

Notes on Leadership and Management – Glenn L. Jenkins 2009

Leadership and management are often considered together simply because in the USA where much of organisational theory has been developed there is focus on the role of management in organisations and consideration of managers in those roles as leaders [1].

The theories can be categorised in a number of ways; based on their breadth of application whether they are universal approaches (reflecting the assumption that one management theory can be used in all situations,) and the more pragmatic situation-specific approach [1]. These theories can also be categorised according to their focus being either person centred (how the relatively fixed personality traits of the individual influence their management,) and behaviour centred (how patterns of behaviour within leaders influence their management) [1].

Theories as a matrix (from Rollingson [1]).

	Universal Approach	Situation-Specific Approach
Person-Centred	Trait Theory	Contingency Theory, e.g. Fielder's Theory Substitutes for Leadership
Behaviour-centred	Style Theory and Derivatives	Transformational Leadership The Attributitional Approach

Trait theories state that leaders have personality characteristics which are either inherited or developed in early life which result in them becoming leaders in most situations [1]. These theories make the assumptions that [1];

1. In order to be an effective leader an individual must have certain personal traits.
2. These traits are stable and transferable to any situation.
3. Traits can be easily identified and measured allowing the prediction of leadership abilities.

Studies attempting to identify leadership traits usually find that traits are a poor predictor of leadership emergence and the original trait theory was heavily criticised as; producing endless list of traits with no agreement on a single set, incorrectly assuming that leaders who succeed do so because of their traits, incorrectly assuming that success or prominence is due to leadership (could be luck, wealth, connections etc.) and finally traits are personality variables many of the 'traits' identified are actually patterns of behaviour and such behaviour is a function of a specific situation [1].

Trait theory has not been completely discarded, researchers agree that while there are no universal traits there are some which are likely to be important in a selected range of situations [1]. In addition two characteristics are observed which are far stronger indicators [1] have been identified;

1. The ability to accurately sense the requirements of a situation
2. A repertoire of behaviours that provide a capacity to adapt to the situation

This leads on to style theory, traits are generally agreed to lead to patterns of behaviour (some of the 'traits' identified were patterns of behaviour,) and so research focused on the style of leadership (the behaviour patterns) and their results [1].

Initial studies by Lewin and his colleagues identified three styles of leadership [1];

1. Autocratic Leaders – Make all decisions and exert a high degree of control, while the group is prepared to follow they often do not understand why and do not accept responsibility when things go wrong. Group tends to have low morale and may be hostile towards their colleagues or leader.
2. Democratic Leaders – Involve followers in decision and delegate responsibility to the group, results in a stronger team spirit, increased responsibility and commitment to implementing decisions and greater satisfaction amongst group members.
3. Laissez-faire Leaders – Abdicated from the role of leader while they do not make decisions for the group or exercise control this is not out of a desire to delegate or to encourage participation but due to a disinterest in leading the group. Group performance depends on the group but if the group is not competent and self motivated members opted out of task competition and sought satisfaction through social interaction.

Further studies developed improved metrics for measuring the effectiveness of leadership independently identifying the task completion and follower satisfaction as metrics [1]. Of these the Ohio State Leadership Studies developed a theory that there were two independent dimensions of leadership Consideration (behaviours focused on interpersonal relations within the group) and Initiating structure (behaviour concerned with achieving the groups formal tasks) [1]. Over generalisations of this theory indicate an ideal manager should display a high consideration for both a dual orientation which is considered impossible [1].

The Michigan Leadership Studies by contrast decided that the contrasting dimensions were in fact different styles of behaviour which exist on a continuum stretching from production centred leadership on one side to employee centred leadership at the other [1]. While these theories redress some of the problems with traits they still assume that one style is best for all situations and do not take into account the interpersonal relationships or the circumstances which surrounds it [1]. Style theories also assume that a manager is a leader and subordinates are followers [1].

Contingency theories of leadership acknowledge that there is no single style of leadership applicable in all circumstances and instead attempt to identify variables which make one style more appropriate than others in a given situation [1]. The contingency perspective is underpinned by the assumption that effective leadership requires a leader to adopt a style of behaviour that matches the conditions in which they are to lead [1].

Fiedlers Contingency Theory was the first contingency theory of leadership often referred to as the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) model [1]. Fiedlers theory suggests that the most appropriate leader behaviour is that which produces the highest productivity (ignoring follower satisfaction,) this

behaviour is a function of the style of the leader and the contextual circumstances of the group [1]. The groups context can be described in terms of three variables, the relationship between leader and members (similar to that between leaders and followers), the task structure (clear or ambiguous) and the leaders position of power (their authority over the group) [1].

Leaders are assessed on a psychological scale based on their orientations to their LPC from a previous project, this is used with a matrix of the context variables to identify the appropriate management style for the task [1]. This approach assumes that the leaders style (assessed using LPC) is fixed and so leaders should be matched to their situation [1]. There are however arguments which suggest that there are additional variables influencing leader effectiveness which should be taken into consideration and that LPC measures only attitude or even personality which are often poor guides to behaviour [1].

Groups are defined as number of people who; interact with each other, are psychologically aware of each other, perceive themselves as a group, purposefully interact towards the achievement of particular goals or aims [1]. Mullins attempts to disambiguate teams and groups suggesting that teams have a limited number of selected individuals managed on a shared or rotational basis where as groups can be any size, are typically non-selected and with a single fixed leader [2]. The perception of individuals within a team is mutual knowledge and understanding, with roles spread amongst individuals where as teams is focused on their leader and encourage convergence of roles (conformist in nature) [2]. Finally teams have a spirit of dynamic interaction where as groups promote togetherness and persecution of opponents [2].

Some groups are planned and created by management and form part of the formal organisation these are formal groups others arise from social processes and the informal organisation which arises from the interaction for people within the workplace [2]. Formal groups are well understood, groups are formed for the co-ordination of work activities with individuals selected on the basis of defined roles [2] (which by earlier definitions may make them part of a team). Formal groups tend to be permanent (though their membership may change) though temporary formal groups are also found in organisations, the groups goals are identified by management and rules, relationships and norms of behaviour are established [2].

Informal groups are created to satisfy the social and psychological needs of individuals within a workplace based on personal relationships and the agreement of the group's members [2]. These groups may or may not be related to the task and often cross cut the formal structure, or may be comprised of a part of a formal group [2]. Informal groups are established for the following reasons [2]:

1. Perpetuation of the informal group 'culture': To fit within the social structure of the organisation individuals need to broadly subscribe to a group culture (values, norms and beliefs).
2. Maintenance of Communication: Groups actively seek information which affects their welfare and will tap into formal communication sources distributing information to members of the informal group.
3. The implementation of social control: Conformity to group culture is enforced by techniques such as ridicule, ostracism and violence.

4. The provision of interest and fun in work life: Many jobs are boring, with few prospects social outlets relieve stress and boredom.

Roles within organisations are defined as expected patterns of behaviour associated with members occupying particular positions [2]. In terms of team-roles and the roles that individuals must play for successful team enterprises Mullins [2] sites a number of sources among them Crainer who neatly summarises the roles required as;

Doers – Concentrate on the task at hand

Knower – Provides specialist knowledge.

Solvers – Solves problems that arise.

Checkers – Ensure product quality and group productivity.

Carers – Ensure the team works as a cohesive social unit.

Belbin's research is also summarised by Mullins [2], it suggested that the best groups were those who comprised a range of roles undertaken by various members and identified the now ubiquitous 9 useful types of contribution or team-roles.

Power is a complex and dynamic concept which is difficult to define, it can be broadly defined as control or influence over the behaviour of other people with or without their consent [3]. Power may also be interpreted as the extent of influence which can be exerted and include influence over objects as well as people [3]. Power may exist but not be used implying that power is a capacity or potential the most important aspect of which is dependency, a person cannot have power over you unless they control something you desire [3].

The Etzioni typology involves three dimensions: power, involvement and compliance (the relationship between power and involvement within an organisation) [3]. Power differs according to the means by which members of the organisation comply; Mullins [3] identifies the following:

1. Coercive power – Relies on the use of threats, sanctions or physical force.
2. Remunerative power – Relies on the manipulation of material resources or rewards.
3. Normative power – Relies on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards, e.g. prestige.

Involvement and the degree of commitment by members of the organisation includes (according to Mullins [3]).

1. Alienative Involvement – Occurs when members are involved against their wishes. A strong negative orientation towards the organisation.
2. Calculative involvement – Occurs when members are involved but attachment to the organisation is motivated by external rewards, low or negative orientation to towards the organisation.

3. Moral Involvement – Based on the individuals belief in and values placed on the goals of the organisation, high orientation towards the organisation.

Etzioni suggests that these are normally found in the following combinations coercive power with alienative involvement (e.g. prisons,) remunerative power with calculative involvement (e.g. most business firms) and normative power with moral involvement (e.g churches) [3].

According to French and Raven (quoted in Mullins [4],) there are several kinds of power exerted by managers (as leaders) over their subordinates, Reward power (based on the ability to reward,) Coercive power (based on fear and the ability to punish,) Legitimate power (based on the perception of the leaders role or position,) Referent power (based on the subordinates identification with the leader, including charisma, reputation, respect or esteem) and Expert power (based on the perception of the leaders knowledge or expertise). Finlay (again sighted in Mullins [4]) adds Personal power (the extent to which individuals are trusted by colleagues and subordinates) and connection power (which results from personal/professional access to key people/information).

Rollingson [5] defines authority as legitimate power to take decisions as does Mullins [6], but these definitions differ from those given in class by some degree.

Conflict is a situation in which the behaviour of an individual (or group) of individuals intentionally blocks or inhibits another group (or individual) from achieving their goals [7]. Conflict can be viewed from a number of perspectives.

The Unitarian perspective is a traditional one that sees harmony and cooperation as the natural state of human affairs and conflict as being either mealy disruptive or destructive [7]. The assumption is that all individuals are on the same side, committed to the same goals behind a single leader and either fail to recognise this or have been lead astray by subversive individuals.

The Pluralist perspective views and organisation as groups and individuals who share some common goals but have others that are different are potentially opposed, conflict is therefore perfectly natural and so measures to handle and resolve conflict should be in place such that it does not cause disruption [7].

The radical perspective is a view derived from the Marxist idea that organisational conflicts reflect inherent conflicts in society as a whole that is between those who own the enterprise and those who work there [7]. It assumes managers are agents of the owners, that all conflicts are vertical and does not accept that managers may have their own divergent interests or the existence of horizontal conflicts [7].

The Interactionist perspective is a refined version of pluralism (and identified as the current view by Rollingson,) it suggests that while too much conflict will hamper progress and absorb a great deal of energy, while no conflict indicates a stifling of the impetus for positive change [7]. The key difference between this and pluralism is the idea of an optimum amount of conflict within an organisation [7].

Research suggests that the key to understanding conflict is to understand the styles of behaviour of the individuals, by assessing their assertiveness (desire to satisfy their own goals,) and their cooperation (willingness to satisfy the other parties concerns) [7]. These can be used to identify five distinct styles [7]:

1. Avoidance – Unassertive and Uncooperative behaviour in which the other party is avoided preventing visible sides of conflict.
2. Competition – Assertive and Uncooperative behaviour in which one or both parties attempt to overwhelm the other.
3. Accommodation – Behaviour is unassertive and cooperative one group sacrifices its aims for the other.
4. Collaboration – Behaviour is assertive and cooperative both groups attempt to satisfy their goals with a solution that fits both.
5. Compromise – Intermediate amounts of assertive and cooperative behaviour satisfaction of some aims for both groups but potentially not all.

The culture of the organisation was more difficult to decide, while the overall organisation has one culture. The departmental culture is different perhaps due to the different style of leadership exhibited by the managers within these departments.

A culture is a pattern of basic assumptions, invented, discovered or developed by a group as it learns to cope with his problems of external adaption and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valuable and is therefore taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to problems and situations [8].

In an early approach Handy (extending the work of Harrison,) suggested the existence of four main types of organisation [9]. A power culture is one in which depends on a central power source with rays of influence from a central figure throughout the organisation, which relies on trust, empathy and personal communication to be effective [9]. While there is little bureaucracy, decisions are made on the basis of influence and encouraging a very political climate [9]. Role culture is stereotyped as a bureaucracy based on logic and rationality, strong organisational 'pillars' (functional components e.g. marketing, finance, production etc.) are controlled by rules, procedures and overlooked by managers [9]. Role or job description is often more important than the individual and position is the main source of power [9].

Task culture is job or project orientated, and consists of a net like structure of individuals with links of varying strengths [9]. Power is based more on expertise than position or personality and influence is in the intricacies of the links between individuals [9]. In a person culture the individual is the central focus and the structure exists to serve the individuals within it. Although found in only a few organisations it is the personal preference of most, management structures exist by mutual consent as individuals have almost complete autonomy [9]. Interestingly amongst the examples listed are professors, doctors and barristers suggesting that this is the most prevalent culture in Universities, on reflection this is probably the case there are a number of instances where senior staff are involved as junior members in research and/or are lecture too by junior staff.

A more recent view of organisational culture (from Schein) suggests that culture centred on a number of basic assumptions, these are fundamental and most people in the organisation (consciously or not) subscribe to them [8]. Surrounding the basic assumptions (putting them into practice,) are a number of values and beliefs, these consist of consciously held reasons for people behaving as they do (for example moral and ethical codes) [8]. The most visible manifestation of culture are the artefacts and creations these include the language (courtesy, use of buzzwords), norms (conformation to codes of behaviour), myths and stories (vehicles to communicate core

values), rites and ceremonies (rituals for inducting new staff or saluting retiring ones) and taboos (often humorous stories of what should not be done) [8].

According to Martin (quoted in Rollinson) are three perspectives on the pervasiveness of cultures though an organisation. The integrationalist perspective suggests that the culture is an organisation wide phenomenon [8]. The fragmentationist perspective suggests that there are so many ambiguities, inconsistencies and changes that a single culture cannot exist [8]. Finally the differentiatist perspective suggests that while an organisation has an overall culture there are variations within groups. These perspectives may all be held by different individuals within a company [8] those in management may believe there is a single culture amongst all its employees while others may see differences in their departments culture compared to others. This has certainly been my experience to date in my current employment, the culture on a school and faculty level is extremely different.

Peters and Waterman identified several characteristics of organisational culture which influenced performance [8]. These are Bias for Action (decisions made even in the absence of complete information,) Staying Close to Customers (customers regarded as the most valuable source of information), Autonomy and Entrepreneurship (company divided into units to foster innovation and initiative), Productivity through People (people should be treated with dignity and respect and given opportunities), Hands on Management (managers seen walking the floor), Sticking to Knitting (company avoids entering areas outside its competence and experience), Simple form (flat structures with few levels of management) and finally a Simultaneous loose-tight organisation (an organisation tight in terms of goals and values but loose in terms of rules and regulations) [8]. Of these Productivity through people seems most relevant to CPD, providing people with opportunities (and I suspect the underlying knowledge/training to take advantage of them).

Goffee and Jones provide a Contingency Framework for organisational culture which has replaced the excellence framework (suggested by Peters and Waterman and their contemporaries,) which naively suggested a single best culture for all companies [8]. Goffee and Jones work from the assumption that there is no right or best culture for all organisations but an appropriate culture for an organisation which helps it cope best with the exigencies of its environment [8]. Their approach works by measuring the Sociability (degree of friendliness between members of the community,) and the Solidarity (the degree of collectiveness, shared goals, tasks, mutual interest of individuals within the community) [8]. The relative amounts of these give rise to the following classifications the networked culture (high sociability low solidarity), the fragmented culture (low sociability and low solidarity), the mercenary culture (high solidarity and low sociability) and the communal culture (high solidarity high sociability) [8].

Organisational structure is the fundamental and relatively unchanging features of an organisation which are officially sanctioned by those who control it and dictate how activities are undertaken and component parts are grouped, coordinated and controlled to achieve the desired outcomes [10]. Structure is essential for any organisation as all organisations need to complete certain tasks, tasks are divided into subtasks and responsibility allocated to organisational units [10]. As a minimum a structure should; ensure tasks occur in the correct order, allow activities to be monitored, ensure decisions are taken making adjustments to ensure goals are achieved, ensure the allocation (and acceptance,) of responsibility and monitor (and control) the use of resources [10].

Organisations have a structural configuration (or grouping) which can be described in terms of two features, horizontal differentiation (concerned with the division of labour,) and vertical differentiation (concerned with the integration and coordination of parts) [5]. Horizontal differentiation takes a number of forms [5]:

- Functional Grouping
 - Groups activities together according to the major functional specialism of the groups, e.g. marketing, finance, production etc.
- Process Grouping
 - A variant of functional grouping where the groups are based on a narrower range of specialist skills, e.g. engine manufacture, transmissions manufacturer, payroll, sales etc.
- Product or Service grouping
 - Groups are constructed according to product, such that each product has its own group from crosscutting disciplines.
- Market or Customer Groupings
 - Groups are based on a market or customer group, e.g. local haulage, long-distance haulage, international haulage etc.
- Geographic Grouping
 - This is a variant of market grouping where the markets served are in different geographical areas.
- Matrix Grouping
 - Attempts to gain the benefits of both a functional and product grouping, functional groups divide their time between product based projects controlled by a project manager.

Horizontal differentiation divides up the overall task, by contrast vertical differentiation establishes a hierarchy of authority responsible for the integration and coordination of subtask [5]. This gives the characteristic pyramid shape of an organisation leads to a scalar chain, the direct line of responsibility from top to bottom [5]. This is also bound to the average span of control which gives an indication of the number of subordinates reporting at each level of the hierarchy, a wide average span is associated with flat organisations while a narrow span is associated with tall organisations [5]. Wide spans of control provide more autonomy for subordinates as this makes them more empowered, their jobs more challenging and interesting they are currently in vogue [5]. They also represent an opportunity to reduce the levels of middle management and reduce costs [5].

- [1] D. Rollinson, "Leaders and Leadership : The Foundations," in *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis : An Integrated Approach*, 4th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008, pp. 349-393.
- [2] L. J. Mullins, "Workgroups and Teams," in *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow, Essex, England: Prentice Hall, 2008, pp. 217-295.
- [3] L. J. Mullins, "Organisational Strategy, Ethics and Responsibilities," in *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow, Essex, England: Prentice Hall, 2008, pp. 350-460.
- [4] L. J. Mullins, "The Nature of Leadership," in *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow, Essex, England: Prentice Hall, 2008, pp. 220-299.
- [5] D. Rollinson, "Dimensions of Structure," in *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis : An Integrated Approach*, 4th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008, pp. 501-530.
- [6] L. J. Mullins, "Organisational Control and Power," in *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow, Essex, England: Prentice Hall, 2008, pp. 421-459.
- [7] D. Rollinson, "Power, Politics and Conflict," in *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis : An Integrated Approach*, 4th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008, pp. 394-429.

- [8] D. Rollinson, "Organisational Cultures and Climates," in *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis : An Integrated Approach*, 4th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008, pp. 591-528.
- [9] L. J. Mullins, "Organisational Development, Culture and Change," in *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow, Essex, England: Prentice Hall, 2008, pp. 462-494.
- [10] D. Rollinson, "The Importance of Structure," in *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis : An Integrated Approach*, 4th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2008, pp. 501-528.