

Leadership Reflective Review

by Andrew Hayes, 2117217

BMPO 7005 Leadership and the individual

Lecturer: Steven Thompson

3rd May 2022

(Word Count: 5488, Excl. Title Page, Executive Summary, & References)

Executive Summary

Failure. It is a word nobody wants to associate with themselves, but I have learnt more from my failures than successes. Nobody can be successful one hundred percent of the time; some of the best leaders in business have an inherent resilience and view failure as a means of making themselves or a product better. Winston Churchill once famously said, 'success is not final, failure is not fatal: it is the courage to continue that counts' (Walter, 2013). When opportunities emerge, one must grab them with both hands because different challenges conceive the prospect of expanding skills, strengthening intelligence, and acquiring experience that will help me become a better leader.

This essay will reflect and evaluate a two year period of personal challenge in a strategic leadership role. In 2019 I was temporarily promoted to Chief Inspector responsible for Protect, Prepare and Prevent within Counter Terrorism Policing Wales. However, in 2020 I moved roles to review and design a new partnership governance structure for Contest (2018). The review involved over thirty-five organisations across the UK and had to consider new legislation. Roughly at the same time, I was in the process of defending myself against false allegations made by one of my staff, and I failed a promotion board in 2021.

overall feelings?

This experience has made me a better leader and helped me develop. Due to adherence to word count, this essay cannot explain every issue I experienced over a two-year leadership period. I intend to describe the situation by summarising the key challenges, explaining my leadership style and emotional state during those challenging times. I will focus on my motivation, resilience and how I managed the expectations placed on me. The essay will also focus on the impact of my leadership style and analyse my emotional intelligence to motivate and encourage development as a team. The paper will conclude by evaluating the learning I and those around me have gained and how I used this experience to pass the 2022 and how I will use it in future leadership roles.

Introduction

In November 2019, I was temporarily promoted, taking responsibility for the strategic leadership of Protect, Prepare and Prevent in Counter Terrorism Policing Wales. This was a challenge that I relished, and I saw significant benefits in how it would increase my strategic awareness, improve my management skills, and develop me as a leader. However, after ten months in this role, I was asked to carry out a strategic review of the Counter-Terrorism partnership and governance structure in Wales.

How did you feel?

The secondment to the Welsh Government and review of the partnership governance structure to deliver Contest involved over thirty-five organisations, ranging from every local authority in Wales to national partners such as the Centre of Protection for National Infrastructure (CPNI). However, there was new legislation (Protect Duty) proceeding through the UK's legislative process, and this legal duty would result in change for private and public organisations. My role was to design, deliver and manage a complete governance change, capture the key legislative priorities, and motivate partners to meaningfully contribute and increase productivity. My senior's instructions to me were to use my subject matter knowledge to deliver on the following expectations: focused priorities, consistency, and accountability.

were you okay with this?

At this juncture, I must explain the complexity of the subject. Partners have limited exposure to terrorism and the vast amount of information within this field. Furthermore, they have conflicting priorities, financial constraints, and other serviceable demands. Policing operates primarily through command and control, and there is a contrasting culture between different statutory bodies. Finally, policing is in a constant flux of change and the new legislation and governance structure altered the operating model for Counter Terrorism Policing Wales. Therefore, my challenge was to support and lead the team to help them understand, adapt, and thrive. I had to identify the motivation and a style of leadership that would support their learning and development.

were you up for the challenge?

As I progressed through the governance refresh, I had false allegations levelled against me, which caused me a lot of personal stress and anxiety; I also put myself forward for promotion. In March 2021, I failed that promotion process for the rank of Chief Inspector. The challenge of the role, the stress and anxiety of a malicious

complaint and the disappointment of failing a promotion interview made me despondent and question how I would bounce back. What could I learn from this experience, and was I really in a position to learn because I felt resentment, disappointment and frustration? In addition to the Contest (2018) governance refresh, my seniors asked me to lead the Protect team again in Wales. I knew that I needed to refocus, re-energise, and demonstrate resilience no matter what had gone before.

why, for you? The team? The org?

Leading people

As a senior officer, the governance review and period of uncertainty made me reflect on my leadership styles and how I would conduct myself. I recognised one size does not fit all; the project required different approaches at certain junctures. I needed to get 'buy in', build enthusiasm and excitement whilst educating and developing those around me to understand my vision, work within the new structures and deliver against the identified priorities.

People inevitably feel apprehensive about changing and new concepts, but we would not have the advancement of technology or means of communication without change occurring as a country. The ancient philosopher Seneca (n.d) once wrote, 'it is our thoughts, rather than the change itself, that is the source of our resistance to change'. This is true today as it was then; people fear the unknown and uncertainty and will resist change to self-preserve and maintain a cognitive equilibrium. Understanding the stress associated with change and its impact on our mental state made me consider the importance of my leadership styles during this period of uncertainty.

good

There are many definitions and theories to understand leadership styles, but being an effective leader is dynamic, complex, and rewarding. Kotter (1987) describes management as a set of processes that keep a system (organisation) functioning, such as budgeting, operational plans and resource management. However, leadership is what creates vision, empowers staff, or transforms an organisation's culture. Capezio & Morehouse (1997, p.1) defined leadership as 'the ability to influence individuals or groups to think, feel and take positive action to achieve goals'. This definition reflects what I was seeking to accomplish because my role was to inspire staff and partners to evolve, change and achieve positive outcomes. According to Capezio and

Morehouse (1997), there are three components to lead: action, influence and motivation. Action is the leader's proficiency to instigate activity or transform others to yield results. Influence triggers others to act and acknowledge duties, and motivation is channelling one's drive whilst meeting an individual's motivational needs.

How did you do this?

The leadership challenges I faced were the unrelenting pace of organisational change, where people suffer from change fatigue. The project was delivered in the meridian of the COVID pandemic, and I had many senior statutory partners to engage and garner support. Organisations continually face challenges, but real leaders ask hard questions, take people out of their comfort zone and manage those around them (Heifetz & Laurie, 2002). The concept of adaptive change was pioneered by Heifetz & Laurie (1997). Within this theory, they recognised leaders need to occasionally step into the terraces to evaluate and identify the adaptive challenge.

I theoretically took myself up in a helicopter to observe current practices and overlay a template that I believed would meet our statutory obligations. However, change is unsettling and great leaders can regulate distress by inspiring people without debilitating their connection to the organisation. It was essential I controlled the change by allowing an opportunity for discourse but followed with direction whilst maintaining balance (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). I achieved this by firstly taking the time to personally brief executives on a one-to-one basis and regularly engaging with my staff. This ensured I had support, allowed participants to ask questions, and I was able to maintain focus on the change programme. Significantly, I was able to seek feedback and take account of others' views which allowed me to develop a model that would succeed and be met with enthusiasm.

style?

Leaders inspire others in change by maintaining disciplined attention whilst debate continues, transferring responsibilities to others to encourage participation and protect the voices of others to provoke debate. My management skills for chairing meetings allowed this process to play out. However, to lead effectively, I tasked specific actions, for example, parts of strategy writing, guidance documents and quality assurance of my reports which encouraged participation and gave others a voice. Kotter (1987) recognised leadership styles must fit the audience to implement change successfully and that there is not one optimum method. I acknowledged that there will always be

one maverick who disagrees with the organisation's priorities and direction and attempts to debilitate progress. Therefore, I dedicated more time to detractors until I could no longer convince them to join the broader partnership on our journey.

Then what?

Policing, by its nature, is very hierarchical, and there are recognisable advantages to an autocratic leadership style. Personally, during critical incidents, when decisive action is required, authoritarian leadership maintains order, the effective deployment and coordination of assets and supports prompt decision making. According to Mullins & McLean (2019), decision making rests with the manager as it is the manager who demands attention and power. While I was not in crisis mode, it is worth recognising that my seniors had bestowed trust and confidence upon me and expected me to deliver. If I had failed, then my career could have derailed.

feelings about this?

I was always against a collapsing time frame to deliver the project, which did make me consider changing my leadership style. Briker et al. (2020) examined the connections between supervisors' time, leadership behaviour and workforce outcomes. The study reasoned those managers with higher time urgency and perceived higher status are likely to exhibit an autocratic leadership style. This style indirectly affects staff workplace stress and time pressure experiences. However, there are occasions staff need direction, and they look to leaders for definitive action. This can undoubtedly be the case during times of crisis or if subordinates are inexperienced. Despite the time pressure, I did not allow this to change my approach.

why?

According to Rast et al. (2013), self-certain individuals support non-autocratic than autocratic leaders, whereas self-uncertain participants support an autocratic more than a non-autocratic leader. Kotter (1987) describes how people are the most crucial part of the context of leadership styles. I managed a team of staff with vast experience and partners who worked for the statutory bodies for lengthy periods; therefore, I never felt their preference would be autocratic, but they looked to me for guidance as a leader and subject matter expert.

Personal leadership style towards subordinates when power is a determining factor can be transferred by using different leadership styles such as democratic or delegative (laissez-faire). Harms et al. (2018) recognised the disadvantages of an

autocratic leadership style: it necessitates directing subordinates, possibly neglecting individual or group needs and rejecting their participation in organisational decisions. I realised that the refreshed governance and to lead my teams effectively, autocratic leadership would lead to a loss of trust and confidence, lack of engagement, and reliance on power. Moreover, the outcome of this leadership style has negative connotations, for example, increased cynicism, poor well-being, group performance and cohesion (Harms et al., 2018).

Burns (1978) notes transactional leaders lead through social exchange. However, does a model of exchange work in the public sector and strategic leadership in policing? Encouraging support and buy-in were not incentivised through reward or recognition. I used emotion to realise organisational plans by explaining our moral and ethical responsibilities. However, I used this style on occasions, particularly when developing the performance and assurance process for Contest Cymru. This set clear parameters, focused on efficiency and would lead to positive outcomes. Bass (1985) provides a basis for effective leadership, recognising if augmented with transformational leadership, it improves satisfaction, effectiveness and engagement.

Bass and Riggio (2008) highlight how transformation leadership have much in common with charismatic leadership. Thus, authentic transformational leaders are more likely to individualise moral and ethical principles, displaying authenticity to exhibit exemplary leadership. According to Burns (1978), transformation leadership is how 'Leaders and followers help each other advance to a higher level of morale and motivation'. Transformational leadership is performed through authenticity because it is person focused. To be an effective transformational leader, one must act as a role model to inspire, challenge correctly, and have high levels of emotional intelligence to understand one's own and others' strengths and weaknesses.

Bass (1985) argues that transformational leadership is proactive and more effective than transactional leadership, particularly when motivating staff. Avolio (1999) concludes that followers work harder, have more outstanding dedication, and teams are more cohesive. Transformational leadership elevated the goals and highlight the values to followers. In contrast, transactional leadership offer incentives to encourage individuals to realise their existing plans.

I needed to inspire a vision, use my subject matter expertise to support colleagues and partners, and maintain high levels of motivation to stimulate debate, innovate and support the development of my teams. This is reflected by Bass and Riggio (2008), who describe the four components of transformational leadership: idealised influence, I acted as a role models. Inspirational motivation, my behaviour motivated by providing meaning and optimism. Intellectual stimulation, I encouraged innovation and problem solving. Individual consideration, I played particular attention to the needs of the followers and acted as a coach or mentor to realise the potential of others.

How the team feel? did it work?

I recognised my communication skills, both orally and written, would play a significant part in my success. However, the most powerful tool I had was the ability to listen and consider others' views when designing the structure and processes. On one occasion, one local authority refused to engage, and despite my best attempts, I had to be open and honest with them, highlighting certain risks. Their lack of situational awareness caused me internal frustrations, and I checked my tone and language. Berson and Avolio (2004) investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and the dissemination of organisational strategic goals in an organisation enduring change. The correlation between effective transformational leadership style was communication, and the three types exhibited to raise employee awareness of strategic objectives: listener, honesty and accuracy. According to Bono and Judge (2003), certain personality traits are better suited to a transformational leadership style, for example, those with emotional stability, resilience and innovation. Reflecting on my personality traits, I recognise I am an innovative person with good levels of resilience, and within more strategic policing roles, I have developed my emotional stability.

According to Bass and Riggio (2008), they believe the role of a leader has changed where autocratic or authoritarian leaders are no longer the norm. Today's leaders have greater self-awareness and emotional intelligence towards others. While followers are diverse, some have equal or greater knowledge, and not one leadership style can blanket an entire team. I do not necessarily agree with this because in policing, we still require autocratic leadership at times of crisis. Bass and Riggio (2008) suggest adaptive leaders are more likely to succeed but recognise that transformational leaders are adaptive. The leadership challenge has meant I have been in a constant

adaptive or situational leadership posture. However, what has stood me in good stead has been authenticity.

Has it been good for the team/org?

George (2003, p.12) clarifies that authentic leaders use their natural abilities, recognise their shortcomings, and work hard to overcome them. They lead with purpose, meaning, and values by building consistent, enduring relationships with people. When people are connected to the organisation, valued, and part of the process, they feel happy, engaged, and even motivated. Subordinates follow because they know where they stand. This connection and identity benefit organisational productivity, but it is also salubrious for the individual. I prefer this style of leadership because of consistency and self-discipline. Authentic leaders are dedicated to developing themselves because they know that becoming a leader takes a lifetime of personal growth. I believe I treated people with humanity and humility, and when leading the team day to day and on a change programme, I treated people the way one would expect to be treated.

Kalungu-Banda, (2006) recognised people in organisations are not merely human resources; they are human beings with different emotions, cultures and life experiences. According to Wulffers (2017), leaders must be agile and resilient, especially at times of crisis, but to foster self-awareness and develop others, they must genuinely relate to all stakeholders. As a leading theory of authenticity Sartre (1943) explained, leaders must be true to others by taking responsibility for their actions. This early theory is echoed by Babin & Wilink & (2015), who believe successful leaders must lead with extreme ownership. In other words, they must take responsibility for their actions, remove ego and de-centralise command. I used authentic leadership by resting the new governance success or possible failure squarely at my feet. However, *How* I removed the ego to garner support and get staff and partners working with me. Handing power for certain decisions over to others gave them the responsibility whilst I maintained accountability. According to Mullins & McLean (2019, p.341), democratic leadership increases the interactions within a group, and the group have a more significant influence when determining policies, processes and outcomes.

Wulffers (2017, p.52) recognised the characteristics one must exhibit to become an authentic leader, self-awareness, integrity, trustworthiness, respect, and emotional intelligence. According to Wulffers (2017, p.13), authenticity is the degree to which we

are true, despite external pressures and influences that might conflict with our beliefs and values. The benefits of leading with authenticity for me personally were that I committed to understanding my strengths and weakness, regulated my emotions and was fervid when expressing myself. I used my communication skills to maximum effect, using words such as 'speaking candidly' and 'I value our working relationship'.

How did it go?

Shamir and Eilam (2005) define authentic leaders as genuine and original. I behaved consistently and had high levels of self-awareness. I learned about others' personal and professional likes, dislikes, and ambitions. This led me to have a better connection with the staff and partners but also, on an emotional level, they felt invested in our collective journey. I recognised from this process the time, effort, and honesty required. Not all partners like honesty, and some merely did not want to engage in lengthy discussions. Authenticity requires high levels of courage and social awareness as it is impacted by personal morals, culture and life experiences.

*did trust increase?
did they give you power?*

I spent some time reflecting on my leadership journey through this change management process, and I conclude that being ambidextrous in my leadership was my propitious style. It delivered consistently by utilising both transactional and authentic transformational leadership. Rosing, Frese & Bausch (2011) propose an ambidextrous leadership style for innovation that allows leaders to travel the pendulum of leadership styles for exploration and exploitation in individuals and teams. March (1991) defines exploration as the increase in the investigation, experimentation and identifying alternatives. Exploitation is a decrease in variance and risk aversion. Ambidextrous leaders develop the competency to recognise when to lead with opening behaviours (exploration) but have the situational awareness and demonstrate the flexibility to switch to closing behaviours (exploitation) (Rosing, Frese & Bausch, 2011). Bledow et al. (2009) consider that exploitation and exploration are entwined and cannot be detached.

In summary, Oluwafemi et al, (2019) stated ambidextrous leadership is essential for an organisation seeking to enhance innovation, and this style generates innovative behaviours in employees. However, these behaviours are conceived through leadership flexibility and situational awareness. In policing, leaders must retain power at times of 'crisis' and utilise transactional leadership to command, control, and coordinate. However, it is preferable to develop innovation at times of benevolence,

harness individual and team motivation, and transfer power. As a leader, I recognised an ambidextrous leadership allowed me to deliver change, innovate and lead effectively.

The impact of my leadership on motivation and learning

Colleagues and partners had to learn about the new structure. The question was, how would experience professionals best adapt and learn new and complex information? Houwer et al, (2013) define learning as ontogenetic adaptation - that is, as changes in the behaviour of an organism that results from regularities in the environment of the organism. Skinner (1976) identified three responses to his operant conditioning: neutral, reinforcement, and punishers. Behaviourists thought learning was simply a reaction to a stimulus and ignored the idea that thinking plays an important role (McLeod, 2016). The Key principle of cognitivism is that learning is a process of receiving, organising, storing, and retrieving information (Ertmer and Newby, 1994, p.58). Cognitivism looks beyond the observable environment and recognises our internal mental processes determine our learning. According to Michela (2018), the cognitivist approach to learning assumes that the learner uses cognitive processes as an active participant in the learning process.

Bandura (1977) proposed social learning theory by considering how cognitive and environmental factors interact to influence human learning and behaviour. Observational learning occurs within the environment, but the mental stimuli and cognitive function occur before and after to mediate the behaviours because Bandura (1977) believes humans are information processors. Therefore, people do not simply observe behaviour and repeat it; they must process the information in their time, contextualise it within their organisations and understand which aspects to adopt. In summary, one size does not fit all, and as a leader, I needed to identify different strategies to improve the collective understanding of my colleagues and partners. *How?*

Following the failure of a promotion board and to demonstrate I had the resilience and courage to drive innovation and improvements continuously, I reflected on my intrinsic motivation. I first embraced the challenge that faced me, recognising the enormity of the project and the responsibility I adopted. I wanted to gain personal satisfaction and

demonstrate the ability to bounce back and recover from setbacks. However, one cannot ignore the extrinsic motivators that rest within us. Power has never been a determining factor; I care what people think of me, but I also am interested in supporting my family's financial stability and promotion improves my children's lifestyle. The impact of my motivation on others was that I was determined and unequivocal in my desire to succeed. Despite the demand challenges and understanding of the subject or capacity, I would push my motivation and goals on others. *was this good?*

Locke & Lathan (2006) argue that goal-setting theory result in desired outcomes must challenge, be accepted, and be clear (Lunenburg & Samaras, 2011). Human beings are, by nature, goal-oriented (Emmons, 2005, p. 15). Therefore, I set SMART (specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-based) objectives within my project implementation document. Many partners and colleagues recognised my determination and enthusiasm and embraced it, but some did not receive it well because they had no desire to engage. Those who did embrace the direction and operating model thrived and started to realise the tangible benefits and the aspects of my transactional leadership, i.e. positive outcomes. As Pervin (1989, p.474) articulated, 'a goal is a mental image or other endpoint representation associated with effect towards which action may be directed'.

Partners who repudiated and did not engage carried risk, and eventually, other senior colleagues would question why certain milestones had not been achieved. This resulted in embarrassment and them re-engaging with me to correct the lack of action. However, I recognised the underlying issues specifically for individuals who did not have the organisational capacity due to serviceable demand or those who did not have the knowledge and experience to deliver. This made me adjust, innovate and demonstrate transformational leadership. I initiated development days to improve understanding and relationships and build a network of networks. Consequently, those slightly taciturn partners or 'detractors' began to motivate, deliver and embrace the new operating model. *did the feel better, was the org better?*

Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs as a motivational theory is often depicted in a pyramid using a bottom-up approach. The lower or basic needs must be satisfied before we look to meet our self-fulfilment needs. The first four levels (physiological

needs, safety, belonging and esteem) are often referred to as deficiency needs and the top-level (self-fulfilment) as growth needs (McLeod, 2007). Maslow (1987, p.69) clarified when a deficit need has been satisfied, our attention is drawn to the next level, but the hierarchy is not rigid because we are all different, and we all have contrasting perceptions and desires (Maslow, 1987, p.68). Growth needs tend to derive from a passion for self-improvement, but if any of our conditions are not met, we lack motivation, and this cycle must be broken through solid leadership. Maslow (1987, p.71) pointed out that our behaviour is often simultaneously multi-motivated. Whilst Alderfer's (1969) ERG theory argues there are three groups of core needs (existence, relatedness and growth), and they operate at the same time but what is notably different to Maslow (1943) is that if higher levels are suppressed, our desire to satisfy lower levels increases.

Every person can be motivated to develop and reach self-actualisation, but progress can be disrupted through events. Therefore, one can fluctuate between the different stages. From a personal perspective, this was certainly the case for me following my promotion failure in 2021. At one stage, I was in growth, but consequently, due to the 'event', my needs changed and my desire to satisfy lower levels intensified. I needed my leaders to refocus on my psychological needs (belonging and esteem) to return me to a growth position. Furthermore, as a leader within the police, I recognise that my primary function to support staff is to meet their deficiency needs. If I did not achieve this within the change programme, I knew I would not be able to move both individuals and organisations on to growth.

McClelland (1961) identified three motivators: the need for achievement, affiliation and power. Often referred to as learned needs theory, people demonstrate different characteristics depending on their dominant motivator. The relevance of this theory when managing the change in governance and partnership landscape allowed me to understand myself and individuals better and use my emotional intelligence to derive positive outcomes for the project. For example, I identified my dominant motivator as a need for achievement as I had a strong need to set and accomplish goals. I liked to receive feedback on my accomplishments and could work alone. I recognise my motivator impacts my staff because my determination to succeed can be the team's

determinant. However, some of my staff and partners had similar motivators to me as they liked to take charge, retain power and persuade others to take a particular path.

The above theories and my leadership focused on what motivates people and addressed specific factors like individual needs and goals. The benefit of this was we had a shared desire for change – to improve the deliverables within Contest (2018). However, the risk when engaging with like-minded people was that we could have clashed. To create balance and to minimise impact, referring to my leadership styles, I understood that understanding these individuals' motivators allowed me to harness their strengths by setting challenging but not impossible goals (policy development, strategies or guidance documents). Others had different dominant factors such as affiliation, where they wanted to be part of a group, often going along with the majority and conforming to groupthink. These individuals often felt uncomfortable with uncertainty, and consequently, I had to integrate them with others and re-invest time to support and continually motivate them.

With a sizable change programme, levels of complexity and a new operating structure, I needed to consider how I would get the best from my colleagues and partners. As previously discussed, I held regular meetings with staff and dedicated time on a personal level - this maintained focus, provided a space for feedback, and I was able to reinforce key messages. According to Pintrich & Schnuk (2002), motivation is a practice of instigating and upholding focused activities. Early theorists interpreted emphasis or seeking corroboration through reinforcement as incentivising and motivating. However, humans are more complex and nuanced. According to Schunk and Usher (2019), people develop beliefs, perspectives, and knowledge through interacting with others. However, people are motivated by these social interactions.

People's emotions can be erratic during change due to confusion or uncertainty. There was a split in feelings for the staff I was leading; one half was excited and enthused by the change, and the other did not engage in the same way. I considered the emotional state of my staff by examining any underlying issues. I used my communication and authenticity to speak with staff to understand the route cause, and I discovered they were not demotivated by my actions, they were unclear about certain aspects of the governance. I asked myself was I equivocal, had I caused the confusion,

Did this cause problems?

How did you feel doing this?

What were you feeling?

was your team?

did I communicate accurately, and had I placed unrealistic targets and expectations on others? I recognised my recalcitrant position, proclivity, the impact of my leadership and motivation on others. Firstly, the pace I was operating at impacted certain people; their knowledge of the subject was not at the same level and due to the complexity, whilst it was clear in my head, others did not understand the vision in full. I do not believe I demotivated any individual; I think many of my colleagues were motivated but what I know now is we were not on a similar trajectory, and I needed to stop and adapt to meet individual needs. *why?*

According to Goleman (1995), emotional intelligence distinguishes great leaders from merely good ones. There are five skills associated with emotional intelligence: self-awareness – recognising personal strengths, areas of development and values. Self-regulation – controlling emotions, impulses and moods. Motivation – relishing the opportunity and facing challenges head-on. Empathy – understanding other people's feelings, character and fears. Social skills – ability to build rapport and create an emotional connection with others. McClelland (1996) discovered how vital emotional intelligence was to an organisation's success. In one study, he found that managers with high emotional intelligence outperformed other divisional leaders who did not have this vital attribute. There must be balance with everything in life; a leader cannot attain success by being too focused in one area and less in another. The leader cannot be overly self-confident or have too much empathy, preventing the business from being taken care of (Willink & Babin, 2018). *were you?*

Public servants, in my opinion, have high levels of motivation, but leadership behaviours impact this. McClelland et al. (1953) argued internal motives existed within the subconscious. Atkinson (1958) demonstrated people are motivated when tasks are moderately complex, but recognised individuals had less motivation if the job was too hard or too easy. I believe I identified the correct balance in terms of timescales and critical milestones. Whilst I needed a motivated environment, I did have to acknowledge that the pace I was initially operating was unlikely to be matched by certain statutory bodies. However, Locke et al. (1986) recognised that when individuals have higher expectancy, it improves performance levels. *was there improvement?*

Social cognitive theory recognises that human behaviour and learning emanate from our social environments. As a leader trying to motivate staff, I realised the importance of motivation through authenticity and leading with humanity and humility. Bandura (2001) states human behaviour operates within an interchangeable framework, effectively moving from one interaction to another. The framework has three factors: personal, behavioural and social environment. Individual behaviour and achievement are both impacted by self-efficacy (Schunk and DiBenedetto, 2022). The more confident people are in learning, the higher their motivation. Social Cognitive Theory has demonstrated the importance of self-efficacy in changing behaviour, and this should be an organisational focus for change management and leaders (Malone, 2001). *was it?*

Malone (2001) advocated a behavioural model and introduced behavioural change techniques into planned change processes. Self-efficacy is an essential concept of motivation, explicitly concerning goal-setting theory. Individuals with greater self-efficacy will set themselves more demanding targets and be able to adapt to assigned tasks, and have greater resilience following negative feedback. However, individuals with low efficacy demonstrate low motivation toward challenging targets (Locke et al., 2001). Reflecting on these theories, it is clear when responsibilities are transferred to others, their inner belief and perception of their abilities play a significant role in how they might approach a task. Motivation does not reside within the subconscious, and individuals can be proactive and self-regulating rather than reactive and controlled by environmental forces. Bandura (1986) recognised human behaviour, motivation and beliefs about their capabilities are critical elements *Do you agree? Did you experience this?*

Reflecting on my behaviours in terms of developing partners and staff, helping them learn and improving confidence, I approached it similarly to self-efficacy theory. This was not learnt behaviour but more instinctive and came from experience rather than theory. I recognise how I developed by gaining relevant experience in change management and leadership. However, I spent a significant amount of time persuading statutory partners they had the skills and knowledge to work in collaboration with me. I used the network and those who had already set goals and achieved success to allow other partners to observe their meetings. This vicarious learning was pivotal because it was an alternative voice to me. *How did you feel?*

what did you think?

Conclusion

Overall, I believe my ambidextrous leadership style positively impacted my team and organisation. I received positive feedback regarding the project, and consequently, Counter Terrorism Policing Wales is in a better position with focused priorities, engagement and accountability. In March of 2022, I used this example in my promotion interview articulating the collaboration with partners, the leadership knowledge gained and the improvement in my presentation skills. Consequently, I was successful in my promotion interview and subsequently changed roles. To summarise, the emotional state of my team is simple – they did not want me to leave. This was primarily due to my subject matter knowledge and how I had driven and held partners to account. Some wider partners have concerns that the motivation towards the change programme may falter without me. I tried to put measures in place to ensure the governance is not ephemeral and support is forthcoming to deliver continued collaborative success.

congrats



is it working?

I have never had a role as challenging as this, the responsibility, the complexity of the partnership landscape and the innovation required was a challenge, however, I learned so much. My communication skills have improved, and my resilience, determination and creativity have all benefited from this experience. It is only natural to reflect and look back with immense pride. I acknowledge there are aspects I would have done differently to obviate mistakes, but hindsight is a wonderful thing. I recognised my initial pace and partners' expectations were too high, and I needed to allow them space to realise my vision. My relentless pursuit to succeed and motivation may have had an impact on those around me by requiring them to work at the same pace. I know this experience will inevitably support the organisation and me in future roles as it improved my change management skills, strategy writing, managing complex strategic partnership and leading diverse teams.



Reference

Alderfer, C., 1969. An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), pp.142-175.

Atkinson, J., 1958. *Motives in fantasy, action, and society*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Avolio, B., 1999. *Full leadership development*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Babin, L. and Willink, J., 2015. *Extreme Ownership*. St. Martin's Press.

Bandura, A., 1977. *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Bass, B. and Riggio, R., 2008. *Transformational leadership*. 2nd ed. New York.: Routledge.

Bennis, W. and Thomas, R., 2002. *Crucibles of Leadership*. [online] Harvard Business Review. Available at: <<https://hbr.org/2002/09/crucibles-of-leadership>> [Accessed 8 April 2022].

Berson, Y. and Avolio, B., 2004. Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 15(5), pp.625-646. Available at: <<https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com> [Accessed 26 March 2022].

Bledow, R., Frese, M., Anderson, N., Erez, M. and Farr, J., 2009. A Dialectic Perspective on Innovation: Conflicting Demands, Multiple Pathways, and Ambidexterity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, [online] 2(3), pp.305-337. Available at: <<http://DOI:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2009.01154.x>> [Accessed 31 March 2022].

Bono, J. and Judge, T., 2003. Self-Concordance at Work: Toward Understanding the Motivational Effects of Transformational Leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), pp.554-571.

Briker, R., Walter, F. and Cole, M., 2020. Hurry up! The role of supervisors' time urgency and self-perceived status for autocratic leadership and subordinates' well-being. *Personnel Psychology*, [online] 74(1), pp.55-76. Available at: <<https://web-s-ebscohost->

com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=b7fc6b61-605b-4b1c-a41e-e041d5b08510%40redis> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Burns, J., 1978. *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Busola Oluwafemi, T., Mitchelmore, S. and Nikolopoulos, K., 2020. Leading innovation: Empirical evidence for ambidextrous leadership from UK high-tech SMEs. *Journal of Business Research*, [online] 119, pp.195-208. Available at: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0148296319306204>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Busola Oluwafemi, T., Mitchelmore, S. and Nikolopoulos, K., 2020. Leading innovation: Empirical evidence for ambidextrous leadership from UK high-tech SMEs. *Journal of Business Research*, [online] 119, pp.195-208. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.035>> [Accessed 31 March 2022].

Caillier, J., 2020. Testing the Influence of Autocratic Leadership, Democratic Leadership, and Public Service Motivation on Citizen Ratings of An Agency Head's Performance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, [online] 43(4), pp.918-941. Available at: <<https://web-s-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=5867bbd6-655f-4c5e-ae8-4393b735f9e2%40redis>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Capezio, P. and Morehouse, D., 1997. *Secrets of breakthrough leadership*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.

Crosby, G., 2020. Lewin's Democratic Style of Situational Leadership: A Fresh Look at a Powerful OD Model. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, [online] p.002188632097981. Available at: <<https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1177/0021886320979810>> [Accessed 25 March 2022].

De Houwer, J., Barnes-Holmes, D. and Moors, A., 2013. What is learning? On the nature and merits of a functional definition of learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 20(4), pp.631-642.

Drucker, P., 2004. *What Makes an Effective Executive*. [online] Harvard Business Review. Available at: <<https://hbr.org/2004/06/what-makes-an-effective-executive>> [Accessed 7 April 2022].

Ertmer, P. and Newby, T., 2008. Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism: Comparing Critical Features from an Instructional Design Perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 6(4), pp.50-72.

Gardner, W., Avolio, B., Luthans, F., May, D. and Walumbwa, F., 2005. "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), pp.343-372.

Gardner, W., Avolio, B., Luthans, F., May, D. and Walumbwa, F., 2005. "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 16(3), pp.343-372. Available at: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984305000275>> [Accessed 27 March 2022].

Gardner, W., Coglisier, C., Davis, K. and Dickens, M., 2011. Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 22(6), pp.1120-1145. Available at: <<https://www.sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S1048984311001548>> [Accessed 26 March 2022].

George, W., 2003. *Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harms, P., Wood, D., Landay, K., Lester, P. and Vogelgesang Lester, G., 2018. Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 29(1), pp.105-122. Available at: <<https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S1048984317300814?token=D3E6E51B9>>

1D5E9E73E2BCF7699BD4491CA03A0A9C6F30AC510DF14B23D732F19F1BCD7D8E4F154F099CFBDC818DAC154&originRegion=eu-west-1&originCreation=20220325072137> [Accessed 25 March 2022].

Heifetz, R. and Laurie, D., 2002. The work of leadership. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 30(1), pp.14-14.

Kalungu-Banda, M., 2006. *Leading like Madiba*. Cape Town: Double Storey Books.

Kotter, J., 1997. Leading change: A conversation with John P. Kotter. *Strategy & Leadership*, [online] 25(1), pp.18-23. Available at: <<https://www.proquest.com/docview/194364629?accountid=130472&parentSessionId=rbyqGIC9dL2cISf3A5I%2FxFLeDwN94AHyq8wG363LDseA%3D&pq-origsite=primo>> [Accessed 25 March 2022].

Kotter, J., 2000. What Leaders Really Do. *The Bottom Line*, 13(1).

Lamb, D. and Cogan, N., 2015. Coping with work-related stressors and building resilience in mental health workers: A comparative focus group study using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, [online] 89(3), pp.474-492. Available at: <<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/trinity/detail.action?docID=5730794>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Meinecke, A., Rowold, J. and Kauffeld, S., 2015. How transformational leadership works during team interactions: A behavioral process analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 26(6), pp.1017-1033. Available at: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984315000776>> [Accessed 26 March 2022].

Lewin, K. and Gold, M., 1999. *The complete social scientist*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Locke, E. and Latham, G., 1990. *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Locke, E. and Latham, G., 2002. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, [online] 57(9), pp.705-717. Available at: <<https://web-s-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=31462099-c754-43d7-aa5f-2502240f4754%40redis>> [Accessed 3 April 2022].

Locke, E. and Latham, G., 2006. New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), pp.265-268.

Locke, E., Motowidlo, S. and Bobko, P., 1986. Using Self-Efficacy Theory to Resolve the Conflict Between Goal-Setting Theory and Expectancy Theory in Organizational Behavior and Industrial/Organizational Psychology. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4(3), pp.328-338.

Lunenberg, M. and Samaras, A., 2011. Developing a pedagogy for teaching self-study research: Lessons learned across the Atlantic. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), pp.841-850.

March, J., 1991. Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), pp.71-87.

Maslow, A. and Frager, R., 1987. *Motivation and personality*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Maslow, A., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), pp.370-396.

McClelland, D., 1961. *The achieving society*. New York: Van Nostrand.

McClelland, D., Lowell, E., Clark, R. and Atkinson, J., 1953. *The achievement motive*. East Norwalk, Conn: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Mcleod, S., 2016. *[Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory]*. [online] Simplypsychology.org. Available at: <<https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>> [Accessed 1 May 2022].

McLeod, S., 2007. *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. [online] Simplypsychology.org. Available at: <<https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>> [Accessed 1 May 2022].

Michela, E., 2018. *Cognitivism*. [online] Edtechbooks.org. Available at: <<https://edtechbooks.org/studentguide/cognitivism>> [Accessed 1 May 2022].

Mullins, L. and McLean, J., 2019. *Organisational behaviour in the workplace*. Pearson Education Limited.

Paglis, L. and Green, S., 2002. Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, [online] 23(2), pp.215-235. Available at: <<https://web-p-ebshost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=b29cf881-d639-4dba-8b02-7c978838a348%40redis>> [Accessed 3 April 2022].

Pajares, F., 2003. SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS, MOTIVATION, AND ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, [online] 19(2), pp.139-158. Available at: <<https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.1080/10573560308222?needAccess=true&>> [Accessed 1 May 2022].

Pervin, L., 1989. *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Pintrich, P. and Schunk, D., 2002. *Motivation in Education*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Pyszczynski, T., Kesebir, P. and Lockett, M., 2019. A Terror Management Theory Perspective on Human Motivation. *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, [online] pp.66-88. Available at: <<https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190666453.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190666453-e-5>> [Accessed 1 April 2022].

Rast, D., Hogg, M. and Giessner, S., 2013. *Self-uncertainty and Support for Autocratic Leadership*. [online] <https://content.ebscohost.com>. Available at: <<https://web-s-ebshost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=dc67b8ec-11ac-45b6-91c3-23635d3ec942%40redis>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Rosing, K., Frese, M. and Bausch, A., 2011. Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 22(5), pp.956-974. Available at: <<https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S1048984311001160>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Rosing, K., Frese, M. and Bausch, A., 2011. Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, [online] 22(5), pp.956-974. Available at: <<http://doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.014>> [Accessed 31 March 2022].

Sartre, J., 1943. *Being and nothingness*.

Schunk, D. and DiBenedetto, M., 2020. Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, [online] 60, p.101832. Available at: <<https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0361476X19304370>> [Accessed 3 April 2022].

Schunk, D. and DiBenedetto, M., 2022. *Self-Efficacy Theory in Education*. [online] Routledgehandbooks.com. Available at: <<https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315773384.ch3>> [Accessed 1 April 2022].

Schunk, D. and Usher, E., 2019. Social Cognitive Theory and Motivation. *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, [online] pp.9-26. Available at: <<https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190666453.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190666453-e-2>> [Accessed 1 April 2022].

Shamir, B. and Eilam, G., 2005. "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), pp.395-417.

Skinner, B., 1976. *About behaviorism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Walsh, W. and Vito, G., 2018. *Police leadership and administration: A 21st-Century Strategic Approach*. Milton: Taylor & Francis Group.

Walter, E., 2013. *30 Powerful Quotes on Failure*. [online] Forbes. Available at: <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/ekaterinawalter/2013/12/30/30-powerful-quotes-on-failure/?sh=7fb2f82724bd>> [Accessed 12 March 2022].

Wang, S., Eva, N., Newman, A. and Zhou, H., 2020. A double-edged sword: the effects of ambidextrous leadership on follower innovative behaviors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, [online] 38(4), pp.1305-1326. Available at: <<https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/article/10.1007/s10490-020-09714-0#citeas>> [Accessed 20 March 2022].

Willink, J. and Babin, L., 2018. *The dichotomy of leadership*. New York, USA: St. Martin's Press; Illustrated edition.

Wulfers, T., 2017. *Authentic leadership effectiveness for individuals and teams*. Randburg, South Africa: KR Publishing.