, training and assessment will become more apparent. In so doing the model proposes a contemporary method of identifying, operationalising and improving leadership focus and practice.

5.6.1.6 Status

The type of education and training required to become a competent first order leader will be different for obvious reasons than those required of a second order leader - one does not build from the other in this model. Both are equally important to the organisation as are first and second order managers. Thus each role of function in this model has equal status.
5.3.2 Leadership Hijacking

The researcher proposes that it is not enough to view leadership from the construct of being good or bad or dysfunctional. Firstly this implies a reactive look at leaders and leadership. Secondly, the research reveals that not all leadership failures can be attributed to Semann and Slattery’s (2009) ‘dark side of leadership’. Negative and inappropriate leadership strategies and behaviours can also be triggered by limbic hijacking (Goleman, 1995; 2006), emotional triggering (Matsumoto, 2013) or systemic problems - such as incorrect organisational structuring, too many reporting lines, incorrect job descriptions, or insufficient authority or power. Arguably, these reflect ignorance rather than ill-intent, although the fall-out can be just as severe. At the same time, external governance that bypasses a leader’s ability to influence can - even if they possess the requisite skills and abilities - make leaders toothless tigers.

Lack of appropriate, current, leadership pedagogy, mis-information, and ineffective application can also be contributing factors to dysfunctional leadership (Bentz, 1985; Lombardo, Ruderman and McCauley, 1988; McCall and Lombardo, 1983). In other words, not all leadership failures stem from flawed interpersonal characteristics as described by Higgs (2009) or Semen and Slattery (2009).

Consequently the researcher brings new knowledge that leadership can be hijacked away from its intended purpose. Because this phenomena has relevance to leaders and leadership in general as well as to the model of first and second order leadership, the researcher now proposes a working hypothesis of “Leadership Hijacking” where the word hijack has been borrowed from common usage meaning “To seize, divert or appropriate …while in transit” (Collins English Dictionary, 4th Australian Edn., 1998, p 730).

The working definition of leadership hijacking is “the will or influence imposed on another(s) by an internal or external agent or agency and which without consent, seizes control and diverts the individual, group or organisation away from its given course for purposes of the agent’s or agency’s own agenda”.

The researcher acknowledges that future studies may reveal additional forms, however forms of leadership hijacking which arose out of the research are:
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Interchangeable use of leadership and management;

Role incongruity;

Egocentric leadership;

Misuse of power and/or ethics;

Lack of authority and power;

Organisational psychopathy;

Fixed ideas about leadership pedagogy; and

Unwarranted over-regulation

5.7.2.1 The interchangeable use of ‘leadership’ and ‘management’

As previously noted, the terms leadership and management continue to be confused and are often used interchangeably. The purpose of leadership, according to Kotter (1990), is “movement and change”, while the purpose of management is "to provide stability, consistency, order and efficiency" (p. 65). This view is shared by Macobby (2000) as previously identified:

According to the current wisdom, managers are principally administrators—they write business plans, set budgets and monitor progress. Leaders on the other hand, get organisations and people to change. That's true, as far as it goes, but there is a more useful distinction between management and leadership: Management is a function that must be exercised in any business, leadership is a relationship between leader and led that can energise an organisation” (p. 57).

Not only is it important to make the distinction between leadership and management, it is also important to think of leadership as an influencing relationship between the leader and follower (see Rost, 1993) as well as viewing it as being the activity of a leader. Leadership can occur anywhere inside or external to the organisation and does not always come from the nominal head with the title of leader, nor by those sanctioned to formally or informally provide leadership (Vecchio et al, 1988). To understand leadership is to ask the question: To whom are people listening and who are they following or copying?

The interchangeable use of ‘leadership’ and ‘management’ waters down both disciplines and causes confusion about the intent, purpose and application of each. To imply that leadership
is a functionality of the discipline or process of management hijacks leadership away from its intended purpose and goal.

5.7.2.2 Lack of defined organisational context

Clearly, leadership is not exclusively located in an organisation’s higher echelons. In the modern workplace, there are sanctioned leaders at many levels who are responsible for varying forms of change (Day and O’Connor, 2003; Lamonthe and Langley, 2001). Consequently leadership needs to be understood in terms of leadership practices and organisational interventions within a particular context and not just classified in terms of leader attributes (Fletcher and Kaeufer, 2003) or entitlements. For leadership to be co-ordinated and allowed to occur without unwarranted interference, there should be a metaphorical umbilical attachment between leadership and it’s sanctioned, intended purpose within and within a particular context so that deviation from that purpose becomes obvious and destructive cross influences do not occur within the organisation. Far from being restrictive, this allows the leader freedom to lead without interference and protection from others who step out of their rightful spheres of influence. As Bennis (2007) suggests, while competent leaders are important, leader attributes alone will be insufficient to bring about desired organisational change. The hypothesis is that lack of a defined context can cause misplaced leadership activity and influence and as such can hijack leadership from its intended, sanctioned purpose.

5.7.2.3 Role incongruity

If leaders lack the appropriate knowledge, skills or confidence they can encounter uncomfortable situations in which they either do not know how to perform their duties or do not know how to remove the obstacle(s) which prevent them from acting as expected. It is suggested that in order to break the impasse and remove any (potential) stress, leaders are likely to fall back on what they know and behave in more comfortable and familiar ways – that is, addressing the situation from their personal identity. It is further suggested that during this time there can be conflict and incompatibility between what the leader should be doing (assuming their organisational identity of leader) and what they are doing (assuming their personal identity). Thus role incongruity occurs when actors, (leaders) are unable to meet the demands of these non-overlapping personal and professional roles simultaneously (Biddle, 1979).
While some leaders may unintentionally fall prey to this form of leadership hijacking, it can also occur as a result of those who deliberately choose to lead from the position of their personal identity over their organisational identity. The suggestion is that this can occur because the leader has a personal agenda, lacks commitment to the role or organisation or for other reasons, including pride, fear or refusal to acknowledge that (s)he lacks the level of knowledge or skills required to address certain situations. Thus role incongruity meets the definition of leadership hijacking.

5.7.2.4 Egocentric leadership

There is a socio-dynamic in leadership that goes beyond mere personal identity. This is when leadership becomes a magnet for egocentricity rather than something that is oriented to the needs of the organisation (Wenzke, 2009). Egocentric leaders care little about the needs and views of others; rather, they “do what they want, how they want and when they want” (Rothstein and Burk, 2010, p.95). The distinction between this form of hijacking and that caused by personal identity is based on intent. For some, the role of a leader and the power that comes with leadership carries with it an inherent social prestige that some people find heady and addictive. It is difficult not to develop a sense of self-importance when society and the organisation hold a leader in high esteem (Bass, 1985; Brown and Trevino, 2006; Wenzke, 2009; Rothstein and Burk, 2010). Moreover, today’s leaders are much more likely than their predecessors to be exposed to the mass media. Even publicity-shy leaders can find themselves through an internet search engine, if they are so inclined. While good publicity is an important part of the marketing of a business, there is a danger in promoting the leader as a celebrity, figurehead or personification of the organisation over its goals, achievements or purpose (e.g. a Prime Minister is the party, Steve Jobs is (was) Apple etc.). Thus when a leader’s “celebrity” becomes the focus rather than the organisation’s earned results or achievement, either intentionally or unintentionally, there is a real risk of a negative impact on the organisation when the eventual, inevitable human failings of the leader are reported (Chemers, 2001; Leary & Tangney, 2003; Wenzke, 2009). Therefore egocentric leadership - whether or not intentional, is considered to be a form of leadership hijacking.

5.7.2.5 Misuse of power and/or lack of ethics
In the relationship between a leader and his/her subordinates, the distinction between voluntary acceptance and coerced compliance may be distorted (Katz and Kahn, 1978). While research has shown that job advancement and success are contingent on the effective use of influence (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1994), the use of power in leadership can and should be “rational, relational, collective, and purposeful as well as being necessary to the central function of achieving purpose” (Burns, 1982, p. 18). Power misused for personal gain is a form of leadership hijacking by egocentric or personal identity, although the latter is more nuanced.

When the purpose and activity of leadership is carried out by such leaders, there is often a gulf between the public and private face of their organisation (Joss, 2001). While many organisations have well publicised statements of their mission, vision or values, the reality can be that the pressure to increase returns to shareholders, make profit or gain public support at all costs often dominates key decision making and leadership in ways that often override the organisation’s purpose, mission and values and ability to survive in the long term (Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989; Waters, 1988). Leadership hijacking through misuse of power or compromised ethics is often a contributing factor to financial loss and low morale as well as a loss of reputation and support for the organisation. Conversely, when a leader’s personal integrity and/or the integrity of the organisation commands a higher priority and is respected in the marketplace over the demands of economic objectives at any cost, then the organisation’s mission, vision and values can be maintained even when there are immediate and strong competitive pressures to the contrary (Watson, 1991; Collins & Porras, 1994). Thus fighting the temptation to give into expediency or rationalising or compromising standards for short-term profit is vital to exercising organisational integrity through its leadership (Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989, p.194).

5.7.2.6 Lack of authority and power

There is another side to the misuse of power that is also a form of leadership hijacking. This is where the leader is not given the authority or power to lead by those higher in the organisation (or by external agencies), although s/he is given the responsibility for achieving particular leadership outputs.
Authority is the ability to make particular decisions without having to ask someone else's permission, while responsibility is being held to account for these decisions (e.g. Bass 2009). It would be impossible to count the number of decisions – large and small—that leaders make daily on behalf of their organisations. A split between authority and responsibility leaves leaders accountable for work but unable to effect a successful conclusion because they lack the permission or power to do so. When responsibility is separated from authority it creates victims (Wallace, 1998). Authority without responsibility creates dangerous situations because leaders who have the power to make decisions for which they can never be held accountable have the potential to be incredibly destructive to their organisations and to the lives of its members (Babiak and Hare; 2006Wallace, 1998). Further organisations that do not hold their leaders accountable provide the perfect environment for organisational psychopaths to hide.

2.7.2.7 Organisational psychopathy

As previously noted, Psychopaths are often only recognised by the trail of destruction (usually financial, informational and/or relational) that they leave in their wake (Demack, 2001; Babiak and Hare, 2006). The more symptoms of psychopathy they have, and the greater their sphere of influence, the greater the havoc they cause. McCormick and Burch (2005) suggest that organisational psychopaths typically appear on the surface as being as normal as anyone else but their actions “tend to be continually manipulative, irresponsible and deceitful; they crave power and prestige, schmooze to bosses, lie easily and take the credit for other people's work. Usually superficially charming and convincing, they lack empathy and any remorse for their actions and are often cool under pressure” (p. 34). Thus a leader with these traits can (and will) hijack leadership away from its intended purpose and use the role to benefit their own interests.

N.B. Diagnosis must be left to qualified professionals and the term ‘organisational psychopath’ must not be used lightly or assumed without such a diagnosis.

5.7.2.8 Fixed ideas about leadership pedagogy

When educational institutions have fixed ideas about leadership pedagogy it is difficult for organisations and students to move outside of that paradigm. Without continually testing
leadership pedagogy, how can there be certainty that leadership studies are providing the type of knowledge and skills that our leaders require to foster organisational improvements, create competitive organisations and be truly innovative?

As Drucker (1993) has remarked:

The basic capital resource, the fundamental investment but also the cost centre of a developed economy, is the knowledge worker who puts to work what he has learned in systemic education, that is, concepts, ideas and theories, rather than the man who puts to work manual skill or muscle (p. 31).

There is a plethora of books, courses, media and personnel specialising in the subject of leading and leadership. Yet, if leading and leadership are commonly misunderstood, it follows that the subject can also, albeit unintentionally, be incorrectly understood, taught or misapplied. Therefore this phenomenon is considered another form of leadership hijacking in that outdated or inaccurate pedagogy ‘dumbs down’ both the student and the subject thus taking it away from its intended intent. According to Gardner, et al. (2005) in order for leadership programs to be effective they “should be grounded in research leadership theories, use experiential learning, include outcomes assessments and include global awareness” (p. 257). Moreover, “models of adult development can organise the (leadership development) literature, account for anomalies and establish the boundary conditions required for successful leadership interventions” (ibid.).

As previously noted, the competency-based training module on Leadership within the nationally accredited Certificate III & IV in Frontline Management is the means by which a vast number of Australians are taught leadership and middle level management skills. The choice of CBT as an educational system and FMI as part of that system has already been critiqued. The Frontline Management training program not only presents a narrow view of leadership but implies that leadership is a subcomponent of the discipline and process of management.

5.7.2.9 Unwarranted over-regulation

As addressed, regulations are often imposed on Industry in response to the spectacular failings of a few. Such regulations impact on all leaders and organisations, including those
who have been performing well and for whom additional regulation is unwarranted. Yet compliance is mandatory.

Thus over-regulation is another form of leadership hijacking because it removes important aspects of leadership and decision making from competent leaders in well performing organisations. Once regulations are imposed, they are almost impossible to rescind.

5.4 Implications for future research

This study has developed a theoretical leadership and management model based on in-depth interviews with leaders across five different sites representing for profit and not for profit organisations in the Public and Private Sector in in the north and western regions of Australia. There is a need to test this model with a broader group of leaders in order to determine not only its practicality but also the generalizability of this model in every day usage and whether it can or should be tailored to meet specific organisational needs.

While this study has focused on linking leaders, leadership and management with first and second order change, further examination of this premise is also recommended. Further this study identifies the problematics associated with all identities that operate in all organisational contexts. It is assumed that it can also be used to analyse connections within any social or other group where two or more people are required to operate collaboratively to produce agreed upon short and long-term goals – however this too requires further investigation. But in doing so care should be taken to understand that this study does not take into account or propose particular values, moral codes or intentions outside of those which support the ethical goals and purpose of organisations or groups.

There is also a need to examine the research methodologies used in this study to better understand leader’s perceptions of leadership, leader, organisations, personal and organisational identity and to further understand the emotional, cognitive and the psychological aspects associated with organisational identities, and organisations.

Finally in order to have an extended understanding of the issues posed by this research it is important to analyse how leader and leadership education and training is taught in Australia - particularly at middle leader and manager level. However consideration should be given to the notion that because educational institutions and their associated systems are also
organisations, they too are subject to the same problematics and conclusions as proposed by this study.

Part of this analysis is the examination of pedagogies and resources used to develop leaders, identify their performance and provide correction; mentoring and ongoing learning that differs from existing paradigms.

5.5 Final Comments

5.5.1 Research Questions and Aims

The central research question in this study is ‘What is the role of leaders and leadership in Australian–based organisational change?’

The sub-questions are:

1. *What is leadership?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2

2. *What, if any, difference is there between leader, leadership and management activity?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2 and 5

3. *What is the purpose and responsibility (ies) of leaders and leadership in modern organisations undergoing change?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2, 4 and 5

4. *What impact, if any, does personal identity have on leader and leadership function?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2, 4 and 5

5. *Is the role of leader owned by the organisation and therefore on loan to the incumbent?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2 and 5

6. *Can leadership be taken off its purpose and if so how and why?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2, 4 and 5
7  *What nature and form does change take in contemporary Australian-based organisations?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2, 4 and 5

8  *Is there a relationship between leading and successful leadership in a change environment?*
   Addressed in Ch. 2 and 5

9  *Is there a model of leadership and management interaction which is suitable for contemporary Australian-based organisations which can be used to assist the change process?*
   Addressed in Ch. 5

The aims of this study were:

1  To demystify the role of leaders and leadership and their change related responsibilities in contemporary organisations;

2  To provide a means of identifying when leaders and/or leadership are diverting from their intended purpose.

3  To provide a research-based set of guidelines for use across all sectors of industry that will allow the correct use of identity, authority, accountability and learning in the process of leading and change.

These central question, sub-questions and aims have been answered by the study, research, conclusions and recommendations in this body of work.

**5.5.2 Trustworthiness**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that a research study’s trustworthiness can be thought of as the ways in which the qualitative researcher ensures that credibility (confidence in the ‘truth’ of the findings’); transferability (showing that the findings have applicability in other contexts); dependability, (showing that the findings are consistent and could be repeated);
and conformability (a degree of neutrality or the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not by researcher bias, motivation or interest).

In this study credibility was established not only through the researcher’s theoretical sensitivity and the prolonged research undertaken but also in spending two years involved in organisational ethnography and six months of ethnographic interviewing (prolonged engagement and persistent observation). Data triangulation (Denzin, 1989) and environmental triangulation (Patton, 2002) (see 3.3), peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308), and negative case analysis (e.g. Patton, 199; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) also contributed to this study’s credibility.

Transferability was established in this study through the use of thick description in Chapter 4 (e.g. Geertz, 1973; Holloway, 1997; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) which allows conclusions to be drawn about the transferability of this study to other times, settings, situations, and people.

Dependability has been established by a) ensuring that the central and supporting research questions were clearly written; b) any propositions were provided and the question substantiated; c) the case study design was appropriate for the central research question; d) mixed purposeful sampling strategies appropriate to the case were described and applied; e) data was collected, managed and analysed correctly; and f) reported (e.g. Russell, et al, 2005).

Conformability was established through a clear audit trail of transcripts, memos and field notes; triangulation of methods during the research and reflexivity throughout the whole project (e.g. Lincoln & Guba 1985).

5.5.3 Leadership Evolution

It warrants repeating that while seeking answers to the central question the researcher encountered many exemplary leaders who made regular positive contributions to their organisations. The underlying factors which contributed to their successes were carefully examined in this study and found to be the antithesis of those also examined and which contributed to ineffective leadership. What has been included in the conclusions are the reasons as was promised at the beginning of this chapter, why, despite leaders’ best intentions
and the vast amount of available scholarship and education regarding leadership, organisations and organisational change, so many leaders still experience difficulties in these areas.

What became apparent to the researcher was that leaders have a need to understand how and why leadership fails just as much as a need know what makes it work. Without this knowledge which has been missing from the literature to date, leaders only get half the story.

So what is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian workplaces undergoing change? Quite simply put, the data and the research suggest that it is to ensure that the leader’s organisation (being made up of all who work for and in it) remains true to the organisation’s purpose, that it sets and achieves its long and short-term goals and that the organisation’s structure, integrity, commitment, viability and reputation remains intact so that this does happen. So it would appear that the central research question is not a difficult one to answer after all, but as the saying goes - the devil is in the detail.

Leader and leadership roles and functionality continue to evolve – they are not static premises as can be seen by the various leadership theories which have evolved over time (see 2.3.2). However, in the transition from one model of leadership to the next, pieces of old thinking and paradigms remain and causing current confusion between:

- what constitutes leader, leadership and management terminologies and practices;
- the role that social and personal identities play in the workplace;
- the rights of the individual as opposed to the rights of the organisation;
- how to educate and develop leaders and how to monitor, assess and correct leadership performance.

However the research concluded that there is an even deeper problematic concerning the continuous pull between the leader performance and behaviour that supports both the organisation’s purpose and its long and short-term goals and those which are supportive and are more beneficial to the individual.
To this end the study found that the notion of organisations being entities in their own right is being eroded in favour of organisations being vehicles for supporting individual career and personal goals and agendas.

Thus as identified in this study, these organisations are experiencing strategic drift where leadership is often intermittently being hijacked away from its intended purpose and organisations are being weakened as a consequence.

Unfortunately these phenomena are usually shielded from view to a greater or lesser degree by the same secondary and tertiary problematics which they cause.

Therefore the researcher proposes that leadership and management need to be redefined and re-classified into first and second order categories. This will provide relevance and transparency of purpose and activity within the modern multi-generational and multi-cultural environment where technology, competition and communication are immediate and change is a constant. Further this taxonomy will work regardless of organisational type or structure, and focuses attention on the attainment of the organisation’s short-term (immediate) and long-term (future) goals.

By viewing leader roles and functions differently from the traditional and linking leader roles and leadership to first and second order change rather than to the existing hierarchical paradigm, the research proposes that there can be a definitive answer to the research question “What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change”.
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Appendix 1: Recommendation 3, Karpin Report
Recommendation Three
Leadership initiative (Band II)

It is recommended that a program be put in place to develop, disseminate and promote relevant competencies in leadership to complement management development and also for use in the general community.

Implementation Strategy

Details of the program are as follows:

- A leadership program in each state modelled on the Williamson Foundation Leadership Program, which is in turn modelled on Leadership Chicago, which is:
  - linked to identified leadership competencies to ensure an appropriate level of rigour and effectiveness; and
  - consists of core state based programs with participants assembling in Canberra for a combined annual national element of the Leadership Program.

- An annual national leadership program which:
  - involves selected participants from each state program;
  - is of approximately 3 days duration;
  - is staged at a key locality to give maximum public exposure; and
  - is run in close association with, and with increasing levels of sponsorship from, prominent industry and community organisations.

- The Williamson Foundation could act as an agent to establish state and national leadership programs. This would include:
  - research into and use of world’s best practice techniques for developing leadership abilities;
  - development of program and resource material;
  - building network of presenters, advisers, supporters, promoters and possible financial sponsors;
  - development, maintenance and linking of alumni with the wider community;
  - promotion development and operation of performance measurement mechanism; and
  - maintenance of accountability.

- The program would be evaluated to gather information on competencies gained and outcomes delivered.

Appendix 2: Recommendation 11, Karpin Report

Recommendation Eleven
Frontline Manager Program (Band I)
It is recommended that there be a national training program for frontline managers.

Implementation Strategy
Details include:
• Participants will not have had any formal management training and will be working in enterprises which are able to demonstrate the application of quality principles in their operations and their human resource development processes;
• An estimated total number of 180,000 frontline managers in Australia are without formal management training. It is estimated that approximately 80,000 to 100,000 of these will qualify by working in quality committed enterprises. Target is to provide access to management training for 80,000 over a five year time frame or in an early stage of its operation;
• Participants to be released, at cost of employer, for up to 20 days structured training spread over a 20 to 40 week period. Approximately 10 curriculum units would be involved in course;
• Training to be funded by the Commonwealth in a manner which allows the enterprise to select the provider which most suits its requirements;
• Delivery, preferably on site, via a variety of mechanisms. Open and distance learning course materials to be provided;
• Course materials to be based on work already undertaken by the Australian Committee for Training Curriculum and to be competency based. Initially the materials will be print based but with funding proposed to make them available on electronic and CD Rom format;

### Appendix 3: The Ten Karpin Competencies and Eleven Initial FMI Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karpin Competencies</th>
<th>Original FMI Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of job and its context (technical specialist competencies)</td>
<td>Manage personal work priorities and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem and opportunity definition (anticipation and planning)</td>
<td>Provide leadership in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving and decision-making</td>
<td>Establish and manage effective workplace relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational insight</td>
<td>Participate in, lead and facilitate work teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (what and how)</td>
<td>Manage operations to achieve planned outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence (ability to influence peers, superiors and subordinates)</td>
<td>Manage workplace information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team management</td>
<td>Manage quality customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-insight (understanding own strengths and weaknesses)</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a safe workplace environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive (energy and initiative, persistence)</td>
<td>Implement and monitor continuous improvement systems process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (adapts behaviour) to situation</td>
<td>Facilitate and capitalise on change and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute to the development of a workplace learning environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 4: Comparison Between Original and Current Frontline Management Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original FMI Competencies</th>
<th>FMI Competencies Jan 2013 comprising of four core and six elective modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage personal work priorities and professional development</td>
<td>Show leadership in the workplace (core) (Elements: Model high standards of management performance and behaviour; Enhance organisation's image; Make informed decisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership in the workplace</td>
<td>Implement operational plan (core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and manage effective workplace relationships</td>
<td>Implement and monitor WHS policies, procedure and programs to legislative requirements (core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in, lead and facilitate work teams</td>
<td>Promote team effectiveness (core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage operations to achieve planned outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Electives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Coordinate implementation of customer service strategies;
- Address Customer needs;
- Implement customer service standards;
- Report on financial activity;
- Coordinate business resources;
- Implement workplace information system;
- Promote innovation in a team environment;
- Make a presentation;
- Maintain business technology;
- Develop teams and individuals;
- Implement continuous improvement;
- Lead and facilitate off-site staff;
- Promote products and services;
- Manage projects
- Build client relationships and business networks;
- Establish networks;
- Analyse and present research information;
- Identify risk and apply risk management processes;
- Implement and monitor environmentally sustainable work practices;
- Establish effective workplace relationships;
- Develop work priorities;
- Write complex documents.
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Appendix 5: Plain Language Statement

Thank you very much for taking part in this survey. Before you start, please take a moment to read the following information.

What is the purpose of this interview?

This interview seeks information from leaders representing Australian companies in the Public and Private Sector about issues concerning leadership, organisations and organisational change. The data collected will form an integral part of my PhD studies where I hope to untangle some of the aspects concerning these issues.

What types of questions will be asked?

I will be asking you general questions concerning your organisation, leadership, management, change and learning.

Confidentiality

Other than identifying the general industry in which you work (e.g. Hospitality, Energy etc.) be assured that your name, position or other identifiers and the name of your organisation will be kept confidential during the progress of the project and in the thesis itself. Further, no information will be released which could indirectly identify you or your company. Your responses to my questions will be printed and kept in a locked filing cabinet in a secure place and no copies will remain on my computer.

What will happen to my answers?

When I have completed all of the interviews your responses along with those of the others taking part in this study will be transcribed and studied to look for themes across all of the data. These themes will be written up and discussed in the thesis. Should quotes be used in the thesis, they will be cited as 'subject number' with no further identifiers. The names of the participants or any other identifiers will not be made public or discussed at any time before, during or after the process.

How will the information be stored?

All written materials, survey questions and related documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in my home office and will be shredded on completion of this study.

What sort of answers do I need to give?

Please answer each question honestly and in any way that best communicates your views. Conversational English is fine. There are no word limits or expectations as to the amount of content given in your responses.
What associated risks are there to participating in this survey?

Neither the organisations nor the participants will be identified in any part of this questionnaire or in the thesis itself. Only information directly relating to the survey questions will be tabulated. That is, the survey questions will be identified in the report and the finding will be presented in a percentage format for the most part. For example I might report, “Sixty-two per cent of people who answered survey question number 1.2 suggested that their organisation had a healthy culture of respect and hard work”. Equally I might report, “The majority of people surveyed said that there were not enough opportunities for training within their organisation”.

What to do when you have completed.

There is nothing that you need to do if we are in a face to face interview. However if the questionnaire is sent to you because you cannot make the interview, you can either email the results to me – kborgelt@allsortsct.com.au or fax to +61 +7 55464507. If you wish you can fax just the consent form and email the survey. Please note consent forms must be completed and sent if I am to include your answers in my work. The fax line and email addresses are viewed only by myself.

May I have a copy of the report when it is completed?

Yes. If your consent form includes a request for a final copy once my PhD is complete, then I will send you a copy when it is completed.

Withdrawing from the project

You can withdraw from the project at any time, and we will make sure your code is removed from all documents. You can change your mind at any time about being involved in the project. If you decide to withdraw, your name (if not yet changed to a code), your code number and the information that I have talked to you about, will be removed from all the project records.

Who to contact with questions or problems

If you have any comments, questions or concerns with the project or the way it is being carried out, please contact Karen Borgelt @ kborgelt@allsortsct.com.au or Prof Ian Falk, Charles Darwin University, and Northern Territory. (ph. 08 89 466666).

Again I thank you most sincerely for your participation.
Appendix 6: Consent Form

I __________________________

Of (address) __________________________

consent to participate in the ethnographic interviews being undertaken by Karen Borgelt as part of her PhD thesis “What is the role of leaders and leadership in contemporary Australian-based organisations undergoing change?”

I understand the purpose of the project is to identify those aspects which determine and relate to management and leadership purpose and activity.

I understand that:

- The aims, methods, and anticipated benefits, and possible risks of the study, have been explained to me by Karen Borgelt.

- I voluntarily and freely give my consent to my participation in the study.

  *I understand that finalized results may be used for research purposes and may be reported in academic journals.*

- Individual results *will not* be released to any person except at my request and on my authorisation.

- I am free to withdraw my consent at any time during the study, in which my participation in the research study will immediately cease and any information obtained from me will not be used.

I acknowledge that I have read a Plain Language Statement that explains all aspects of the project, including my rights regarding confidentiality and participation, and have had an opportunity to discuss these aspects with Karen Borgelt.

I wish to receive a copy of the completed thesis. YES/NO

Signature __________________________ Date __________________________

Contact details __________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 7 (A): The inter-relationship between the key words in the central question, the sub-questions, the interview guide themes, the interview guide questions and the key theorists used in their development.

NB This does not represent all authors read in the development of the questions nor all authors cited in the text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words in central research question (Total of 5)</th>
<th>Sub questions (Total of 9)</th>
<th>Interview guide themes (Total of 4)</th>
<th>Interview guide questions (Total of 40)</th>
<th>Key authors used in the development of questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>Culture, Change, Learning, Identity</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.12, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>Dawkins; Senior &amp; Fleming; Buchanan &amp; Huczynski; Pride, Hughes &amp; Kapoor; Baron &amp; Greenberg; Hatch; Carnall, 2003; Drucker; Johnson, Scholes; Whittington; Vecchio, Hearn &amp; Southey; Dougherty; Mullins; Giddens; Hardy; Johnson; Esser &amp; Liandoerfer; Jannis; Smithin; Dwivedi; Greco; Schumpeter; Veblen; Rogers; Walters; Wicksell; Yeager; Horwitz; Lewis; Becker; Bourdieau; Pennar; Field; Balkundi &amp; Kilduff; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Daft; Rost; Bennis &amp; Nanus; Ravasi &amp; Schultz; Schein; Knight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>Culture, Change, Learning, Identity</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.7, 3.12, 3.13, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>Avolio; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Daft; Plutarch; Machiavelli; Sun Tzu; Rost; Bennis &amp; Nanus; Carlyle; Moore; Bogardus; Bennis; Covey; Greenleaf; Mccall &amp; Lombardo; Horton; Malandro; Misumi; Skivington; McGregor Burns; McLellan; Stogdill; Fiedler; Hogg; Hersey-Blanchard; Boles &amp; Davenport; Tichy &amp; Devanna; Bolman &amp; Deal; Peters and Waterman; Bavelas; Filley; Kotter; Macoby; Schermerhorn; Davidson;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders (cont.)</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Culture Change</td>
<td>Learning Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 3.13, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>Avolio; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Daft; Plutarch; Machiavelli; Sun Tzu; Rost; Bennis &amp; Nanus; Carlyle; Moore; Bogardus; Bennis; Covey; Greenleaf; McCall &amp; Lombardo; McGregor Burns; McLelland; Stogdill; Fiedler; Hersey-Blanchard; Boles &amp; Davenport; Tichy &amp; Devanna; Bolman &amp; Deal; Peters and Waterman; Bavelas; Filley; Drucker; Kotter; Macobby; Schermerhorn; Davidson; Blanchard; Maxwell; Welch; Hogg; Sergiovanni; Hare; Lorenzi; Cialdini; French &amp; Raven; Forsyth; McLean; LeDoux; Dogie; Gazzaniga; Ramachandran; Goleman; Darwin; Ekman; Matsumoto; Frank, Scherer; O’Sullivan; Friesan; Babiak &amp; Hare; Burch &amp; Anderson; Conger; Demack; Hogan; Holland &amp; Van Landuyt; Keely; Knight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Australian-based Organisations</td>
<td>3, 5, 9,</td>
<td>Culture Change</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7</td>
<td>Australian Public Service Commission; Australian National Training Authority; Australian Taxation Office; Australian Institute of Company Directors; Senior &amp; Fleming; Buchanan &amp; Huczynski; Pride, Hughes &amp; Kapoor; Baron &amp; Greenberg; Hatch; Carnall, 2003; Johnson, Scholes; Drucker; Whittington; Vecchio, Hearn &amp; Southey; Dougherty; Mullins; Giddens; Hardy; Johnson; Esser &amp; Liandoerfer; Jannis; Smithin; Dwivedi; Greco; Janis; Schumpeter; Veblen; Rogers; Walters; Wicksell; Yeager; Horwitz; Lewis; Becker; Bourdieu; Pennar; Field; Balkundi &amp; Kilduff; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Daft; Ravasi &amp; Schultz; Schein; Bridges; Deming; Senge; Goodman; Levy &amp; Merry; Watzlawick, et al.; Levy &amp; Merry; Karpin; Knight; Furedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3, 7, 8,</td>
<td>Culture Change Identity</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Fleming; Kanter; Buchanan &amp; Huczynski; Pride, Hughes &amp; Kapoor; Baron &amp; Greenberg; Hatch; Carnall, 2003; Johnson, Scholes; Whittington; Vecchio, Hearn &amp; Southey; Dougherty; Mullins; Giddens; Hardy; Johnson; Esser &amp; Liandoerfer; Jannis; Smithin; Dwivedi; Greco; Schumpeter; Veblen; Rogers; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Daft; Walters; Wicksell; Yeager; O’Toole; Horwitz; Lewis; Becker; Bourdieu; Pennar; Field; Balkundi &amp; Kilduff; Bass; De Vries; Joss; Mintzberg; Ravasi &amp; Schultz; Schein; Bridges; Deming; Drucker; Senge; Goodman; Hurst; Levy &amp; Merry; Watzlawick, et al.; Van de Ven and Poole; Fiedler; Boleman &amp; Deal; Newmann; Czarniawska &amp; Sevon; Knight; Furedi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7 (B): The direct inter-relationship between the key words in the central question, the sub-questions, the interview guide themes, the interview guide questions and the subsections addressed in the Literature Review (excluding research theory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words in central research question</th>
<th>Sub questions (Total of 9)</th>
<th>Interview guide themes (Total of 4)</th>
<th>Interview guide questions (Total of 40)</th>
<th>Literature Review sub- sections (Excluding Research theory) (Total of 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>Culture Change Learning Identity</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>Culture Change Learning Identity</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.7, 3.12, 3.13, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>Culture Change Learning Identity</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 3.13, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Australian –based Organisations</td>
<td>3, 5, 9,</td>
<td>Culture Change</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7</td>
<td>2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3, 7, 8,</td>
<td>Culture Change Learning Identity</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8</td>
<td>2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.2.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.4, 2.5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8: Demographic by individual interviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int. Guide No</th>
<th>Govt.</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>For Profit</th>
<th>Not for Profit</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>Over 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8 (cont): Demographic breakdown by interviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int. Guide No</th>
<th>Govt.</th>
<th>Private Enterprise</th>
<th>For Profit</th>
<th>NFP</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>Over 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendice 9: Node Listings: 40 categories with 348 subcategories
(Most subcategories sorted alphabetically)

1. CULTURE

1. 1.01 Define Organisational culture (23 subcategories)

- Attitudes beliefs behaviours
- Brand - reputation
- Communication
- Customers
- Decision making
- Diversity of employees
- Environment
- Fairness
- Formal policies & procedures
- History
- Leadership
- Management
- Organisational purpose mission vision
- People
- Production or services
- Respect trust
- Shared purpose & goals
- Support & motivation
- Systems & structure
- Values & ethics
- Work ethic
- Unsure
- Other

2. 1.02 Culture of this Organisation (2 subcategories)

- Negative (9 subcategories)
  Communication
  Conservative - old fashioned
  Employee dissatisfaction
  Fragmented fractured dysfunctional
  Management & leadership
  Policies & procedures
  Purpose
  Risk averse - reactive
  Slow to react

- Positive (12 subcategories)
  Brand image reputation
  Community minded
  Customers
  Diverse culture
  Management & leadership
  Organisational purpose mission vision
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People
Production & services
Shared purpose
Supportive
Values
Other

3. 1.03 Division between management & staff – example (2 subcategories)

- No
- Yes – example (13 subcategories)
  Attitudes beliefs behaviours
  Communication
  Cultural
  Decision making
  Favoritism cronyism nepotism
  Hierarchy
  Organisational structure
  Policies
  Salaries & rewards
  Sharing purpose & knowledge
  Support motivation
  In general yes
  Not extensive - evolving limited expected

4. 1.04 Opinion this Organisation as an employer (2 subcategories)

- Needs improvement (16 subcategories)
  Attitudes beliefs behaviours
  Dealing with change
  Decision making
  Diversity
  Ethics integrity
  External influence
  Fairness trust
  Favoritism
  Management & leadership
  Pay & benefits
  Policies
  Production & services
  Shared purpose
  Stability
  Support & motivation
  Other

- Positive (12 subcategories)
  Benefits & pay
  Communication & feedback
  Diversity
  Environment
5. 1.05 Opinion management this Organisation (2 subcategories)

- Needs improvement (9 subcategories)
  - Change
  - Communication - sharing information
  - Decision making
  - Employee dissatisfaction
  - Policies
  - Purpose focus
  - Qualifications skills knowledge
  - Self interest
  - Style

- Positive (7 subcategories)
  - Approachable - good interaction
  - Good in general
  - Knowledge & skills
  - Motivational
  - Organisational purpose vision mission
  - Shared purpose
  - Trust

6. 1.06 Characteristics good manager (10 subcategories)

- Decisive
- Flexible & objective
- Friendly approachable
- Integrity courage conviction fair ethical
- Interpersonal skills - communication
- Knowledgeable & skilled
- Leadership
- Purpose vision goals mission of Organisation
- Supports - motivates
- Other

7. 1.07 How view leadership this Organisation (2 subcategories)

- Needs improvement (11 subcategories)
  - Ability skills knowledge
  - Approachability accessibility
  - Communication
  - Decision making
  - Favouritism cronyism nepotism
  - Management vs leadership
  - Purpose vision mission
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Self-serving
Support
Trust/fairness
Other

- Positive (10 subcategories)
  - Approachable - interaction with staff
  - Communication
  - Decision making
  - Enthusiastic - energetic
  - Good overall
  - Knowledge & skills
  - Proactive progressive flexible
  - Purpose vision mission
  - Support - motivation
  - Values ethics

8. 1.08 Characteristics good leader (11 subcategories)

- Approachable
- Communication & feedback
- Decisive
- Fair
- Knowledge & skills
- Leads by example
- Motivates & inspires
- Open flexible
- Personal characteristics
- Purpose vision mission
- Supportive

9. 1.09 Difference between leader and manager roles (3 subcategories)

- Leader (8 subcategories)
  - Guiding
  - Inspires motivates empowers
  - Leads by example
  - Managing - overseeing
  - Natural
  - Purpose vision mission goals objectives
  - Relationships
  - Other

- Manager (5 subcategories)
  - Leader
  - Operational oversight & applications
  - Personality
  - Training
  - Other

- No difference or difficult to define
10. 1.10 Accountability & responsibility viewed this Organisation (6 subcategories)
   - Consistent
   - Legal - contractual
   - Self-determined
   - Inconsistent or low accountability
   - No accountability
   - Other

11. 1.11 Rewards & discipline in your Organisation (5 subcategories)
   - Formal processes
   - Informal processes
   - Few or none
   - Unfair or poor handling
   - Unsure

12. 1.12 Are rewards discipline handled effectively Why (3 subcategories)
   - No
   - Yes
   - Unsure

2. CHANGE

13. 2.1 Changes last two years in your Organisation (11 subcategories)
   - Branding
   - Business practices
   - Funding
   - Growth - workload
   - Leadership management
   - Pay
   - Products services
   - Staff
   - Structural & systems
   - Technology
   - None

14. 2.2 Who created change – leader and manager or external imposed (2 subcategories)
   - External
   - Internal
15. 2.3 If 2.2 external give example internal (3 subcategories)

- **Negative (4 subcategories)**
  - Community
  - Leadership management
  - Staff
  - Structural – Organisational

- **Positive (5 subcategories)**
  - Customers
  - Environment
  - Leadership management
  - Staff
  - Structural – Organisational

- Cannot tell if positive or negative

16. 2.4 How well did leaders and managers implement change (3 subcategories)

- Good
- Poorly
- Other

17. 2.5 Impact of changes on you & the Organisation (3 subcategories)

- **Negative (8 subcategories)**
  - Accountability
  - Communication
  - Environmental
  - Increased workload
  - Job security
  - Leadership management issues
  - Products & services
  - Staff issues

- **Positive (9 subcategories)**
  - Benefits pay
  - Career development
  - Communications
  - Environment
  - In general good
  - Job assignment - responsibility
  - Job security
  - Policies
  - Products & services

- No impact

18. 2.6 Should leader and manager behave differently during times of change why (2 subcategories)

- No
• Yes (9 subcategories)
  Accessibility
  Communication
  Decisive
  Flexible
  Inspire & motivate
  Proactive
  Professional
  Supportive
  Other

19. 2.7 Does l&m support follow-up ensure adequate implementation (3 subcategories)
  • Not supportive (2 subcategories)
    Communication & follow-up
    Other
  • Yes supportive
  • Other

3. LEARNING ORGANISATIONS

20. 3.01 Your opinions ideas listened to by leader and manager– example (3 subcategories)
  • No
  • Yes
  • Varies

21. 3.02 How do leader and manager view mistakes in this – example (4 subcategories)
  • Do not tolerate mistakes
  • Fair policies & procedures in place
  • Inconsistent - little or no consequences
  • Unsure

22. 3.03 Does tolerance to mistakes vary at different levels of org – explain (3 subcategories)
  • No
  • Yes
  • Do not know or unsure

23. 3.04 How often training occurs when mistakes are made (3 subcategories)
  • Frequently - ongoing
  • Infrequently
  • Unsure or none
24. 3.05 Knowledge shared in Organisation from leaders & managers (2 subcategories)
   - Good
   - Needs improvement

25. 3.06 Ongoing training in your Organisation (6 subcategories)
   - Available
   - Encouraged
   - Denied - very little - none
   - Uninformed or have to request
   - Unsure
   - Would like to see

26. 3.07 Promotions within or external (3 subcategories)
   - External
   - Internal
   - Other

27. 3.08 Like to see done differently with regard to learning training (5 subcategories)
   - Examine effectiveness of training
   - More training opportunities
   - Satisfied with the way it is
   - Do not know
   - Other

28. 3.09 Training learning like to see re-enforced (17 subcategories)
   - Communication
   - Customer
   - Decision making
   - Innovation creativity
   - Job skills
   - Management & leadership skills
   - Organisational structure
   - People skills
   - Products services
   - Purpose vision mission
   - Regulations - mandatory issues
   - Stress management & mental health
   - Team building
   - Technology
   - Values ethics
   - Do not know or no additional training needed
   - Other
29. 3.10 Form of induction given to you in your role (2 subcategories)

- No
- Yes (3 subcategories)
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - Other

30. 3.11 Has this induction been followed up - should it be (4 subcategories)

- Followed up
- Not followed up
- Should be followed up
- Should not be followed up

31. 3.12 Should leader and manager have induction & training in their roles – why (3 subcategories)

- No
- Yes (6 subcategories)
  - Expectations
  - In general yes or other
  - Job skills & role
  - Management & leadership skills
  - Stay updated
  - Values
- Unsure

32. 3.13 How well is this done in your Organisation Explain (3 subcategories)

- Done well
- Not done well or not done at all
- Do not know

4. IDENTITY

33. 4.1 Describe yourself as an individual (3 subcategories)

- Attitudes
- Attributes
- Skills

34. 4.2 Describe yourself in your role in this Organisation (14 subcategories)

- Attitudes
- Challenge - motivation
- Decision maker - problem solver
- Knowledge & skills
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- Leader
- Manager
- Mentor coach
- People person
- Responsible accountable
- Shared purpose
- Team player
- Work ethic
- Unsure
- Other

35. 4.3 Should people behave differently in l &m role vs. private individual – explain (2 subcategories)
   - No
   - Yes

36. 4.4 Do leaders and managers in your organisation behave in professional manner – example (2 subcategories)
   - No
   - Yes

37. 4.5 Are there cliques in your Organisation (3 subcategories)
   - No
   - Yes
   - Unsure

38. 4.6 Rate the trust within this Organisation – why (5 subcategories)
   - High
   - Average
   - Low or none
   - Varies greatly
   - Do not know

39. 4.7 Are leader and manager trusted by their staff- why (3 subcategories)
   - No
   - Yes
   - Do not know or neutral

40. 4.8 How well does communication occur within org – example (2 subcategories)
   - Negative or needs improving
   - Positive