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Introduction

Welcome to the third in a series of research reports from Leadership South West, the regional Centre of Excellence in leadership, based at the Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter. This report builds on from the last one, 'What is leadership development: purpose and practice', which explored the range of approaches to leadership development available to individuals and organisations and the assumptions and principles that underlie them. This is done by considering the impact of context on the appropriate content, style and format of leadership development.

The report is divided into two main sections. The first looks at how different organisational and individual priorities shape the content and format of leadership development. Thus, for example, what are the sorts of things an organisation needs to pay attention to when embarking on a process of strategic change? What is distinct about development initiatives targeted at different client groups (e.g. women managers, senior executives)? And how can topics such as ethics and self-awareness be effectively conveyed within leadership development?

The second section takes more of a sector/occupational focus on leadership development, looking at what tend to be the most significant factors and challenges facing organisations in these different environments. Thus, for example, what is distinct about the police or military context and what types of intervention seem best placed for organisations of this type? What are the key issues for leaders in local government and/or the education sector and how can leadership development help? And what are the main issues when dealing with people from different occupational groups and how can they best be engaged?

The report concludes with a summary of themes arising from the different sections and an integrated framework for leadership development. Key themes include:

- the importance of taking a systems-wide perspective on leadership development whereby it is considered in relation to other organisational systems and practices;
- the importance of ethical and inclusive leadership that recognises the need for leaders at all levels within organisations;
- the value of experiential and participative leadership development where participants are encouraged to discuss and reflect on their own experiences of leadership;
- the importance of succession planning and establishing a "leadership pipeline" that will develop the leaders of the future; and
- the need for core values that inspire and motivate individuals and groups to work together in the pursuit of shared objectives.

The Structure of This Report

Entries are provided by a range of CLS faculty, fellows, affiliates and partners, and draw together a number of different theoretical and/or practitioner perspectives, combined with personal experience and/or research. Thus, each entry gives a broad overview of key issues and a critical evaluation of possible responses for leadership development in different contexts. Recommendations for further reading are also provided.

The report is designed so that articles can be read as standalone entries, thus enabling you to turn to the issues of most relevance to you. We do, however, encourage you to read more broadly so as to consider leadership and leadership development from a variety of perspectives – you may well find insights and observations from other areas of activity equally illuminating as those coming from your own field of expertise.

The intention of this report is to provide practical advice on best practice but, above all, to challenge individuals and organisations to consider the ways in which they go about developing management and leadership capability and what they hope to achieve by doing this. Furthermore, we hope to reveal some of the more distinctive aspects of leading in different contexts and, through this, contribute to an awareness of what is unique and needs to be tailored to the specifics of the situation.

1 A brief profile of each contributor is given in Appendix 1.
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Part One: Individual and Organisational Context

In this part of the report we will explore how different organisational and individual priorities shape the content and format of leadership development.

The following issues are explored:

- **Developing self-aware leaders**: why, how and at what price can we develop self-aware leaders?
- **Developing ethical leaders**: post Enron and World.com, how can we promote ethical leadership in organisations?
- **Developing women leaders**: women are still seriously under-represented in senior positions so what can be done to better support them in taking up such roles?
- **Developing enterprise leaders**: how do the development needs of leaders at the most senior level within organisations differ from those elsewhere?
- **Leadership development for strategic change**: what are the development priorities for organisations embarking on transformational strategic change?
- **Customer focussed leadership**: what are the challenges and implications of developing a more ‘customer focussed’ approach to leadership?
- **Leadership development and performance management**: how can organisations leverage the most out of their leadership development and performance management systems?
- **Leadership development for social change**: in what ways does leadership development differ when its primary aim is civic and social change rather than organisational performance?

Developing Self-Aware Leaders

(By Donna Ladkin)

The need for leaders to be self-aware is perhaps self evident. At the most basic level, understanding their weaknesses and strengths enables leaders the best chance of leveraging their own abilities. At a more sophisticated level, understanding the habitual patterns of perception and interpretation they use can enable leaders to be alert to the prejudices and biases which can impair their effectiveness.

This piece considers why self-awareness is so important to effective leadership performance before offering three frameworks which may be particularly helpful in enhancing this capacity. Throughout the piece, reasons why the role of leading itself poses particular challenges to developing self-awareness are offered. It ends by taking a more critical stance by suggesting reasons why in some instances, it may be helpful for leaders to be less, rather than more self-aware.

**The self-aware leader: why?**

Self-awareness, or self-insight, is an oft cited capacity of effective leaders. London and Maurer, for instance, suggest that:

“Leaders need self-awareness to know what’s happening with their own emotions, maintain a positive state, keep distressing emotions out of the way, be empathetic, and prime positive emotions in others” (London and Maurer, 2004: 228)

From this perspective, self-awareness is key to being able to manage oneself and choose behaviours which will encourage certain behaviours from followers, resulting in effective leadership performance.

A second factor which points to the importance of self-awareness has to do with the degree of power inherent in the leadership role. Bulls in china shops can be troublesome, but if a bull wields power over the lives of others, his lack of self-awareness can be dangerous. In order to exercise power ethically leaders need to be aware of the effect they have on others, as well as a sense of their conscious and unconscious motives.

This notion of the unconscious leads to an understanding that self-awareness operates at different levels. There is a distinction, for instance, between a leader being aware that she is not very good at handling detail, and her being aware that every time a certain subordinate enters the office she finds herself addressing him in language similar to that she uses with her children. The first can be relatively easily handled, for instance, by the leader working alongside someone who is good at analysing detail. The second might require a much deeper level of self-insight in order...
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to interrogate and change the behavioural dynamic at play.

These more deeply seated patterns of behaviour can often be indicative of response mechanisms for handling anxiety and fear. For instance, if a leader feels his position may be threatened by a follower, he may be dismissive of the follower, more as a way of handling his own anxiety than because of a rational belief that the follower should be dismissed. Becoming consciously aware of that level of anxiety can be disturbing in itself, and such anxiety is a key reason why self-awareness can be particularly difficult to develop. This is particularly true for leaders, who often occupy exposed roles subject to followers’ interpretations and projections. Given such factors, how can self-awareness in leaders be developed?

Developing self-awareness in leaders: how?

Perhaps a paradoxical aspect of self-awareness is that it cannot be developed in isolation. In order to be more self-aware, one needs to engage with others. This is aptly demonstrated by reference to the Johari Window, a tool often used in introducing the process of feedback to managers and leaders. Developed by Luft and Ingham (1955) the Johari Window provides a framework for categorising different domains of self-awareness. It is depicted in Figure 1.

![Johari Window Diagram](image)

**Figure 1**: The Johari Window (Luft and Ingham, 1955)

The ‘Open’ domain represents those aspects of which we are aware and others are also aware; those aspects of which we are aware and others are not aware are private or ‘hidden’, those aspects of which we are not aware and others are also not aware are ‘unknown’ and, for our purposes the most interesting quadrant, those aspects about which we are not aware but others are aware—are represented by the ‘blind spot’.

Feedback is a key tool for uncovering that ‘blind spot’ and learning how others perceive and interpret actions, intentions and behaviours. However, by the nature of the leadership role, gaining truthful and constructively critical feedback from followers can be a particular challenge for leaders. Followers are usually astute enough to know better than to tell the leader what they ‘really think’, (unless what they really think is positive—but this can also have its difficulties, if a follower does not want to appear sycophantic.) Some organisations have employed 360-degree feedback processes in order to provide this information to its leaders, and a number of studies suggest that upward feedback can lead to behavioural change (Smither et al., 1995; Walker and Smither, 1999). A more immediate means of gaining this information is for the leader to model the kind of curiosity and inquiry methods which would enable followers to provide this vital information in a more routine manner.

Courage and self-reflexivity are key to pursuing the kind of feedback which can be helpful. Pedler et al. (1994) offer a tool which assists systematic reflection on one’s actions. They suggest keeping a diary in which leaders keep track of critical incidents, and note their feelings, thoughts, action tendencies and choices for behaviour. By rigorously noting and reviewing this information, leaders can spot patterns and chart the ways in which, through bringing conscious attention to this area, behaviour can be altered.

Another useful framework for encouraging this kind of self-reflexivity is the ‘Learning Pathways Grid’ developed by Rudolph et al. (2001) This tool also focuses on critical incidents, and offers a structured mechanism through which people can identify their ‘desired’ outcomes, frames and actions, and compare these with the actual outcomes, frames and actions. Through close examination of the frames which one brings to particular situations, and consciously reframing situations, the person can come up with new and novel ways of responding which can be more aligned with the desired outcomes.
Coaching and mentoring schemes are among the most popular organisational interventions geared toward developing self-awareness in leaders. Coaches, located from outside the organisation and therefore (relatively) unaffected by organisational politics, can be particularly helpful in providing a constructively critical perspective on recurring patterns of behaviour, ways of framing and interpreting situations and responses which can limit a leader’s effectiveness.

Self-awareness: what’s the price?

Some studies indicate that self-awareness is not the panacea its proponents would suggest (e.g. Watts, 1951; Jackson and Carter, 2000). Over concern with the self can foster unhelpful obsessiveness, again, something which can be exacerbated by the relative loneliness of the leadership role. Additionally, being too self-knowing can limit a leader’s capacity to make difficult and troublesome decisions, which can often be called for. Finally, the desire to act in a self-aware and authentic manner can cause paralysis when there is seemingly no option available which appeals to all aspects of the self.

The answer here seems to reflect one of the things most leadership theorists agree on—there is no one right answer about an optimal level of self-awareness in leaders. In our age of narcissism (Maccoby, 2000), the question of what might constitute generative self-awareness might be a useful indicator. I would argue that such self-awareness would be grounded in the desire to connect with others, to really understand interpersonal dynamics, and to achieve a higher degree of alignment between the way one is perceived, and one’s values and ethical ideals. Rather than encouraging navel gazing, such self-awareness would encourage leaders to be curious about the self in relation to others, and to hold that self-knowledge lightly, with humour and compassion for both self and others.
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not use another human as a means to something else.

**Information and critical tools**
We live in an information-based world. For leaders, the role played by information is particularly important. They work with information from many sources, often from areas where they have little expertise or knowledge. Their ability to analyse, and use this information productively is critical to their success. Information is money in a leader’s hands; if ethical information is included along with other information, then money becomes ‘good’ money. You cannot make good ethical decisions if you do not have the right information. Information on the one hand, and good critical ethical tools (such as ethical theories, critical thinking and linguistic distinctions) on the other, are the keys to teaching ethics in leadership. Case studies can be particularly valuable, and I often use scenes from films. These can make the student feel immersed in a real ethical dilemma and can create empathy with the protagonist’s problem. After viewing the scene, students have a group discussion about applying ethical tools: should we be Kantians, or should we think in a more utilitarian way?

This approach involves imagination and requires students to place themselves in other people’s shoes. Information processing and a critical understanding of the problem are required, but that still leaves room for the aspiring leader’s ethical feelings.

“Analyze That” is a very funny film with some intense scenes. For example, when the boss, Robert De Niro (the godfather), bursts into the office of Billy Crystal (the psychiatrist), students often start laughing. But at the same time, they understand the difficulty of the psychiatrist’s position and his moral dilemma (over professional integrity) when facing the godfather. Different ethical strategies such as deontology or consequentialism lead to different solutions and different outcomes. This helps leaders to think critically in order to develop a creative vision of the problem and how to solve it.

**Reasons for actions**
Solving a problem is not simply a matter of stating what the right action should be. It is also necessary to provide reasons for a particular action. Leaders therefore need to be able not only to perform the best action possible, but also to give reasons why that action is better than another. In these discussions, students are asked why an action they recommend is good and morally better than another. Providing reasons for an action is a core task of ethics.

Another element is the identification of fallacies. Presidential debates and political speeches help students identify such fallacies, says Joanne Ciulla:

“Public discourse, particularly among politicians, often fails to respect the ethical and logical requirements of discourse... politicians frequently win elections based on name-calling and misrepresentation of facts, which legitimises sloppy thinking. Our society bombards us with lazy thinking & questionable information in editorials, news reports & advertising.” (Ciulla, 1998)

To face this kind of dialectical problem, I use student group discussions about a moral case study. One method is to split them into groups: each group thinks about a solution to a case study from a particular point of view. One can have two groups – deontological versus consequentialist approaches – for example, or four groups, such as Kantian, Rawlsian, utilitarian and virtue theory. After a discussion within their own group, they are asked to face each other and show that their argument is better than others. This lets them appreciate how ethical tools work in a debate, and enables them to unmask the fallacies and argumentative weaknesses of others.

Teaching ethics to leaders is a far cry from forcing them to be ethical. That may create fanatics who pursue their beliefs with extreme consequences. Genuine ethical behaviour is not extreme. As Aristotle put it, “in medio stat virtus”: virtue lies in the middle way. Reasonable and reasoning leaders lead better than fanatical leaders. Being a moral agent is up to the individual. Explaining how to become one is a powerful task for educators, which, if successful, produces more informed and more responsible leaders.

**Suggestions for Further Reading**
Developing Women Leaders

(By Donna Ladkin)

In the spring of 2005, Leadership Southwest launched an exciting new initiative, Inspire, a diversity initiative aimed at recognizing and welcoming difference on Boards. A woman-only programme, the design was intended to equip women with the requisite skills and knowledge to take up Board positions, as well as providing networking opportunities. Its content included modules on ‘Exploring the Role of the Company Director’ and ‘Leadership and Strategic Change’ as well as the opportunity to work with a coach in smaller development groups wherein they could address their specific issues and concerns. A one-day launch event was over-enrolled, and a second one-day ‘taster’ event similarly elicited a full house. Those attending expressed enthusiasm and interest in the programme but when it was time to sign up for the entire 9-month offering there were few takers.

This piece examines what might be learned from our experience of Inspire, particularly about how women perceive their own developmental needs, and the implications of this for those working to increase the total leadership capacity of their organisations. In order to set the story of Inspire within its wider context, a framework for understanding some of the issues involved in addressing gender disparities within organisations is offered.

Women Leaders: Different from Men?

There is a vast amount of literature which debates the question of the extent to which men and women differ in terms of their styles of leadership, and the extent to which those differences might be socially determined. What we know to be true is that women occupy a significantly lower number of major leadership positions within the West, there are far fewer women Board members (only representing 12% of executive directors in England, for instance), far fewer women CEOs of companies, heads of NGOs and charities, as well as far fewer women MPs and other governmental leaders. Undoubtedly, there are complex factors which contribute to this scenario; however, the question here is how might organisations address the disparity in gender representation and what role might formal interventions, such as Inspire, play in redressing the balance?

Kolb et al (2003) offer a helpful four-category framework for considering different approaches to thinking about how gender differences might be addressed within organisations.

Firstly, in line with ‘first-wave feminist approaches, they suggest

“Fix the women”

From this perspective, the ‘problem’ of gender disparity is located with women. It is based on an underlying assumption that everyone has equal access to opportunities, and the reason that women are not seen in the upper echelons of organisational life is because they don’t know ‘the rules of the game’. Developmental interventions are geared to teaching women these rules, helping them to ‘learn the language’ of senior leaders, and be more assertive and confident.

The second strategy is:

“Celebrate the differences”

This involves acknowledging that women are socialised to be different from men, and that these differences are of value and importance to organisations. Much of this kind of rhetoric is apparent in organisations today, where values such as ‘care’ and ‘empathy’ are purported to be of increasing importance to organisations. Interventions based on this approach generally aim to raise consciousness of men as well as women, and to promote more ‘tolerant’ and ‘inclusive’ organisational norms.

The third approach is:

“Create equal opportunity”

This is based on the idea that there are differences between men and women, and the structural aspects of organisations tend to exacerbate those differences. The notion of the ‘glass ceiling’ is informed by this kind of approach. Organisations operating from this frame would tackle gender equality issues through structural routes such as creating flexible working hours, offering good maternity leave packages or making provision for childcare.

After reviewing these options, Kolb et al suggest that the most powerful approach is also the most difficult:

“Revise work culture”

---

3 I would like to thank Jackie Bagnall and Ann Cullum for their reflections on this initiative.
Developing Women Leaders

From this frame, disparity in gender representation is seen to stem from cultural norms within the organisation itself. In order to encourage norms which go beyond tokenism and rhetoric, the organisation must consider how its culture represents, provides opportunities for, and rewards its women members. It must consider quite truthfully the extent to which its practices and norms match its rhetoric about equality of opportunity and rewards.

How might this framework inform our experience of Inspire?

Having been a tutor on a very successful women’s only programme run for British Telecom from 1985-1997, I have long been sold on the benefits of women-only training. In an evaluation of that programme, women reported benefits including increased confidence, increased awareness of organisational politics, and increased skill at networking and self promotion. They suggested the women-only environment had provided a safe container in which to discuss gender-specific issues and work towards creative solutions.

I was therefore surprised to learn of the relative lack of interest in the women-only version of Inspire. My colleagues at Leadership South West pursued those who had attended the launch events to try to discover the factors which were putting women off. It became clear that at the level of seniority this programme was targeted, women were not interested in attending a women-only programme. Consistently prospective participants argued that in taking up Board positions, they would need to be interacting effectively with other men. They didn’t see they would gain that benefit from a programme in which all of their colleagues were women.

Their response raises the possibility that women may require different training and development interventions at different times in their careers. Women-only interventions largely are informed by Kolb et al’s first frame, one that suggests the answer is ‘fix the women’. Indeed, much of the content of such programmes is often based on building confidence, learning the skills of assertiveness and understanding organisational politics. These skills are perhaps particularly important for younger women at the beginning of their careers, a time when learning in a relatively safe environment could be particularly important.

The more senior women we were aiming to attract to Inspire had, to a large extent, already learned the rules of the game. They were seeking more particular knowledge sets associated with the role of a Board Director. For that, they didn’t need to be with other women. In fact, they saw attendance on such a programme as sending a message that in some way they were less able than their male colleagues, in need of remedial support.

Inspire has not totally gone to ground, however. One-day, all-women events are still held as a way of attracting women to the idea of attending our Institute of Directors (IOD) programme, a mixed gender programme which focuses on developing the particular skills required of Board Directors. So far, the number of women on that programme has more than doubled, evidence to us that this kind of engagement is having a positive effect.

What ‘Inspire’ has taught us about developing women leaders

There are at least four key lessons which have arisen for us from the experience of Inspire.

(1) The decision of whether or not women should attend women-only or mixed gender formal interventions should be determined at least in part by their level of seniority as well as their career aspirations.

(2) It is important to be aware of the symbolic messages inherent with the invitation for someone to undertake a development programme. Providers of such interventions should be aware of how their product will sit alongside other ongoing organisational processes.

(3) Additionally, it is important to be aware of the messages inherent in any marketing material and the signals it gives about who a programme is for. We have found the softer imagery used for Inspire has been much more attractive to women than the masculine black and silver look of the IOD Programme marketing material.

(4) The high interest in our one-day launch events signals to us that there is a need, and certainly a delight, for women of all levels of seniority to take part in that level of intervention. Similarly, such an event can provide the forum for women to clearly suggest the kind of developmental
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opportunities they desire, based on their own experience, needs and aspirations.

We feel the implications of these observations are of great significance to organisations looking to engage and develop more senior women leaders – not least the importance of listening and responding to the developmental needs and requests of those women themselves.

Suggestions for Further Reading

Developing Enterprise Leaders
(By Neville Osrin)

The distinction between Leadership Development in general and Executive Development in particular is at best blurred. Many leadership development programmes focus explicitly on distributed leadership, de-coupling it from traditional hierarchical models. Executive Development, by implication, suggests a more focused development thrust, its target being unequivocally the senior management cadre within the organization. However, it is far less common to find within the executive development category any distinction being drawn between top management as a whole, for example the familiar top 100 or top 250 leaders category, and a far smaller group comprising the CEO and executive board who are at the helm of the enterprise. One might ask: From a developmental perspective, is this distinction valid or artificial? In other words, is the development of enterprise leaders simply a variation on a theme – more of, rather than fundamentally different to, generic executive development?

An emerging strand of thought suggests that there may be important differences between the leadership imperatives of organizational leaders as a whole, and those who collectively bear the ultimate accountability for organizational outcomes.

The Leadership Pipeline
Charan et al. (2001) use the metaphor of a pipeline to explore six critical passages leaders navigate through an organization. The transition from group manager to enterprise manager is a particularly crucial one. What makes the transition to enterprise leader so difficult, they contend, is that they are managing an enterprise in its totality, not a single business. At this level, leaders are responsible to multiple constituencies – boards, analysts, investors, alliance partners, shareholders, communities and so on. More than any other leader they are in the spotlight. This passage confronts even highly successful and talented executives with serious challenges.

The transition during the sixth passage is much more focused on values than on skills. Enterprise leaders must reinvent their self concept, and as leaders of an institution must be long-term, visionary thinkers. At the same time they must develop and drive operating mechanisms to deliver performance that is aligned with longer-term strategy. They need to understand the nuanced patterns of shift in value creation for customers, the appropriate business model to respond to these, and the competitive landscape. There is a subtle but fundamental shift in responsibility from strategic to visionary thinking, and from an operations to a global perspective. Enterprise leaders need to come to terms with the fact that their performance will be based on three or four high-leverage decisions annually; they must set three or four mission-critical priorities and focus on them.

This leadership passage requires enterprise leaders to value tasks that they may never have done before, and often they feel the strain and pressure that may accompany a lack of confidence in setting strategic direction. Understanding and managing risk, dealing with complexity and a capacity for deep thought are crucial if enterprise leaders are to be successful. We have seen many enterprise leaders fail because they did not fully complete the transition. They sustain the same skills, time application and work values that served them well as business managers, and never adjust their self-concept to fit the new leadership role. They behave as though they were running a portfolio of business, not one entity.

Charan and colleagues present a thoughtful and compelling picture of the unique imperatives of the enterprise leader. If their analysis is only
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directionally accurate, it would suggest that enterprise leaders have a raft of developmental challenges that may be required to support successful transition, if they are to achieve outcomes beyond the ordinary.

**The Development Agenda**

I would suggest that there are at least three vital elements in the development agenda of enterprise leaders. They may or may not be included within an executive development agenda, but their omission would almost certainly preclude any programme from being appropriate for enterprise leaders. They are:

- Practices
- Personality
- Personal leadership

A framework of *desirable practices or competencies* lies at the heart of many executive development processes and programmes. However, Professor Pierre Casse, Dean of the Berlin School of Creative Leadership, asserts that many such generic frameworks, while perfectly helpful, and in their own way valid, may inadvertently promote what he terms the *tyranny of the average*. In other words they assist in moving from mediocre to average, or even from average to above average performance, but do little to facilitate the accomplishment of the level of outstanding performance demanded of enterprise leaders. He contrasts conventional practices such as ‘set ambitious goals, listen to one another, measure progress, check understanding, and check assumptions’, with practices such as ‘disagree and create conflict, be provocative, be emotional, create chaos, and create new assumptions’. While these are likely to raise a few eyebrows as prescriptions for mainstream executive development, as components of an enterprise leader’s agenda they may be perfectly aligned with leadership imperatives. While Casse’s choice of alternative practices may not be everyone’s cup of tea, the notion of less conventional, or at least different practices/competencies being specific to enterprise leaders is gaining ground (Collins, 2001.) Other studies, (e.g. Osrin, 2001) suggests that the nature of these competencies may relate to ‘paradoxability’ – the capacity to alternate seamlessly between apparently paradoxical modes of behaviour, in a way that is perceived by followers as entirely integrated and highly effective leadership practice.

In the bullish and up-beat world of leadership development *personality dysfunction* does not feature prominently. Yet there is sufficient evidence at least to postulate that CEOs and other enterprise leaders often fail because of fatal flaws linked to dysfunctional facets of their personality. (Dotlich and Cairo, 2003; McCall, 1998)

Executives are usually promoted into positions of enterprise leadership at, or close to the pinnacle of their careers, yet also at a time when the consequence of failure has the most serious and widespread implications. Being aware of their vulnerabilities, and the risks associated with specific facets of their personality, ought to be vital components of personal development for enterprise leaders. Professor Robert Hogan has identified 11 areas of vulnerability - high risk areas (derailers) that could lead to a significant and profound loss of leadership effectiveness. As Hogan puts it:

“The most common reason for leadership failure will be their inability to build or maintain a team. Their inability to build a team will be a function of certain dysfunctional dispositions, interpersonal tendencies that are usually invisible during job interviews, or assessment exercises. These tendencies usually become apparent when people are under pressure or when they let down their guard. They fall into eleven categories and can be assessed with considerable fidelity.” (In Dotlich and Cairo, 2003)

However, the complication, and the reason why derailment should be a crucial focus for development lies in the fact that these ‘dysfunctional dispositions’ in their benign form may be precisely the reasons for the leader’s achieving the performance or reputation that has led to their elevation to enterprise leader. The paradoxes inherent in this, and the psychological complexities associated with derailment are unlikely to form an integral part of the curriculum of more generalised executive development. For the enterprise leader, however, understanding the dynamics of derailment could make the difference between success or failure in the role.

By the time executives have made the transition to enterprise leadership, they are
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likely to be well into their mid-career term. It is probable that their personal leadership style will have been forged, developed and honed to a point where they are internalised – part and parcel of their natural leadership behaviour, exercised for the most part unconsciously. But in a complicated, insecure and constantly changing world, how do effective enterprise leaders in high-performing companies continue to succeed? How do they reconcile their tried-and-tested leadership style with the need to transform businesses, make fast decisions and inspire everyone, no matter how complex the situation? Are the enterprise leaders who rise to this challenge, win followers and get things done heroic figures – or do they actually need to possess characteristics and practice skills that fall outside the comfort zone of executives steeped in traditional leadership styles and behaviours? In a business environment turned upside down by e-commerce, diversity, security concerns, globalization, and matrix structures it simply is not credible that their ‘natural’ leadership behaviour will serve them as well as they did a decade earlier.

Dotlich and Cairo (2001) challenge conventional wisdom about leadership such as ‘be in control’ and ‘hide your flaws.’ Instead, they identify ten ‘unnatural acts’ that effective leaders regularly commit and are, they assert the best response to an ‘irrational, chaotic and unpredictable universe.’ They include:

- Refuse to be a prisoner of experience; rely as much on innocence.
- Surround yourself with people who create some discomfort.
- Acknowledge your ‘shadow side’ and admit your vulnerabilities.
- Connect instead of create.
- Trust first – ask questions later.
- Give up some control.
- Grapple with right-versus-right decisions.
- Coach and teach rather than inspire and lead.

While the authors do not explicitly associate these alternative leadership behaviours with any specific leadership role or transition, I would argue that in the case of enterprise leaders they fall into the ‘must-have’ rather than ‘nice-to-have’ category. Whether enterprise leadership is distinctly different from executive leadership in general probably remains a moot point that will continue to be debated over innumerable cups of coffee and pints of beer. However, those who bear the responsibility for organisational effectiveness and leadership development will ignore the practical realities of the distinction, however subtle, at their peril.

Suggestions for Further Reading

Leadership Development for Strategic Change

(By Alan Hooper)

This article considers the value of leadership development for organisations embarking on a process of strategic change. What is it that organisations and their senior leaders can do to prepare themselves for the inevitable challenges and uncertainties that lie ahead?

Preparing for the unknown

Producing a strategy to develop leaders to manage change has always been difficult, but no more so than today. Ever-changing technology and improving methods of communication have combined to produce an environment of unprecedented speed of change which has left many organisations struggling to keep up with the pace, let alone develop a strategy. However, in the midst of this chaos there are some organisations that appear to be managing the process very well (for example, BP, Honda, HSBC and Tesco). Furthermore, the gap between such organisations and their competitors grows wider year by year.

On closer observation there appear to be some broad principles that such organisations adopt when embarking on a process of leadership development for strategic change.

First, they are comfortable with ambiguity. They take change in their stride, accept it as the norm and understand that there will be periods of confusion as they try to find
their way through the fog of uncertainty. At the same time, they avoid falling into the trap of complacency through rigorous and constant analysis of their performance (viz Tesco).

Second, they adopt the Sigmoid Curve approach (Figure 2) (Handy, 1994) by starting the second curve change process at Point A before reaching the peak of the first curve, thus using the latent energy of experience from the old curve whilst still on the development stage. It is much more difficult to start a change process when past the peak of the old curve as Marks & Spencer discovered in 1998. However, organisations which are really effective at continuous change realise that there is not one sigmoid curve but continuous successive waves of them stretching way into the future – and they introduce a planned succession of change initiatives at "Point A's" to maintain the momentum, and thus keep ahead of the game (Hooper & Potter, 2002).

**Figure 2: The Sigmoid Curve (Handy, 1994)**

This leads us on to the third point: developing the strategy. There has to be a start point, which should be carefully selected when the organisation has some time to run on a successful "old curve" (for BP this was 2001 when they brought together the top 600 managers worldwide to consider the future strategy). This phase is characterised by rigorous and honest analysis which enables the organisation to develop a strategy which will be sufficiently robust, but also flexible, to withstand the inevitable changes in a fast-moving world.

This phase is the bedrock and therefore crucial. It requires intellectual application of the highest level and therefore should involve the brightest in the organisation, especially young people who do not carry the baggage of the old culture. Furthermore, it involves effective thinking at the strategic level, a key element of higher level leadership (Adair, 2002).

**Developing "Leadership" Strategy**

The fourth point is the development of the "leadership" strategy, a central aspect to this topic but, surprisingly, one that is not being met particularly well in the UK. We are good at developing leaders at the frontline, not too bad at the operational level, but the evidence is patchy at the strategic level. This explains, in part, why individuals who are effective at the top end of the spectrum are constantly in demand and why many of them become serial chief executives and chairmen (and they usually are men; a matter of regret now that almost the same proportion of the working population are women).

So, let us examine what is being done to develop leaders at the strategic level. There appear to be three broad strands:

1. **Internal leadership programmes.** These tend to be used by large organisations that have the HR capacity to run such programmes and the size to enable individuals to climb the promotion ladder acquiring increasing responsibility on their way to the top.

2. **Specific sector leadership programmes.** These include such programmes as the Cabinet Office “Top Leaders’ Programme" for the public sector and the Armed Services week-long programme run by the Defence Leadership Centre which is mandatory for all newly-appointed one star officers (brigadier level).

3. **Generic strategic leadership programme.** The identification of the need to grow strategic leaders and equip them for the particular difficulties of operating at this level has led to the recent introduction of two programmes:

   - In 2000 Exeter University launched the 4x4 Group which brings together, four times a year, selected individuals operating at the strategic level from its Leadership Partners, drawn from both the public and private sectors. Learning from current top leaders and from each other, this peer group is growing together.

   - A year later the Windsor Leadership Trust launched its Consultation for Newly Appointed Strategic Leaders. This consists of a four-day programme for those who have just moved into strategic leadership roles (for example, bishops, chief constables, vice-
chancellors, headmasters, major-generals and chief executives of organisations).

All these illustrate the growing understanding that operating at the strategic level is a step-change and that people need assistance with enabling them to be effective at this level. It is puzzling that it has taken so long to appreciate the need for such programmes for, apart from some large organisations, the Cabinet Office programme and the Armed Services, there has been little evidence of this happening across the vast spectrum of organisations in both the public and private sectors. The recent developments may be due to a couple of factors: one, the recent acknowledgement that it is possible to learn to be a strategic leader (until quite recently the “you’ve either got it, or you haven’t” school held sway); and two, the growth of self-awareness and personality profiling techniques which have enabled professional facilitators to work effectively with senior leaders.

Characteristics of "Strategic Leadership" programmes
Leading strategic change is difficult and it is not surprising that many have struggled with developing effective programmes for this level. Approaches differ as people experiment and then adjust to meet the practical realities of their clients. However, whilst acknowledging these differences, there appear to be some generic characteristics of such programmes:

(1) Use of external facilitators. A few organisations are able to resource such programmes internally, but the vast majority have brought in experts to be facilitators or coaches. This has become a growth area in the last few years and there are a number of highly skilled professionals who are competent in helping with the growth of senior leaders. The good ones retain a close relationship with their clients (both individual and senior management teams) for a long time.

(2) Self-Awareness. I referred earlier to the development of effective self-awareness techniques. The use of these by competent facilitators enables individuals to understand about their personality and their preferred leadership styles. This in turn gives them more self-confidence and enables them to understand about how best to relate to people. It is also crucial for leaders to learn how best to manage their time, deal with stress and avoid burnout. The development in the field has been so marked that it is now particularly noticeable if a senior leader does not possess good self-awareness.

(3) Emotional Intelligence. Linked to self-awareness is the development of Emotional Intelligence, which has really come to the fore as a result of the work of Daniel Goleman (2001). The higher up an organisation an individual climbs, the more important becomes emotional intelligence. Senior leaders need to be effective in four areas: self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy and social skills. It is these ‘soft’ skills that are the key to success at the top.

(4) Intellectual Application. It is interesting that the individual running an organisation is not always the brightest person in it – but all the most successful strategic leaders are vigorous in their intellectual application. Most seem to possess what the Armed Services refer to as “effective intellect”; that combination of understanding, common sense and intelligence which balances the possible with the practical. They draw on the talents of their brightest colleagues and insist on rigorous analysis before taking strategic decisions (two prime examples of such current leaders are Lord Browne at BP and Sir Terry Leahy at Tesco). Strategic thinking requires a great deal of hard work and is often the difference between success and failure – and that often depends on a judgement on what decision to make, and when.

(5) Communications. Communicating at the strategic level is very different from positions beneath that, and it is difficult because “the leader” has to communicate effectively with a variety of “audiences”: board colleagues (both collectively and one-to-one), employees, stake-holders, the public, politicians and the media. To all of them “the message” needs to be consistent but the requirements are very different. Furthermore, much will depend on how much people believe the message and trust the leader – and that is complicated because the leader can be more open with some audiences than with others. Fundamental to success appears to be the leader’s ability to reach out to employees and level with them (both Archie Norman at Asda and Max Barratt at Barclays were particularly good at this –
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and turned around their companies most effectively).

(6) External Focus. A key difference about operating at the strategic level is the amount of time that needs to be devoted to external issues. According to the interviews I conducted with some 30 chief executives they spent at least 50% of their time doing this (Hooper & Potter, 2000). It is not so much the need for external focus as the time it absorbs that surprises people when they first reach this level – and it is a difficult aspect to cater for in a programme. It is probably best achieved by seconding individuals to other organisations on their way up, and also encouraging them to become non-executives on boards. The aim is to develop an awareness of all aspects of the external environment that may relate to a particular organisation. Shrewd strategic leaders develop a feel for this and intuitively learn which external factors may impact on the activities of their own organisation, and therefore when to take a decision. The very best anticipate (often diverting a potential crisis). They are also good at appreciating the perception that others have, which is often as important as the reality.

(7) Mission Command. The requirement for top leaders to develop the strategy, communicate it thoroughly and then trust people to fulfil their parts can be traced back to Nelson’s style of leadership and is the hallmark of today’s British Armed Services. However, this effective style of leadership has not been particularly prominent in other aspects of British life (notable failures are evident amongst both politicians and business leaders). However, belatedly, there is now interest in how to convert “mission command” to civilian life so that strategic leaders can learn the essentials of standing back, developing a “helicopter view” and, above all, avoid being sucked into the detail. The combination of the realisation of the importance of empowerment and teamwork plus the increased pressure of work has forced top leaders to appreciate the necessity of “letting go”. However, there is more to it than that, and it is hoped that the inclusion of “mission command” and related topics on leadership programmes will enable them to develop the appropriate techniques.

(8) Peer Groups. It is often said that it is “lonely at the top”, but the reality of what this means is not apparent until an individual reaches the heady summit of their organisation. On assuming the top job, a new CEO was told by his predecessor to be prepared for the isolation which would include no invitations to private dinner parties by any of his close colleagues. As he had grown up in the company he thought this was nonsense – but nobody invited him or his wife to any private functions for the first two years. Against such a background it is no wonder that top leaders seek the company of others operating at their level. Not only is it important from a social viewpoint it is also crucial that there is somewhere where they can share their concerns in a confidential environment. Trust is implicit and, although some of this can be met by the close relationship with a coach or mentor, the confidentiality of a peer group with people sharing similar responsibilities can provide much needed support. All good leadership programmes include this aspect. Some are specific to the sector and others cater for all sectors (such as the Exeter Leadership Partners).

Conclusion
Developing individuals to become really effective as strategic leaders in a constantly changing world is difficult. Just promoting someone who has been good at the operational level is not good enough - and yet this happens all too often. Only a few organisations do this well (BP and the Armed Forces are two) and, those that do, achieve this by early identification of talent followed by gradual development of selected individuals preparing them for the strategic level – and then appointing them to the top appointments when they are ready.

The key factor is to appoint an individual to the top job when they have the confidence and the knowledge to be really competent operating at the strategic level.

As a final note, it is worth reflecting on the conclusions of the research carried out by Alan Hooper and John Potter (2000) when they interviewed some 30 effective strategic change leaders to discover what they did that made them so successful.

The interviews revealed certain characteristics which such individuals displayed; they:
- are good at creating understanding
- are effective at communicating at the strategic level
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- identify talent and release potential
- provide an excellent personal example
- are good at self-pacing.

The inference of this is that those who do not reflect these characteristics are not good at operating at the strategic level. Unfortunately, there are still far too many of them.

Suggestions for Further Reading

Customer Focussed Leadership
(By Richard Bolden)

At a recent conference the Public Services Leadership Consortium revealed findings from their research into ‘customer focussed leadership’ in the public sector and their learning resource pack for public sector leaders. The shift in focus to the ‘customer’ is a key pillar of current UK public service reform and is defined as follows:

"Customer focus is about public service organisations treating service users with dignity and respect, and ensuring that the services they receive represent value for money. It is also about optimising choice for users, and giving them a stronger voice in designing services. This is imperative to achieving the Government’s aims for a society in which there is universality of opportunity, in which every child and every adult is enabled to achieve their full potential.” (Cabinet Office, 2006)

Thus, there is a direct link to the Every Child Matters agenda in schools, the NHS Improvement Plan and Neighbourhood Policing to name but a few. From this perspective it is the student, patient, citizen, or ‘customer’ as they have been collectively labelled, who is seen as the primary stakeholder and one deserving of choice, quality and respect.

The public sector has been notoriously poor at responding to the demands and needs of its customers, typically considered as ‘users’ or ‘clients’ of services for which the provider held a monopoly, and was more likely to consider central government as the most important stakeholder. It was typically they, after all, who held the budgets, drove quality assessment, and placed increasing demands on employees within the sector. The call for true ‘customer focus’ therefore comes none too soon, however, what are the implications for a public sector already under great pressure and a workforce committed to the values of public service rather than corporate performance?

Key elements of customer focussed leadership
Research conducted by Professor Ivan Robertson and Elisabeth Henderson on behalf of the PSLC (PSLC, 2006) sought to identify the qualities required for customer focused leadership across public services, and the learning required to develop those qualities. Box 1 outlines the distinctive qualities of customer focussed leadership as identified by this work.

We thus see the need for a paradigm shift whereby the ‘customer’ becomes the logical focus of public service delivery at all levels within the organisation. Leadership is distributed throughout (and beyond) the organisation as a function of core purpose (i.e. the provision of services) and

---

4 I would like to acknowledge the support of Alan Wingrove and Jenny Deere at CENTREX, the Police Leadership Academy, in commissioning this review.
5 Customer Focussed Leadership for Improved Public Services, Centrex, Bramshill, UK – 30-31 March 2006.
6 The PSLC was formed in 2005 with the aim of encouraging cross-sector collaboration and partnership between key UK public sector leadership academies. Chaired by the Cabinet Office its membership includes: National School of Government, Leadership Centre for Local Government, Improvement and Development Agency, National College for School Leadership, NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement, Centrex (the Policing Leadership Academy), HM Prison Service, Social Care Institute for Excellence, Fire Service College, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, and the Centre for Excellence in Leadership (learning and skills sector).

7 The research comprised desk research, literature review, 25 one-to-one interviews and four focus groups with senior leaders, policy makers and advisors in the field of public services.
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Public services are encouraged to restructure themselves around the needs of the customer rather than professional or administrative structures.

- The ability and desire to see the organisation through the ‘eyes of the user’, to be an advocate for and to have empathy with the customer.
- A passion for customer focus that keeps it at the top of the business agenda, with strong personal ownership of customer issues, even where authority is delegated down to the front line.
- Combining the ability to lead strategic and systemic change with the ability to direct leadership effort throughout middle and junior management – focussing leadership attention at the top and at the bottom of the organisation.
- The skills and values needed to reshape the organisation – designing it around the customer rather than around the expectations or customary practice of the professionals involved, or around historical, administrative structures.
- The ability to influence the wider system dynamic – gaining and giving sponsorship for customer focus with other partners across the delivery landscape – but going well beyond simply ‘joined up’ services by thinking outside traditional boundaries, with the entrepreneurial agility to spot and grasp opportunities for service improvement.

**Box 1: Distinctive qualities for customer focus (PSLC, 2006)**

Arising from this work a learning framework was devised, which outlines three stages for the development of customer focussed leadership, including: two prerequisites; seven learning areas; and the transfer and embedding of learning in the workplace (see Figure 3).

Stages one and three offer a refreshing alternative to the majority of change initiatives that focus almost exclusively on the change process itself with little consideration of the organisational (and personal) context in which activities must occur. The emphasis, then, is on the strategic context of the change – it needs to be tailored to the needs of individuals and their organisations and to be introduced in a manner that is congruent with organisational values, priorities, systems and processes.

**Figure 3: Customer Focussed Leadership Learning Framework (PSLC, 2006)**

The meat of this framework is in Stage two: the seven key learning areas. These were identified through desk research, literature review, interviews and focus groups and outline a core curriculum for customer focussed leadership development.

1. Understanding the spectrum of customer focussed services.
2. Assessing and analysing who your ‘customers’ are.
3. Learning how to realign organisational systems and processes to better deliver customer focus.
4. Enhancing the motivation and well-being of staff to deliver excellent customer service. The ‘satisfaction mirror’ highlights how satisfied staff lead to satisfied customers.
5. Using the local and wider ‘authorising’ environments to lever and effect change.
6. Setting strategic leadership attention to middle and junior management activities that will ensure effective customer focus.
7. Developing and using entrepreneurial skills to ensure innovation and flexibility across provision.

These seven areas were well received at the PSLC conference and are seen as key to creating and maintaining a customer engagement.
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focussed organisation. These elements do, however, reveal the need for top-level organisational support and the engagement of all staff (not just those in 'customer service' roles). This is more about securing wide-scale cultural change than the development of a few key individuals and, as such, is a challenging and ambitious undertaking.

In order to deliver this agenda the PSLC seeks to provide strategic leaders with the learning resources necessary to drive change in their organisations, to embed these in the leadership development offerings of PSLC member organisations and to continue to review and update this learning in the light of evaluation and emerging good practice.

Customer focussed leadership in action

During the course of the PSLC conference a number of presentations and workshops were held that revealed insights into customer focussed leadership in action. Two particular examples demonstrated the challenges and benefits of customer focussed leadership in the UK Police Service.

Mark Simmons, Borough Commander in Tower Hamlets, described the Safer Neighbourhoods campaign whereby community crime prevention teams were introduced at ward level within the Metropolitan Police Service in London. The remit of these teams was to work with local community groups to address publicly defined priorities and, unlike previous initiatives, a commitment was made to leave teams 100% within wards and not to abstract staff onto other activities. Whilst the presence of these teams had a marked impact on street crime levels (a 15% decrease over three years) an interesting dynamic occurred whereby the public actually reported more incidents. This discrepancy revealed two major issues about customer focus: (1) that increasing customer focus is likely to lead to increased customer expectations, and (2) there may be a difference between the relative importance given to priorities by the provider and the customer (e.g. the police being recognised and rewarded for crime detection and response rate, whilst the public are most concerned on a day-to-day basis about ‘quality of life’ issues such as anti-social behaviour).

These points were echoed by Paul Stephenson, Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service, in his plenary presentation about the Working Together for a Safer London campaign championed by Sir Ian Blair. In each case it was discovered that, at the time, government-set priorities for the police were most closely associated with detecting and reducing serious and traditional crime rather than enhancing community support and reassurance. The principal dilemma posed by customer focus, therefore, was not whether this was desirable (it clearly was) but how rising public expectations about community issues could be met alongside and in addition to the already significant demands placed on the service. This challenge was further compounded by the fact that the community objectives were less easily quantifiable and more likely to increase than decline with closer customer engagement. Indeed, what was required was a fundamental shift in culture from policing by consent to policing by collaboration.

The need to address wider stakeholder priorities is experienced across the public sector (in education, health, local government, fire and rescue, probation, etc.) and calls for a closer engagement and participation with communities. Such a shift, however, invariably calls for greater partnership and cross-agency working that erodes traditional organisational boundaries and competes with organisation-specific targets and priorities. A commonly recurring theme at the PSLC conference was the oppressive climate of targets and assessment imposed by the government (many of which are in direct opposition to improved customer focus) and a concern that ‘customer focus’ would simply add to the range of metrics against which they were expected to deliver.

Implications of customer focussed leadership

The fundamental premise of customer focussed leadership as currently espoused by the UK public sector is undoubtedly a good one, after all, who could argue against the benefits of tailoring services to the needs of customers and of giving them a greater say in the types of service they receive. The challenge, however, lies in its implementation.

Customer focussed leadership could provide a powerful means for enabling employees within the public sector to re-
engage with their core purpose, what it was that encouraged them to enter such a career in the first place. Speak to doctors and nurses and they will usually describe patient contact as the best part of their job, teachers speak of students and so forth. If the manner in which customer focus is communicated goes counter to this understanding, however, and it is perceived as just another externally-imposed, target-driven initiative then this is more likely to have an adverse effect on motivation and commitment. On-going dialogue will be key to securing ownership at all levels within (and beyond) the organisation.

Another concern is the extent to which ‘customers’ themselves have sufficient knowledge of their requirements and what is reasonable to expect from public services. There is undoubtedly need for an awareness-raising process for customers so that they are capable of taking a proactive role in debates about public service provision. Many sectors have their own elaborate lexicon and procedures, however, which could seem impenetrable to the uninitiated. Perhaps the engagement of ‘expert customers’ (like ‘expert patients’ in the NHS) could help give voice to customer needs and expectations without becoming lost in technical jargon.

Additionally, it would be unwise to extend private sector concepts of customer focus too far. In the public sector ‘delighting the customer’ is not always an option. In the health, police and fire services, for example, customers rarely use services out of choice. What they require is a professional, reliable and reassuring service rather than an endless array of choice; in this sense the notions of dignity and respect outlined in the PSLC definition of customer focus are paramount.

There is also a danger of being overly simplistic in the definition of ‘customers’. For public services there are invariably multiple stakeholder groups, frequently with competing priorities. Take, for example, the field of Higher Education. Whilst the main customers are without doubt students, other groups have both similar and divergent needs. Parents, for example, are becoming increasingly vocal yet their idea of a ‘good education’ may differ from that of their children; employers seek new recruits with vocationally relevant qualifications that may go counter to the more ‘rounded’ education traditionally offered at many universities; research users have expectations and needs that may well compete directly against teaching priorities; and, as repositories of the Nation’s intellectual capital, Higher Education Institutions have a wider commitment to society. As less popular or uneconomical disciplines are replaced do we run the risk of losing the breadth and diversity of knowledge and education that has been the foundation of Britain’s competitive advantage over the past centuries?

**Conclusions**

Placing the customer at the heart of public sector services is undoubtedly a wise idea, as is extending and refining the range of services to better meet the changing needs of society. The trick, however, is to do this in a manner that is economically viable (and sustainable); is reflected in performance appraisal and reward structures; and is inspirational rather than prescriptive. Furthermore, such a change requires a fundamental shift in mindset across the whole of the public sector, from Whitehall down. The model proposed, with the emphasis on customer experience, offers hooks for otherwise abstract and somewhat ephemeral notions of ‘distributed leadership’ and provides a system-wide framework for action. For this to be effective, however, there needs to be a willingness from the centre and the top to loosen the reigns of control, to truly empower employees to do what is best for the customer. Whether or not this happens, I’m sure, will become clear to all of us users of public services in due course!

**Suggestions for Further Reading**
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Leadership Development and Performance Management

(By Richard Bolden, Jonathan Gosling, John Burgoyne and Inmaculada Adarves-Yorno)

This article is based on the outcomes of CELEX, an interactive research workshop series, run by the Centre for Leadership Studies and Lancaster University Management School in conjunction with BAE Systems, BBC, RAF and another large private-sector organisation that wished to remain anonymous, all of whom were concerned with how organisational performance could be promoted through their leadership development and performance management systems.

The aim of the project was to enable this rather select (and diverse) group of organisations to learn from each other, and from the analysis and interpretation of their experience. It represented an opportunity to benefit from exposure to informed opinions from both practitioners and academics in the area of leadership and performance delivery and to clearly articulate the strengths, weaknesses and impacts of different performance-oriented leadership systems.

The initiative comprised a series of two workshops, interspersed with reciprocal visits and conversations over a period of five months in the latter part of 2005. Exchange visits gave participants the opportunity to see how leadership development and performance management are implemented within different organisations, and the chance to talk through the pros and cons of different approaches with peers from other industries. Theoretical and conceptual support was provided by the academic partners on shared themes raised during the first workshop through a series of ‘thought papers’, workshop inputs and conference telephone calls.

This article presents the main practical and conceptual issues raised during the course of this work.

Practical issues

The workshops and visits revealed a number of significant practical concerns facing participating organisations and, despite the obvious sector differences, many of these were common across all of them. The most significant challenges were particularly related to performance management at the organisational level and included issues such as: how do you know you are rewarding/reinforcing the right behaviours; what is the impact on other aspects of the organisation; and how can systems and procedures be integrated to support other organisational practices?

Key issues around leadership development included: how do you evaluate the impact of leadership development on a range of performance outcomes; and how can you create a leadership pipeline that ensures sufficient skilled managers/leaders for future succession?

The participants found it helpful to share these concerns with peers from other organisations and to gain different perspectives on how to resolve/address these issues. The discussions, however, revealed a series of common conceptual issues that fundamentally impact upon a chosen solution to any of these practical challenges.

Conceptual issues

At the first workshop a number of significant conceptual questions emerged, including: How can you ensure the right balance between tightness (i.e. control) and looseness (i.e. flexibility) within a performance management system? Is performance driven by the management system or by a shared sense of identity and purpose? What evidence is there of a causal link between leadership, leadership development and performativity? What part does reward play in motivating employees and what options are available other than financial? What is the right balance of skills (transformational and transactional) at different levels in the organisation and in different situations? How can we develop a shared vision that enables a systemic view of organisational processes? What is an appropriate time span of accountability in performance management? How much can we expect from short courses and what should we do to develop real improvements in how people lead? Of these, the first three were selected for further discussion and reflection.

Footnotes:
8 We would like to thank Jenny Cridland and her colleagues at BAE Systems in supporting and coordinating this initiative.
9 If you or your organisation would be interested in participating in subsequent workshops then please contact us.
The ‘tight-loose’ debate was a fundamental challenge for all participating organisations. How can you maintain sufficient structure and direction to ensure that the actions of managers (and other employees) are in line with organisational strategy and policy without hampering personal creativity and flexibility? Whilst many organisations have their own competency or qualities frameworks, the degree of precision over how these translate to behaviour and outcomes is highly variable. Thus, for example, whilst some organisations favour a more general statement of ‘values’ (such as integrity, trust, humility) others prefer a more prescriptive definition of behaviours that can be objectively assessed during performance appraisals. In the course of these workshops it became clear that participating organisations sat at different positions on this continuum, often with good reason, by virtue of the nature of their work. The BBC, for example, used a relatively unstructured approach more aligned to its culture of creativity and innovation, whilst BAE Systems, an engineering company, favoured a more prescriptive approach. In each case, however, there were concerns that the chosen approach may be having an adverse impact on certain aspects of the business (e.g. meeting hard performance measures and targets in the BBC and nurturing creativity and innovation in BAE Systems). The question was then posed as to how organisations might embrace both dimensions simultaneously (e.g. is it possible to comply with a culture of creativity?), thus giving a ‘both and’ rather than ‘either or’ solution.

The issue of social identity relates to the extent to which individual and organisational performance is driven by the performance management system or by a shared sense of identity and purpose. Most performance management systems seek to drive organisational performance through the management of individual performance. Thus, bonuses, promotion opportunities and recognition are generally allocated at an individual level, even though the effective performance and completion of tasks is invariably dependent on collaboration and engagement with others. Whilst such a situation may well lead to the enhanced performance of individuals it is also likely to introduce dynamics of competition, one-upmanship and complicity that may be detrimental to overall organisational performance. The social identity perspective, on the other hand, encourages consideration of the factors that lead to group cohesion and a shared sense of ‘we-ness’ (Haslam, 2004). In this case, collective, group-level factors such as organisational citizenship and culture become important considerations and performance management systems may be re-appraised for their capacity to support a collective sense of purpose and identity.

And thirdly, the issue of evaluation was discussed to explore any evidence of a direct causal link between leadership, leadership development and organisational performance. In many cases this is often overlooked, however, there is clear evidence that by focussing on what it is that you wish to create and foster within your organisation, and by putting in place appropriate measurement and evaluation systems, the ultimate success of any leadership development intervention will be enhanced (Burgoyne et al., 2004).

Follow-up and exchange
The conceptual and practical issues outlined above formed the basis for a series of short exchanges between participating organisations and a subsequent follow-up workshop. Out of this phase of the work, three main conclusions emerged.

Firstly there was agreement that organisational performance is driven by the culture of the organisation rather than any individual performance management tool/practice. It was appreciated, however, that performance management processes can be instrumental in determining the overall ‘feel of the place’ and can either reinforce or undermine the effects of organisational culture more generally. To this extent, factors such as organisational citizenship behaviour are significant indicators and outcomes of shared purpose and identity. Likewise, if an organisation promotes and supports a distinct ‘leadership cadre’ this can have a beneficial impact on the shared identity of this group, although possibly a negative impact on other groups.

Secondly there was an agreement that leadership development and performance management systems are more likely to be effective at bringing about the desired outcomes when they are integrated and consistent with one another. Thus, for
example, if an organisation is encouraging ‘distributed leadership’ at all levels this needs to be reflected in leadership development opportunities and reward structures.

And thirdly it was recognised that individual-level performance management systems can sometimes reward and encourage behaviours and practices that are ultimately non-beneficial for the wider organisation. An example is where all leaders/managers are expected to exhibit the same behaviours irrespective of the context, or where individual performance is encouraged to the detriment of team cohesion.

Conclusions
It is a common observation that organisations often have more inherent leadership and management capability than they actually use, whilst also performing many leadership and management tasks less effectively than they could. Performance management can play an important task in redressing this situation.

Research evidence implies that leadership development, performance management and HR processes are most effective when integrated within a coherent ‘bundle’ so that they mutually reinforce one another. Underlying this hypothesis is an understanding that concepts of what constitutes effective leadership and performance should be clearly and consistently expressed within the organisation. This is likely to require an ongoing dialogue and engagement between people at all levels within the organisation.

The issue of directive control or negotiated alignment was a key theme highlighted by the CELEX inquiry which might help explain the ‘mechanisms’ by which performance management systems may enhance organisational performance. There appear to be two somewhat different approaches:

- The first is the monitoring and control of leadership behaviours for the delivery of local performance that supports the organisational mission and strategy and aligns individual actions to the achievement of joint purpose.
- The second involves the adjustment and alignment of the personal identity of the leader with that of the organisation. If identity can be seen as some combination of how the person sees himself or herself and how others see the person then the processes of discussion involved in performance management can themselves be seen as the leaders’ negotiation of their identity with the organisation. The fact that many performance management systems deal with ‘values’ as well as competencies and behaviours suggests that they are implicitly or explicitly designed with this mechanism in mind.

It thus appears that performance management systems may be about alignment or control of either external (to the person) behaviours or more internal senses of identity and values. ‘Control’ suggests that the individual is fitted to the organisation, whereas ‘alignment’ implies a two way process, a degree of negotiation within which the person can see if his or her values and sense of self can find a place in the setting of the organisation. Whichever approach is most dominant within a particular organisation is likely to be dependent on a whole host of factors. However, as the importance of ‘knowledge work’ and ‘knowledge workers’ increases, placing the means of production in the hands of employees rather than employers (brains in the head rather than machines on the factory floor), then alignment rather than control (and leadership rather than management) is likely to be of increasing importance.

The issues of alignment and control and how these can be integrated to provide a coherent cross-organisational approach to performance management and leadership development map well to the concept of the “learning company” described by Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell (1996). According to this view (see Figure 4) companies (including all organisations where people work together) function through the interaction of the four processes of policy (in the sense of a structured strategy, not the ‘rule book’), operations (both collective properties of the company), individuals’ ideas (including feelings and values) and individuals’ actions (a preferable term to behaviour: action = behaviour + meaning in context). Policy and ideas are vision/thinking things – collective and individual. Operations and action are doing things – collective and individual.
In this article we will draw on our experiences of researching a pan-African leadership development initiative to explore the manner in which participants use their understanding of leadership to facilitate beneficial social change in their communities.

The voices that speak to this are African - 300 men and women from 19 sub-Saharan countries; participants on a Pan-African leadership development programme, InterAction\textsuperscript{10}, that seeks to transform Africa through the development of a new generation of leaders. The emphasis on appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987), ‘Africa for Africa through collaboration’ and leadership within a community context makes this distinctive from more traditional post-colonial development initiatives. Indeed, rather than bringing in ‘experts’ from the ‘developed world’ InterAction embraces African wisdom, acknowledging the strengths and contributions of all participants and partners, and uses a facilitative, discursive and experiential approach rather than a more didactic teaching-based format.

As an independent research partner, our intention was to gain insights into the mechanisms and processes by which this initiative builds upon and challenges traditional conceptions of leadership in Africa and facilitates engagement with transformational\textsuperscript{11} social change. A guiding principle of the research was, therefore, to give voice to new ways of thinking by Africans about leadership in Africa and to explore the mechanisms by which, through a process of leadership development, they can facilitate beneficial social change within their communities.

\textsuperscript{10} InterAction is an initiative from the British Council, funded by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and delivered in partnership with Questions of Difference (QoD) and LEAD International. Please visit http://www.bc-interaction.org for further details.

\textsuperscript{11} Please note that the word ‘transformational’ is used in the sense of transformation/change rather than ‘transformational leadership’ as described by Bass (1985) and others.
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Leadership and identity
A key theme emerging from our conversations with participants has been how their engagement with the InterAction programme has encouraged them to reconsider their sense of identity both as a leader and as a member of their communities. This process has facilitated a shift in their conception of leadership from ‘intimidating and inaccessible’ to ‘desirable and possible for me’. Such a shift, we believe, is brought about through the opportunity of experiencing, discussing and reflecting on the nature of leadership with peers from all walks of life to expose and challenge outdated, competing and unhelpful representations. This discursive process is a key element of ‘identity work’ – the ongoing struggle to create a sense of self and provide answers (albeit often temporary) to questions such as ‘who am I?’ and ‘what is my purpose?’ (Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003). This is not a solitary pursuit, however, and within the context of our work (i.e. social change in Africa) the concept of self is inextricably linked to the notion of community. As captured in the Nguni/Zulu concept of ubuntu, a sense of self is only meaningful if located in relation to the concept of community; that is to say the two are mutually interdependent in much the same way as the Chinese concept of yin and yang (Louw, 1998; Van Der Colff, 2002).

The various ways in which participants on the InterAction programme conceive of leadership and their identities as leaders and how this changes through their engagement with the leadership development process is explored elsewhere (Bolden and Kirk, 2005; Kirk and Bolden, 2006), however, we will now briefly present a conceptual model of how this programme may be operating to bring about social change.

System leadership development
As a result of research and education in a number of community contexts Kirk (2005) has devised a model for leadership development from a systems (collective) rather than individual perspective. Firstly, he argues, systems must provide the capacity for organisational members to “see together” (this he labels connective leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 1996)). Secondly, he argues that systems must offer the opportunity for organisational members to “walk together” (this he labels collective empowerment using Reed’s (1976, 2001) notion of role taking). And thirdly, he argues that systems must offer a forum in which organisational members can “talk together” (labelled as dialogue and building on, amongst others, Senge’s (1990) work on organisational learning and Isaacs’ (1999) work on dialogue and thought). This model is represented diagrammatically in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: System Leadership Development (Kirk, 2005)](image)

This model can be used as a conceptual framework for exploring the manner in which the InterAction programme offers a structure in which participants can develop their understanding of leadership and their ability to take up the leadership role through a shared process of seeing, walking and talking together with other participants and members of their communities. In particular, the following elements seem especially relevant for different parts of the model:

- **Connective leadership**: InterAction is founded on a set of guiding principles, passions and assumptions, which, along with a number of relatively easy-to-interpret conceptual models offer a common language and mode of engagement for participants.
- **Collective empowerment**: the programme is structured around a series of community engagements. In Module 1, participants prepare for the engagement, in Module 2 they conduct the engagement and in Module 3 they debrief and receive feedback from members of the communities they
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visited. In addition to this, the programme starts with a Pan-African event where participants from across Africa travel to a different country and interact with people from a wide range of African countries (often for the first time in their lives). This, again, offers a powerful shared experience that brings participants together and gives them the chance to practice and enact their learning in a safe and supportive environment.

- **Dialogue**: discussion is at the heart of the programme. There is a conscious effort to eliminate possible inter-personal barriers (such as the presence of ‘experts’ and ‘non-experts’) and include and engage as diverse a group of people as possible. Practical tools used on the programme that facilitate dialogue include the use of questioning and a number of other listening and communication tools.

Thus, despite not being explicitly designed to these specifications it appears that the InterAction programme contains all of the elements of a system leadership development initiative.

**Leadership development as a catalyst for social change**

The system leadership development model offers a mechanism for engaging participants in a collective process of sense-making, identity formation and collaborative action. What has become clear from our research on the InterAction programme, however, is that this is not in some abstract, depersonalised sense, but is embedded in a very personal sense of ‘self in community’ and ‘self as a leader’. Furthermore, it would appear that the tools and techniques used in the programme not only contribute to individual development but offer a very practical means for engaging others as leaders and, as a consequence, influencing social change within communities. That is to say that the fundamental role of the leader is to develop other leaders and that their ability to do this is enhanced through the tools acquired during the programme.

This approach speaks to contemporary theories that describe leadership as a social process rather than the property of an individual and as a collective responsibility but builds on from some of the more abstract, disembodied representations of collective and distributed leadership to a re-personalisation and embodiment of individual leadership acts. Thus leadership, whilst shared across the many, is revealed within discrete leadership acts (or ‘events’) - each deeply influenced by the nature of the people and situations involved.

Large-scale social change requires collective effort and demands the active engagement of significantly more people than can be realistically put through a leadership development programme. Our research on the InterAction initiative in Africa has indicated that participants on a programme such as this can act as ambassadors for social change within their immediate communities. Their impact, however, is not through directive action or personal qualities (as might be implied by more individualistic models of leadership), nor necessarily through transformational or inspirational influence (although this could be used), but primarily through the facilitation of a perceptual shift from the idea of the leader as an exceptional (and usually senior) individual to the notion of ‘everyone is a leader’ (a fundamental premise of the programme). Such a perspective clearly views leadership as “socially constructed”, arising out of the interactions and sense-making processes between actors, but also hints at how leadership can be instrumental in the construction of shared purpose and values – i.e. it can facilitate a shift to inclusive, ethical and mutually beneficial role constructions.

This inclusive and communal view of leadership, associated with a set of straightforward concepts and tools, creates a model of leadership development that can easily be replicated and transmitted within social groups, enabling individuals to engage with others through the processes of connective leadership, collective empowerment and dialogue to create a self-replicating network.

**Implications and conclusions**

Our research has revealed a wide range of issues and concepts about leadership in Africa that warrant further exploration and elaboration. A number of substantial points, however, do stand out.

Firstly, this research reveals something about the **nature of leadership**. The stories collected indicate that it is the small things that matter - that leadership is the
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glue that connects and holds people and communities together yet, like glue, can be almost imperceptible to the naked eye. It is the thread that runs throughout and is more frequently revealed within subtle, incremental actions rather than dramatic or heroic acts.

A second set of issues and implications surround the context of leadership. Whilst it is easy to argue against the inexorable shift towards ‘global’ styles of management and leadership (typically US in origin) and tempting to romanticise more ‘traditional’ practices neither is necessarily inevitable nor desirable. Our exploration of the concept of ‘African leadership’, for example, has revealed much that is inspirational and desirable, but also much that is destructive and undesirable. The same is also true of mainstream Western leadership and management theory and practice yet this seems to be becoming the ‘global’ model. The indigenous people of Australia, aware that importing knowledge can become a form of neo-colonialism, nonetheless speak of the value of the waters from internal rivers (indigenous knowledge) and those of the wider oceans (other knowledge) coming together in a confluence that produces new knowledge seen as a foam they call “ganma”. For them ganma has a special value; all can learn from it. Ganma they say however is not to be captured: try to capture the foam in our hands and it evaporates. It is only through the simple act of gently holding out our hand to connect with the foam that it will linger, revealing itself to us. Held lightly we become aware of it and its value (Pyrch and Castillo, 2001). This metaphor teaches us of the need for humility and sensitivity in our thoughts and actions. There can be a tendency to think of African culture as ‘other than’ or ‘different from’ Western culture and vice-versa yet such a stance seriously hinders a true appreciation of the multi-cultural nature of the societies in which we live. Jackson (2004) argues that Africa has long been multi-cultural and, as such, is typified by hybrid forms of management and organisation whereby different cultural forms coexist side-by-side and can (and should) never be fully unravelled. Perhaps similar realisations in Western countries could allievate some of the alienation and disillusionment felt by minority groups in our own societies.

And a third set of issues surround the application of leadership. Our research has indicated that leadership begins with accepting and taking up one’s role within a community context. By viewing the concept of ‘self in community’ as the essential building block of shared or distributed leadership we can re-personalise these notions, thus moving away from abstract, diffuse and distant representations to an appreciation of how humans interact within a social milieu. This does not represent a return to psychological theories of leadership but acknowledges the importance of recognising one’s position within a social system and the opportunities that this affords for taking up a leadership role. Indeed, within an African context, such a perspective is rooted in the concept of Ubuntu, a philosophy of coexistence whereby a person can only be conceived of in relation to others, which offers a powerful challenge to concepts of individuality so dominant in the West.

To conclude, as we proceed into the 21st Century and seriously address issues of inequality it is essential that we not only take account of but also celebrate our different legacies, heritages and indigenous practices in order to better appreciate and understand the multitude of ways in which notions such as leadership can be understood and expressed. This is not only beneficial for the recipients of Western management and leadership theory but will also help to expand and refresh our own world-view – offering new insights into the phenomenon of leadership and its pivotal role in social change.

Suggestions for Further Reading


Part Two: Sector and Occupational Context

In this part of the report we will take more of a sector/occupational focus on leadership development, looking at what tend to be the most significant factors and challenges facing organisations in different environments. The sectors and occupations described include:

- Local government
- Police
- Military
- Schools
- Higher Education
- Customer service organisations
- Professions
- Cultural sector
- Non-profit sector

These sectors have been selected as ones in which CLS faculty and fellows have particular experience and which provide insights into leadership not often captured within mainstream corporate leadership texts. They are by no means comprehensive and our experiences may well be untypical of certain parts of the sector. We do, however, feel that together they provide an interesting cross-section of leadership development issues worthy of consideration and, in the spirit of multidisciplinarity, offer the opportunity to learn from the experiences of people operating in differing environments.

Leadership in Local Government

(By Keith Kinsella and Sybille Mansfield-Schiffman)

What is distinctive about this sector?

During a prolonged period of intense change instituted by the Labour Government under the Modernisation Agenda, local authorities are beset by challenges that have no easy answers. They are now being required to deliver 'outcomes' - which represent public value as against simpler and more easily measured private sector 'outputs' - in the face of rising customer expectations, reducing financial budgets, and all within an ever demanding inspection regime. These more ambiguous stakeholder oriented outcomes are increasingly more ambitious in scale and are often connected with large complex interventions requiring linked changes across many sectors.

Delivering these involve local authorities and their counterparts in health, police, education, voluntary and business sectors in developing grounded solutions that require new levels of co-operation across organisational boundaries. These solutions have to 'join up' and integrate multiple central government initiatives, and engage the more 'complex cast of characters' involved in the public sector (Alford, 2001) in order to transform these policies into practical offerings that diverse interests in local communities will appreciate.

The political dimension with a Janus-like dualistic kind of power sharing, adds a critical and distinctive feature of this sector (Schiffman, 2005). The once accepted division of roles implied that politicians interpreted the will of the people, instructed managers to deliver the required outcomes, scrutinised progress and then held managers to account. This is no longer, and in many cases probably never was, that simple. Increasingly 'leadership' must be seen as a shared responsibility where elected members and appointed officials have to work together to deal with dilemmas, like e.g. improving efficiency while protecting local employment, in what are often difficult and ambiguous conditions (LCLG, 2006). This work within a 'goldfish bowl' atmosphere sets up a risk-averse 'what will fit' decision-making ethos, reducing the likelihood of much needed innovation.

All of these difficulties have to be addressed in what is now considered a generally unhelpful culture characterised by a bureaucratic mindset driven by formal papers and meetings and guided by norms which favour stability, efficiency, and 'verticality'. The strong tendency to resist sharing decisions with other departments, and unwillingness to move information to the front line, inhibits attempts to introduce new ideas and tap into the potentially powerful motivating force of the public service ethos (O'Brien, 2002).

These pressures create a distinct working environment in which leaders, whether they be elected or appointed, are being asked to deliver integrated system-wide solutions in innovative and involving ways - all the while subject to intense central direction/monitoring and local critique. These conditions create a very testing and
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complex environment in which to develop the new levels of capability and culture which will enable the innovation and performance improvements that appear necessary.

What kinds of interventions are effective?

In contrast to the private sector, local government leaders do not have access to the usual change levers and readily accepted measures of success available in the commercial sector where increases in outputs generally means success. Instead, in seeking to increase the more ambiguous notion of ‘public value’, this sector has to employ a programme of changes using combinations of elements like market mechanisms (e.g. outsourcing and strategic planning), structural means (like goal setting) and audit/inspection regimes. These centrally initiated programmes generally also attempt to achieve a series of linked goals (like improving service provision), building capacity and enhancing leadership for changed working practices, and strengthening monitoring of provision. These complex planned interventions enjoy a mixed success.

- One commentator likens the basic approach of central government as ‘top down radical shock strategies and the exercise of political clout’ (Ferlie et al in O’Brien, 2002). The success of these changes based on multiple policy initiatives, re-structuring, and use of top down power, depend on there being sufficient compliance and willingness to follow by the people lower down who have to make the ideas work. This is often more to do with paying lip service than real support – the language is often changed to respond to the new imperative but the behaviour and value patterns lag behind.

- These top down initiatives are usually framed as planned interventions with a built in programme of changes. They are generally not designed to cope with unanticipated consequences or allow for local adaptations or the surfacing of new ideas. This often leads to implementation difficulties and a lack of active support from local communities of interest. There would seem to be some advantage to including a more holistic, participative, and emergent approach which by stimulating the service ethos that has brought many into the public sector, would operate at the level of culture and so enable change throughout an organisation. This has implications for a kind of a more ‘worldly’ leadership, not only of the organisation but the wider community at large, that would be most appropriate in this new environment (Niven, 2006).

- The bureaucratic methods associated with the hierarchical command and control model lead to functionalised ‘up and down’ ways of thinking, information ‘silos’, a lack of focus on customers and other external stakeholders, and a blame culture that mitigates against risk taking and confrontation. This set of values and operating practices doesn’t support the need for a much greater degree of cross boundary, multi-agency, and partnership working (I&DEA, 2005), and the higher levels of innovation that a more collaborative mindset (Gosling and Mintzberg, 2003) using participative and network orientated models could provide. Action oriented approaches such as those suggested by Wallace (2005) offer interesting ideas as to how a group of leaders might ‘orchestrate’ the type of complex change involving many sectors and administrative levels, and what elements need to be present if these are to be effective.

- Attempts to build capacity focus primarily at the level of individual skill and use conventional classroom based methods and team building initiatives. There is little evidence that this approach is also leading to the changes in relationships and cultures that would allow more highly skilled individuals to perform better. There is a need to extend such development work to the level of cultural practices. This will require more in-situ, embedded, and organic approaches to learning (Kinsella, 2006), and also involve participative work with large groups where changed interactions are more likely to generate the collaborative and creative actions to deal with the politics of change.

The Modernisation Agenda has clearly instigated a minor tsunami of change in this sector and there is the promise of further shocks/waves to come. This has led to what is called an ‘unfreezing’ of past
practices and values allowing more ambitious thinking about what may be possible in this critical sector. But there is clearly room for new ideas and approaches which can better address the major challenges faced by leaders and followers in changing the cultural practices which form the bedrock of performance capability and which can be implemented with and alongside people who have to cope with already crowded and pressured working lives.

Ideas for Further Research
Apart from the paper by Mike Wallace, there is little published research on models of change for the public sector. Further development of the notion of ‘orchestration’ as a semi-emergent and multi-faceted approach to complex change would seem advisable. This work could be allied with looking at ways of engaging/leveraging the dormant power of public service ethos. There is a need for further work on developing models of partnership working which, as well as providing containment, enable confrontation and tough decision making about priorities and shared budgets, and help deal with the ambiguities and tensions encountered in member/officer relationships. There is also very little on leadership and leadership development approaches for the challenges encountered by leaders, particularly for the newly emerging strategic partnership models like Local Strategic Partnerships and associated Local Area Agreements. Research into the kind of leadership mindsets which suit these new arrangements would be beneficial as would looking at the refinement of new ‘close learning’ methods which seek to embed an organic approach to learning, development, and performance improvement.

Suggestions for Further Reading
LCLG (2006), Leadership in Local Government: an Eight Point Manifesto, LCLG.

Police leadership development is a vibrant process, inspired by both an internal desire for change and an external pressure to modernise under the government’s reform agenda.

All of the trends reported by Bolden (2005: 11) are discernible in police leadership development, although it would be unwise to claim that equal or indeed unimpeded progress is consistently being achieved on all fronts.

The same report notes some evidence of a general move towards the wider development of leadership within organisations as a whole. This development is also reflected within the police service. The service does not perceive leadership to be the exclusive responsibility of an elite or leadership cadre; instead, the police service exercises leadership at many levels and recognises that leadership is diffused throughout the organisation.

If leadership is diffused, however, is it also diluted? If everyone is a leader, then could it be argued that the concept itself has been weakened? Although the ‘great man’ theory of leadership is no longer in vogue, surely there remains something special about the idea of being a leader?

In essence, and to condense a great deal of discussion on the subject, it would be fair to say that the police service still believes that there is something special about leadership. Its new draft doctrine, Leading for those we serve (National Police Leadership Centre, 2005), lays out a developmental path for police leaders, showing how leadership changes with increased seniority and emphasises the need for continuing self-awareness and self-development. It anchors police leadership to a binding ethical framework, exploring the fundamental characteristics of integrity in the police context and placing the achievement of performance
with integrity at the core of police leadership. Finally, it recognises the need for police leaders to adapt to, and to reflect, changes in late modern and diverse society in order for them to continue to be able to police by consent. The police service does not dispute the fundamental need for leadership and the pressures it imposes on those who accept its obligations.

The body of this text serves mainly to show the 'growing clarity and emphasis upon leadership values, beliefs and purposes' which characterises the modern police service, and gives some indication of the practical difficulties that police leaders face and how leadership development may help in their resolution.

Police leadership qualities, it has been proposed, should now emphasise, in addition to those qualities and skills previously identified: self-awareness, personal integrity, and a passion for achievement. This change of emphasis mirrors the trend in other organisations such as the National Health Service and is reflected in contemporary police doctrine.

The practical challenges of police leadership

Although doctrine is a first step it is not the solution - the practical difficulties of police leadership remain, whatever ideals are expressed on paper. What are those difficulties? Adlam (2004) recognises five areas wherein ambiguities arise which make the practice of police leadership both distinct and persistently challenging.

1. The constitutional context

Police leadership requires an understanding of the underlying features of a liberal democracy and the need to apply them in policing. This applies to all roles and at all levels and includes the proper use of discretion and the ability to resolve conflicting objectives.

"There is uncertainty about the ultimate goal. What is it? To preserve the Queen’s peace? Uphold the rule of law? Improve community relations? Help to maintain the “status quo”? All these are open to individual interpretation. In fact, police staff arguably have the vaguest of remits—to undertake a multitude of tasks but with unclear objectives; objectives which depend upon their personal interpretations of what the law, the local community or national policies appear to be looking for.” (ACPO, 1993)

Leaders need to build and shape an organisational culture in which rank-and-file officers are not left feeling alienated by the conflict of objectives that their work may impose, exacerbated on occasion by the need to satisfy ‘performance indicators’ that may be based on national policing objectives rather than current local requirements.

2. The legal context

All governments make politico-legal changes in the unceasing drive to reduce crime and increase public security. Police leadership needs to be able to cope with a changing politico-legal environment, in which change does not necessarily flow in an orderly and logical sequence. Those who make the law, as well as those who apply it, must be responsive to changing events and pressures, as 9/11 made clear: there is now a far greater pressure for both measures and policies that will promote public safety in the age of global terrorism that could not have been predicted before Al Qaeda’s attacks. Events in London in July 2005 have reinforced this pressure.

Police leaders have to judge how to enforce the law, since insensitive law enforcement can have a damaging effect on police-community relations and undermine police legitimacy.

3. The public sector

Public sector leadership necessarily involves:
- appreciating diversity
- building and testing for consensus
- managing conflict; and
- applying a responsibility to focus scarce resources in achieving the valued ends shared by the collective.

Public sector leaders are obliged to forge partnerships with collectives, communities, organisations and agencies that contribute to the common or public good.

4. The psychological and ethical context

On a day to day basis, police work is characterised by:
- the need for instant decisions
- the reliance upon individual skills, judgement and initiative
- the emotional demands of policing
- the physical dangers of policing
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- the influence of the police officer's image.

Police work takes place in a psychological and ethical context. Its leadership requires a psychological understanding of the sustained impact of police work upon the mentality and personality of the staff concerned, both individually and collectively. Police leaders have to understand that staff are exposed to ethical risk and are susceptible to moral depletion and need sophisticated methods to prevent its occurrence.

5. Philosophy and practice

It might be argued that these are not practical difficulties, but philosophical ones. The police force or unit that becomes aware of an armed robbery in progress does not need to pause and think what it should do: there is an obvious and pressing need for its services. However, even or perhaps especially in this situation there is a need for cool-headed and strategic leadership—for the careful application of clearly thought out and well-established principles and procedures in the hurly-burly and shortage of crucial information of a live event. To rush into a dangerous situation may make matters worse, and further endanger the lives and safety of those whom the police have officially sworn to protect. At the same time, to do nothing or exercise an undue caution is not an option: police work requires the intelligent management of risk, rather than its avoidance altogether.

As John Grieve, a former and very highly respected senior police officer in the Metropolitan Police Service, puts it:

“There will be occasions when the presence of the leader at or near the point of conflict is appropriate. However, good police leaders need not always be present to command their officers, nor share the physical dangers that they face in order to merit their respect. The leader’s physical presence is not always necessary. But what we might call his moral presence is another matter.

“Heroic leadership may be necessary in a riot. But the enduring challenge to the police leader is, perhaps, the less heroic but more difficult one of being able to make unheroic but competent decisions, under pressure, with inadequate information, time and time again: and of being able to sell those decisions not only to an angry or disbelieving public, but on occasion to one’s own workforce.” (In Adlam and Villiers, 2003)

How leadership development can help

This heading has been left hanging and must now be addressed. It is generally recognised that police leadership is in need of modernisation and reform, not least from within the service itself. How is that change, which implies a system of continuous improvement and development, to occur?

We have noted that a large number of change measures are in place, but does this address the heart of the problem? Is there something about the nature of the police culture itself—insular, conservative, cynical and on occasion prejudiced, as has been reported in almost every survey—that is able to sabotage and disempower all attempts at reform?

We think not: but the challenge is a real one. If the police service is to change itself from within—and the alternatives of a military style and separate officer corps, or outright direction by professional managers who may have little or no experience of the reality of policing, have never been recommended as anything more than more-or-less remote possibilities—then it needs to grow both its leadership and its leaders from within. That process began with the creation of the modern police service by Sir Robert Peel in 1829 and received a tremendous boost in 1948, with the creation of a National Police College at Bramshill in Hampshire (later to be renamed the Police Staff College). The college had a twofold aim from the start:

- To develop the police leaders of the present and future, from within the service; and
- To develop the quality of leadership within the police service as a whole.

Those aims remain valid, and the Central Police Training and Development Authority (commonly known as Centrex, and soon to be absorbed within the National Police Improvement Agency) is charged with taking them forward. The changes that have taken place and are planned for leadership development within the police service reflect the observations made in the last LSW Research Report (Bolden, 2005).
Police culture is not necessarily an obstacle to change, and an organic change process, supported and sustained at many levels, is more likely to succeed than any staccato attempt at reform.

**Conclusion: the need for ethical leadership**

In conclusion, the key challenge for police leadership at all levels is how to sustain performance with integrity against both external and internal pressures, and both *Leading for those we serve* and this account of work in progress emphasise the need for ethical leadership.

Ethical leadership encompasses an active respect for human rights and its core virtue is integrity. *Leading for those we serve* considers the moral development of the police leader as an individual, the moral development of the Service as a collective whole and the positive relationship between the two.

It divides police work into four quadrants, stresses the dangers of activity that is regarded as unethical but effective, and presents a model for good police performance as both ethical and effective.

It defines successful policing as related to both process and outcome, for example in regard to the investigation of crime. The ideal outcome is one in which due process leads to lawful conviction. The assessment and measurement of success needs to be addressed with care. It must be born in mind that many highly desirable police activities, such as preventing crime or building better community relations, are difficult if not impossible to measure in terms of quantifiable results. They should still be undertaken, though, and other means found to assess their impact.

The new doctrine provides guidance on how to deal with the moral dilemmas that are an inescapable part of police work and presents a democratically-based model for investigating and resolving them.

It reviews the ethical frameworks that have guided policing in the past and will do so in the future. *Inter alia*, it:

- Emphasises the importance of the development of a national code of police ethics.
- The Police Leadership Qualities Framework (*Leading for those we serve*) provides an explicit moral framework for the development of the quality of British police leadership that can act as a valuable guide for leaders in this sector, whilst still giving sufficient flexibility to select a course of action appropriate to the situation.

**Suggestions for Further Reading**


**Military Leadership**

(By John Jupp)

The military have always needed leadership since man first persuaded a group to take up weapons with intent to kill. From the times of Sun Tzu (500 BC), and others down the ages, they have written about it. They could not operate without it. Management in the military is also vital, a military campaign has always set an enormous logistical challenge to house, clothe, feed, equip and train a military force and place it where it is needed as any study of Nelson, Wellington, Dowding or many others will show. Yet you cannot manage people to put their lives at risk. Even transactional leadership has its limits; to offer a man stuck on the Normandy beaches on D-Day a financial bonus to ‘take out’ the machine gun nest keeping them there was likely to have earned you a completely unprintable answer! The military have always needed

---

14 © British Crown Copyright 2006/MOD. Published with the permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty's Stationery Office.

15 For example see Nelson’s Way, Stephanie Jones and Jonathan Gosling, 2005.
inspirational leadership which must also be ethical. The leadership of many sectors of the economy face decisions on which lives depend but only the military lead others knowing that they go out to kill and that some of those they lead will be killed. Fortunately, all the military are not permanently at war (though parts of the British military have been permanently on operations now for the last 15 years); modern military enterprise is a large and complex business covering enormous procurement projects, huge logistical contracts to support both operations and training, and running that training to be constantly ready for those ever more diverse operations whether they are enduring or emergent. Military leadership needs, therefore, to cover not only those operational aspects I have outlined, but also a complex, continuous and ever more technical business that enables those operations. Of course, the whole is spiced with the political angles that are immutably bound to military affairs.

The challenges of developing leadership within the Royal Air Force are no less than most other organisations. The Royal Air Force is a hierarchical organisation for very good reason: a hierarchy is needed for the proper control of lethal force. Yet hierarchies create their own bureaucracy and tend to stultify innovation. Military flying is an inherently dangerous business even before you face an enemy and needs to be closely regulated whether in its administration, the engineering of the aircraft or the flying of them. The plethora of regulations can mean that those put into leadership positions could get by doing things ‘by the book’. Indeed, those who don’t do it by the book could very easily fall foul of the system for good reason! Also, the exponential growth in employment legislation, from which the military are not exempt, tends to make people risk-averse. If we don’t take risks we will not win wars. The Royal Air Force Leadership Centre was created to provide a focus for leadership within the Royal Air Force and devise a through-life coherent leadership training policy for all its personnel. After much internal and external research we devised the following list of attributes that Royal Air Force leaders should concentrate on:

- Warfighter/Courageous
- Emotionally Intelligent
- Flexible and Responsive
- Willing to take Risks
- Mentally Agile/Physically Robust
- Able to Handle Ambiguity
- Politically and Globally Astute
- Technologically Competent
- Able to Lead Tomorrow’s Recruit

Doing or being these things will not make a leader but they are what the Royal Air Force needs its leaders to understand. What was also clear was that all personnel in the Royal Air Force needed to be given leadership training and for that training to continue through life whether or not they advanced through the hierarchy, but particular attention was needed when personnel did advance. That training would have to ensure that everyone was conversant with Mission Command\(^\text{16}\), that they increased their knowledge of the different styles of leadership and when they were appropriate; that various models of leadership were made available to them and they applied them in practice. As careers developed, a return to the touchstone would be necessary and issues above the tactical, at operational and strategic levels, addressed, particularly ambiguity. Thus the Royal Air Force Leadership Centre devised leadership interventions in the series of general service courses that every career officer or non-commissioned officer undertakes.

These courses serve those who progress up the career ladder reasonably well but it can be a considerable number of years between courses for any particular individual. For those whose career does not progress up the promotion ladder but develops in different ways there are no more of these types of courses where leadership can be developed. Thus the Force Development concept was brought into being. This is designed to give support in the workplace for various general service training needs and leadership is one of the five ‘pillars’ of this learning.

Our research showed that in general in the Royal Air Force, while on operations, risks

\(^{16}\) Mission Command is a philosophy and has four enduring tenets. It requires timely decision-making, a clear understanding of the superior’s intention, an ability on the part of the subordinates to meet the superior’s remit, and the commander’s determination to see the plan through to a successful conclusion. It promotes decentralised command, freedom and speed of action and initiative but is responsive to superior direction. (From British Defence Doctrine). It is a way of proper empowerment and delegation.
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(calculated risks) were taken, Mission Command worked well, personnel were empowered and leadership worked well. On the other hand, when not on operations personnel did not feel empowered, commanders wanted their people to take responsibility and more risk, people wanted clear-cut answers and so forth. Ensuring that all personnel are conversant with the tenets of Mission Command does not mean that it will work. A perceived, or otherwise, blame culture will stop empowerment in its tracks. Deep and enduring trust right up and down the command chain must be actively sought and maintained. Although this can be a challenging culture change, if we in the Royal Air Force can make it work on operations then we should be able to do so when we are not on operations.

The lessons of military history should not be misunderstood. Nelson commanded his fleets using a philosophy very much akin to Mission Command, his band of brothers. At Trafalgar, he ensured that his captains knew his intent, he gave general orders such as “...no Captain can do very wrong if he places his Ship alongside that of an Enemy” (Clayton and Craig, 2004: 94), giving his captains much freedom to work within the overall plan. His captains were enthralled by the empowerment Nelson gave them and used their initiative to devastating effect (Vincent, 2005). Yet by the Battle of Jutland, the signalling system, ironically introduced to the Royal Navy just before Trafalgar and used by Nelson to signal his famous message prior to the Battle, was continually developed and allowed the admirals to believe they could control a battle to the ultimate degree. The night before Jutland, the German fleet sailed within sight of at least two rear-admirals who dared not do anything as they had no orders to do so. They did not even pass the sighting of the German Fleet to their commander, the analysis of why is more difficult. Either they were so used to the tight control of the all-knowing commander that they thought he already knew, or they were so intimidated by the constant total control of their commanders they did not feel they could disabuse Jellicoe of his ignorance. I am sure that either suggestion would have appalled Jellicoe who may well have insisted that he would have liked to have known of the presence of the German Fleet and would have approved of any action the rear-admirals took that furthered his intent. So why did nothing happen? The lesson is clear, as new technology comes along, and people develop, constant work needs to be put in to maintain the trust up and down the command chain and make Mission Command a reality. With this flexibility, the ability to adapt and cope with the ambiguity of the battlespace, military leaders can aspire to the ethical leadership necessary to minimise the loss of life inherent in full military operations.

Suggestions for Further Reading
Ministry of Defence (forthcoming) British Air Power Doctrine AP3000: 4th Ed. HMSO.

School Leadership
(By Julian Thompson)

The national priority to improve educational standards in recent years has led to a significant increase in the level of interest in leadership development in schools. Successive governments have demanded higher standards, more equal opportunities and consistent quality in the nation’s education service. For most schools this has felt like much greater involvement and ultimately control in their affairs. At the same time more and more management functions have been delegated to headteachers and governors in the belief that schools would be more likely to succeed if decision making and accountability was localised and school leaders were given the freedom to respond to the needs of their own communities and context.

As a result of these two apparently competing principles the pace of change in schools over the past 15 years has been fast and furious. It is perhaps reassuring that a concern to structure and support school leadership has developed quickly too. At its heart is an exploration of the balance between the concepts of leadership and management in a system which is at the same time centrally prescribed, locally managed and highly moral.
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17 As argued by Jones and Gosling (2005) based on an analysis by NAM Rodger.
This centralisation of the curriculum, assessment and inspection schedules has undoubtedly led to greater consistency of practice, monitored and evaluated by school leaders and inspectors. Initially, the government’s view was that schools would improve more quickly if a number of key improvements in teaching strategies were used. These approaches and content were detailed by OfSTED and other national bodies. Headteachers were required to manage these “tools” and provide evidence of growing success in raising standards. Opportunities to exercise autonomy in curriculum design were earned only by those schools that were succeeding.

More recently and as other initiatives followed, there is evidence that this emphasis has changed. There is a growing view that schools’ experience in creating the conditions to respond creatively to an uncertain future may be far more valuable to improving the whole system than replicating specific improvement strategies. Schools are now being asked to measure progress against their own values and priorities as well as national targets. A focus on self evaluation and schools’ knowledge of their own capacity and potential is enabling headteachers and others to consider the process of leadership development more holistically. Without diluting the standards agenda there seems to be a greater consensus now that the process of change in schools is highly complex and contextualised.

Bodies such as the DfES Innovation Unit, the Training and Development Agency and the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust have played an important part in supporting new ideas and platforming the work of schools, drawing it to the attention of policy makers and other government departments in order to inform and shape future educational provision.

Learning to Lead
The National College for School Leadership was formed in 2000 to focus on improving the quality and effectiveness of leadership in all schools. It has a clear vision to “tailor leadership provision to individual and local contexts”. NCSL’s National Leadership Framework is the main vehicle for this. It is a suite of facilitated programmes which cover middle and departmental leadership, senior leadership and programmes for aspiring and recently appointed headteachers as well as for advanced and experienced headteachers working as consultants. Central to the framework is the NPQH, The National Professional Qualification for Headteachers, a statutory requirement for all maintained school headteachers. The National Leadership Framework is underpinned by the Key Standards for Headteachers which covers 6 key areas of headship (DfES, 2004):

1. Shaping the future
2. Leading learning and teaching
3. Developing self and working with others
4. Managing the organisation
5. Securing accountability
6. Strengthening community

Taken together the areas represent the role of every headteacher. They also provide some coherence in content for school leadership development at all levels. Increasing modularisation means that programmes are linked and more related to individual needs and learning styles. Participants can identify a personalised pathway through the programmes to reflect their own needs and wishes. NCSL is also commissioning the design of programmes regionally and locally to respond to the context of schools in their settings, for example rural small schools or faith schools or schools in particularly challenging circumstances.

Leading to Learn
As schools in England are becoming more diverse so the development of leadership skills and approaches for specific settings becomes more important. Full Service Schools and Children’s Centres in particular, aim for learners and their families to have direct access to social and health and other services in order to deliver the Every Child Matters Agenda (DFES, 2003). Leadership programmes and activities are being developed which enable individuals and teams to understand different working and leadership practices and cultures.

Groups of schools considering federation and amalgamation as well as those embarking on the new Trust School status may require models of leadership and management which can properly only be developed alongside the new institutions themselves. What will leadership of these new institutions be like? Who will be in charge? How will students be involved? If these schools really reflect and give voice to their communities how can leadership potential be identified and developed
locally within the community and how will it relate to the formal educational leadership we call headship?

Identifying and nurturing leadership capacity is not only important for new forms of schooling. Around 65% of headteachers are over 50 and will retire in the next 10 years. Re-advertisements for headteachers are at a record level. As Frank Hartle puts it:

“It is absolutely essential that all schools take a pro-active stance in talent development or risk a leadership recruitment crisis.” (Hartle and Smith, 2004)

Leadership development for schools may well mean recognising leadership as a collective activity and moving away from focussing solely on individual career development. This is important, not just for demographic reasons but also because it is through effective teamwork at all levels that schools will be able to access and sustain the range and responsiveness which is required:

“Your leadership in a culture of change will be judged as effective or ineffective not by who you are as a leader but by what leadership you produce in others.” (Fullan, 2001)

Understanding how leadership can be distributed in schools is essential as John West Burnham explains (West Burnham, 2004):

- the power of one is giving way to a belief in the power of everyone
- as schools become more complex we need more leaders
- we need a pool of talented leaders to grow tomorrow’s school leaders

Perhaps there is also another fundamental reason why ideas of distributed or delegated leadership sit comfortably in a school setting.

“Leadership cannot be taught it has to be learnt. The most powerful means of developing leadership is to create an organisational culture that values the sorts of learning that are most likely to enhance the capacity of individuals to lead.” (West Burnham, 2004)

Making the link between leadership and learning has had a significant impact on leadership development in schools. For many schools the promotion of a learning culture has enabled leadership to be more distributed because it focuses on a moral purpose to improve the quality of learning – what schools should be about – not only of the students but also of leaders and potential leaders at all levels. It requires heads and deputies to let go of some of their responsibilities and build a learning culture which is inclusive and enabling of others, both colleagues and students. This is perhaps best exemplified by an increasing number of school leaders who are happy to refer to themselves not as “headteacher” but “lead learner”.

Suggestions for Further Reading


Leadership in Higher Education

(By Georgy Petrov)

This article sets out to present the features of university leadership and to show how changes occurring in the sector (larger organisations, complexity, financial accountability, competition, teaching and research quality audits, etc.) demand increasing professionalism in the running of these organisations. As a result, universities face a serious challenge for developing and equipping leaders committed, motivated and able to meet the current and future challenges.

Leadership in higher education (HE) is an ambiguous and contested domain because it does not easily fit the traditional academic value system nor many aspects of the structure and function of universities (Middlehurst, 1993; Shattock, 2003). The distinctive features of the university as an organisation presented below have been argued by many writers to make the work of leadership in universities different from that in other organisations and have direct implications for leadership development in this sector.

The Centre for Leadership Studies is currently conducting a major study of leadership in Higher Education with funding from the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
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**University as collegiality**

Universities, especially old universities, have long been described conceptually as organisations with a “collegial” form of governance, which assumes a ‘first among equals’ style of leadership, authority of professional expertise (over positional power), academic autonomy, and self-regulation. Institutional authority has tended to be perceived as weak and the university viewed more as a holding company for the disparate disciplines rather than an integrated whole. Decisions have been perceived as being reached (and frequently delayed) through a consensual process of discussion and debate within numerous university committees. Although the extent to which universities were ever truly collegial (in terms of open and transparent engagement) may have been exaggerated, its principles worked well enough in an elite HE system (where power resided principally within the professoriate) and in a period of moderately plentiful resources with limited external intervention. In the current climate of mass education, intense competition (especially for international students and high-profile research grants), changing funding mechanisms (decreasing funds from central government and an increasing need to engage with business) and increasing user expectations (e.g. resulting from the implementation of student fees and corporate sponsorship) the weaknesses and limitations of the traditional collegial system are becoming more and more evident.

Firstly, the collegial model tends to treat the university as a static entity, assuming that both the external environment and organisational/departmental goals can be clearly identified and that, once identified, academics will pursue them. However, modern universities have very ambiguous and unclear goals, which may be more likely to produce conflict and competition rather than consensus. Secondly, the lack of well-defined boundaries in HE, the contested nature of academic processes, the development of new knowledge and increasing external demands make it impossible for a university to function entirely by consensus – a path will always need to be taken amongst competing interests. Thirdly, the rise of mass HE has brought with it an increased complexity and range of stakeholders, leading to a demand for quicker decisions, greater external responsiveness and accountability, and a search for economies of scale. This has forced universities to strengthen their non-academic expertise and support structures and to take managerialism more seriously.

**The tension between collegiality and managerialism**

As indicated above, in order to respond to external demands in these fast-moving times, universities have needed to strengthen their non-academic expertise, which in turn has led to internal changes, such as bureaucratic expansion and the emergence of managerialism. This creates a tension between the processes of collegiality, preoccupied with the protection of autonomy, and managerialism, asking for accountability and control. In the 1990s, opponents of the shift of balance between academic and administrative powers argued that academic organisations had intrinsic values and qualities incompatible with managerial values and systems. They argued that the shift to managerial forms of governance would inevitably undermine academic freedom and impose greater uniformity and inhibit creativity. Supporters of the shift, in turn, argued that the introduction and enhancement of managerial processes would render institutional decision-making more effective.

In the current HE context, however, it may be argued that collegiality should no longer be seen as a defensive ideology against change but, instead, should be geared towards it as collegiality and managerialism are not mutually exclusive (Clark, 2004). However, in order to do this effectively greater care is needed to lead and manage academics well, not only because their allegiance to their discipline may well be stronger than that to the institution, but also because of the value these individuals tend to place on individual autonomy and academic freedom (Ramsden, 1998).

**Individual autonomy, academic freedom and loyalty to discipline**

Strong loyalty to academic discipline remains important to academics and because of it the current move towards a more corporate institutional identity and leadership presents a problem for many universities. Academics’ loyalties tend to lie far wider than their institution, to their networks, discipline and professional affiliations (the ‘invisible college’). Equally, the ideas of individual autonomy and
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academic freedom, which imply individual discretion to pursue the quest for knowledge and truth, and a variety of academic interests may further limit the ‘corporateness’ of the whole (Middlehurst, 1993). The university as an organisation with many sub-cultures (chiefly based on disciplines) can thus be regarded as a fragmented whole and within this context a ‘corporate’ style of management and leadership may well be perceived as a threat to individual autonomy and freedom through increased bureaucratic responsibility and accountability, and is likely to be met with resistance.

The divide between academic and administrative authority

Management (and by implication leadership) is sometimes treated in the academic community as ‘mere’ administration, lacking in status and competing directly with measures of academic performance (research and teaching excellence). One of the reasons for this is that two distinct cultures of ‘administrative’ and ‘academic’ have formed within nearly all universities, in which the purpose of the former is only seen as providing support and service to the latter. However, in the mass HE system and market, the roles and tasks performed by professional managers/administrators are becoming more significant as they are increasingly being asked to do more at the school/department level (budgeting, marketing, outreach activities, student recruitment, project management). This leads to a situation where, on the one hand, boundaries between ‘academic’ and ‘administrative’ powers and tasks are becoming fuzzy (Whitchurch, 2006) but, on the other hand, the increasing complexity and variety of managerial tasks demands a clearer division of labour between academics and managers/administrators.

In parallel to this trend, the notion of training and development for academic leaders is changing. Until recently, the scope of institutional provision and support for management development focused chiefly on administrative staff, whilst leadership and management development for academic leaders was very limited. The cult of the gifted amateur underscored the idea that any highly educated and intelligent individual could undertake the task of leadership without training and where academic excellence automatically implied managerial and leadership competence (Middlehurst, 1993).

From the gifted amateur to the professional manager

In HE management and leadership skills have traditionally been acquired informally, on-the-job, through progression to ever greater responsibilities (Middlehurst, 1993). Academics are often reluctant to take up leadership roles, especially those of a school or departmental head, because of the lack of tangible rewards, the precedence of discipline over institutional loyalty, a career structure that rewards research over management excellence, and the potentially negative effects of leadership tasks on research performance and relationship with peers. Since many leadership positions, including school and departmental heads, deans and pro-vice chancellors in pre-1992 universities, are based on rotating fixed-term contracts (usually three or four years), academics in these positions do not necessarily identify themselves as managers (expecting to return to the ranks once their term is completed) and thus do not usually see a need for formal management and leadership development. Furthermore, as they may well have been elected or appointed to this role, not having actively sought it out, they may be complacent about their need for development and academic leadership remains a largely amateur performance.

In the current social and economic climate, however, where increasing financial and strategic responsibility is being devolved to these levels there is a pressing need, in the views of institutional actors interviewed during our own research, to improve the quality of leadership functions, notably resource allocation, direction-setting, articulating the value of the school’s/department’s work to other parts of the university and external stakeholders, managing greater staff turnover on temporary contracts, managing and disciplining performance of academic colleagues, interacting with financial, marketing, recruitment (sales) and student finance professionals – whether this can be done collectively or will form a more individualised leadership approach is a subject of further enquiry. But individual or collective, it needs to be more ‘professional’ and will take up more time and effort, with greater accountability. There is, therefore, a need to raise the
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In his tales of “the wise fool” Peter Hawkins (2005) describes a management team asking Nasrudin if he could help them prepare a better communication policy for their staff. “Certainly”, said Nasrudin, “only first tell me what it is you are not hearing?”

In a very different book Gordon Corrigan (2003) reports that 91 British Generals were killed in action between 1914 and 1918, and a further 146 were wounded or captured, a higher proportion of casualties than other ranks, so they must have been in the front line.

This may seem an odd way to start looking at some recent thinking on the leadership of staff operating in a customer sensitive environment. Yet we read that the staff working in Marks & Spencer knew that customers were not attracted to their merchandise long before the management. They knew their children, husbands, friends and relatives were not shopping in the stores, and they saw that customers were not buying. Similarly when British Airways operations collapsed in chaos last year it was three days into the dispute before the airline announced that “senior management were now in Terminal 4 to deal with the problems”, implying that they were not there before. So the leaders of two major companies whose fortunes are dictated by their ability to attract and retain customers might be accused of “not hearing” and of not “being there”.

These are not new perceptions of leadership needs. Ron Heifetz (1994) summarised many of them in the mid 1990s. In his view good leaders seized every opportunity to ask staff questions. Hence Colin Marshall learned how difficult it was to clean the first-class section of aircraft because of the curse of escaped peanuts, how passengers noticed these, and how the staff knew how to deal with it if only their managers would give them the different nozzle on the vacuum cleaner which some had already bought in the high street. Heifetz also captured the thought that good leaders were not afraid to describe reality. So recently Justin King
agreed with his Sainsbury staff that the goods were not on the shelves and this had to be fixed. He did not continue to reassure them that the new IT based system would eventually work. He understood that the goods were not on the shelf and actually put them there using current systems and immediately.

This thinking has been continued by Clayton Christensen (2003) who argues that successful innovation and growth requires systemic investment in customer R&D, and developed by Selden & MacMillan (2006) who say it is essential for frontline employees to be involved in such a process. In other words, make sure you are close to the staff who are close to the customers and engage with them.

Front-line staff, it is argued, know how customers are actually feeling and behaving. So if the managers were only there too, saw the situation and asked questions, might they not understand too? This does not mean that metrics are not also useful. One of Alan Leighton’s first actions at Royal Mail was to ensure that he and his managers know sales and operations results within a few days, not a few weeks. In addition, he also asks the staff what they see as happening, and in just one example this resulted in the inadequate plastic shoes issued to postmen being changed. It takes Leighton time to read 50 or 60 emails a day from staff but he argues that it is worth it. Similarly in his rejuvenation of the massive US Home Depot chain, Robert Nardelli blended the management process approaches from his GE background (e.g. data templates and strategic planning) with the passion for customers instilled by the previous management through learning forums, conference calls, and simply visiting the stores (Charan, 2006). It took time for a First World War general to frequently slog his way to the front line and see that the shells were misfiring, or that the soldiers had no gas masks – and for many of them this journey also cost them their lives - but it may also explain why systemic failures were fixed, and why so many people actually followed their lead in frightful conditions.

To Jim Collin’s (2001) description of the good leader looking out of the window when things go well, and in the mirror when they go badly, there is another dimension emerging. Some leaders also shout out of the window in order to keep staff clear as to the purpose of the business. Setting a clear purpose does not necessarily mean improving customer service. Virgin Atlantic constantly reorients their processes and communications to ensure that staff believe they are there to deliver the customer promise of personal service. Ryanair, however, uses public and internal pronouncements to ruthlessly emphasise that there is no customer promise other than a low fare. Consistency is the key element. No-one is in any doubt that if something goes wrong with a Ryanair flight you are on your own, but with a Virgin ticket there is an expectation of assistance. What matters is that staff understand the customer promise and every message they hear from above, and the leaders reinforce this. So Richard Branson will call disaffected passengers personally, and Michael O’Leary will swear at them.

In both these illustrations the leaders are also dealing with the vulnerability that even front-line staff may not understand the trend they have reported. British Airways staff started taking trips on Ryanair very quickly when they realised that the fares to Venice were cheaper than ‘discounted staff rates’ on their own airline, but they did not see the competitive threat to their own positions. NHS staff may have spotted that Netcare and Capio have entered the private hospital market, but they may not have realised that these operations now substantially undercut the cost of hospital provision for national health patients for the government. Leaders need to constantly make sense of these ‘competitive disruptions’ and make them real for their staff. Nardelli is quoted as replying to staff when they felt they were being rushed into a change “Good point. Give me five minutes. I’m going to call Lowe’s [a competitor] and ask them to slow down for us!”

Leadership in context therefore means making sense of the organisational purpose and story, listening to the insight gained from those making the customer transactions, and being there with them. Even in apparently simple customer transactions daily choices determine the perception of the service by the customer. Does a teller in a busy bank take the time and trouble to process a cheque when no prior arrangement has been made and there is a queue? Do staff in a hospital ward check that a patient not only has food
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but is eating it? It is the sum of such small choices that define the customer perception of an organisation. There is no 'right' answer so staff look to the local leader to provide guidance.

This guidance may involve overruling an earlier decision by their staff. For example, waiving the 'visiting hours' rules in a busy hospital because of distress this would cause to a patient despite a recent missive to enforce the rules so that in general patients can rest. Or by intervening to move airline passengers from pre-booked seats so a family may sit together despite the family having clearly purchased low fare tickets with no advanced seat allocation priority. Here the leaders need to recognise the validity of the earlier decision yet demonstrate that in this particular context the change is for the good of the overall enterprise, possibly despite the metrics.

In such a context developing a range of leadership approaches is crucial. Leaders have to be analytical – customer transactions need to be profitable; they have to be worldly – they have to understand trends; they have to be decisive – about individual customers and about systems that are failing; they have to collaborate with colleagues – solving system failures; and most difficult of all they have to find the time to stop and think about how it is all going – customers do a lot of reflection on how they have been treated and have long memories, yet often this is not matched within the service delivery organisation. A useful tool in this is to work with managers on the differing mindsets required of every manager (Gosling and Mintzberg, 2003). In customer management there is no single mindset that will meet all requirements.

Perhaps most important of all recent thinking reminds us that contextual understanding of a customer-facing business needs to be simple and relevant. As Andy Neely (2006) has recently advanced in his research on balanced score-cards “managers lost their focus once they had more measures to think about” and “needed more local information”; so where better to get this from than the staff? Staff, however, can easily be de-motivated or confused by too many targets as the NHS amply illustrates, so the constant redefinition of the context of the business, and careful listening to staff as to why policies or procedures do not make sense is important.

Most leaders in customer-driven businesses are good at making decisions; they have to be. The challenge for their development is to improve the quality of the decisions through learning cycles (Honey and Mumford, 1992) that ground theory, experience and action in the trenches of the working day and crucially make the time to reflect on what they are hearing and seeing, and what they themselves are shouting. This may explain why, for the development of any leaders in customer-facing markets, on-line learning and coaching are replacing classrooms and away-days, and execution is being advanced by developing presence, listening, and making systemic decisions. Such development demands the blending of strategic, managerial and leadership disciplines ‘close to the work’ (Kinsella, 2006), as is currently being explored by members of the CLS at Exeter – the context demands it.

Suggestions for Further Reading


Leadership in the Professions

(By Robin Ladkin)

This article sets out a particular view of leadership based on the author’s experience of developing professionals as leaders in many different settings. In many of these developmental initiatives Action Learning (Revans, 1980) has been used as a primary method of development. The article considers a number of
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traditional approaches to action learning and suggests ways in which these might be helpful depending on the particular aspects of leadership under development.

A note on experience
The author has been designing and implementing leadership development initiatives for a variety of organisations over the past fifteen years. These include large, commercial organisations such as Sainsbury and NatWest bank, professional organisations and firms such as the Magistrates Court system of the UK, a number of legal practices and Universities, and international organisations such as the International Finance Corporation, part of the World Bank Group. As a consequence of this experience the author has developed a particular interest in the way leadership development can be positioned as a continuation of professional development in an appreciative way (see Cooperider and Srivastva, 1987). This contrasts, in his experience, with many approaches to development which take, as their starting point, a deficit orientation. Action Learning seems, in his experience, an effective way to build on professional attitudes to work and outcome, sometimes coupled with one-to-one coaching and selected educational programmes.

A model for Leadership Development
There is much written and spoken about leadership - it is both highly topical and equally thoroughly contested. How leadership differs from management; the extent to which leadership characteristics, if they can be identified, are developable; the present retreat from a highly individualistic and heroic model of leadership towards a more collective and relational process; gender distinctions in leadership form are all familiar elements of the contested field.

The author has chosen to focus his development efforts on a view of leadership composed of three inter-related aspects which form axes of the model below (Figure 6).

Figure 6: A model for leadership development

Contextual Awareness: This aspect is a recognition that leadership is situated in a particular context. The nature of the business, its strategic imperatives, the capabilities and motivations of colleagues and team members, relationship with one’s boss - all these and many other factors will have an impact on how one should lead. This recognition strongly argues against notions of a single list of leadership characteristics which are universally applicable, although the context may well include a set of behaviours or characteristics identified by the organisation as preferable. These should be included in the contextual consideration rather than assumed to be definitive.

Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell have developed a slightly different three aspect model (2001) which also takes as its starting point the significance of context in leadership, a factor in their view of the challenges of leadership.

As will be discussed below this contextual aspect of leadership can be effectively developed through project based action learning often supplemented by appropriate business education.

Awareness of self: This aspect is based on an assumption about leadership which is that it is an expression of self. A clear distinction the author makes between leadership and management is that management is largely role based and includes many necessary activities, such as setting objectives and performance reviews. Leadership, in contrast, is a way of being, an expression of characteristics such as enthusiasm, belief, vulnerability, reliability, clarity of purpose which
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emmanate from a choiceful awareness of self.

This aspect of leadership can benefit greatly from peer support and challenge within an action learning set, which can sometimes lead to relatively deep questioning, a more cathartic approach, as discussed below. This aspect is also often the basis of one-to-one coaching.

Leadership as relational: In the same way that leadership is increasingly recognised to be situational, (arguing against too much emphasis on generic characteristics), so is it being recognised as relational.

This aspect is argued persuasively, for example, by Drath (2001) who argues for a third leadership principle: a recognition that leadership typically takes place amongst a plurality of interests and is, therefore, a factor which provides sufficient agreement, or alignment, for effective action to be taken by the relevant group.

A second aspect of the relational, in this author’s view, is that leadership acts are remarkably ordinary relational behaviours, basically forms of conversation. What makes these inter-actions, whether one to one, small or large group, extra-ordinary is the choice of form as well as content. Leaders who listen attentively, or speak thrillingly, or convey certainty, or confront gracefully are worth following, especially if they make space for and encourage collective leadership.

It is this relational aspect of leadership which is so often the subject of issues raised in action learning encounters – how to behave well in particular, often challenging, relationships.

Summary

There are three aspects of leadership, contextual awareness, awareness of self and the relational nature of leadership which play a significant role in different forms of action learning.

Suggestions for Further Reading


Leadership in the Cultural Sector
(By Sue Kay)

The UK cultural sector is large and diverse. It incorporates the seven ‘domains’ of Visual Art, Performance, Audio-Visual, Books and Press, Sport (and physical activity), Heritage and Tourism and operates through freelances, micro enterprises, small, medium and (a few) large-scale organisations which span the public, private and voluntary sectors.

According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer ‘The British cultural sector is a success by any standards…. [it] not only helps define and shape and deepen our lives as individuals. It also makes a significant contribution to our nation’s prosperity’ (Arts Council England, 2006b). Within the UK the sector ‘accounts for over 5% of GDP and has been growing at twice the rate of the overall economy over the past decade’ (Arts Council England, 2006a).

Alongside these successes, and in line with concerns about leadership quality across the economy as a whole, several sector specific reports have provided evidence of a ‘crisis of cultural leadership’, associated with apathy, low morale, and a general lack of aspiration (Holland et al, 1997; Boydenn Associates, 2000; Metier, 2000; Resource, 2001; Hewison and Holden, 2002). This has more recently been challenged and reframed as a ‘a serious gap in current provision for developing our current and future leaders’ (Arts Council England, 2006b) which must be addressed if the sector is to maintain its healthy position as a driver for growth and prosperity. In this article we review some of the initiatives that have been designed to plug the gap.

“We expect a great deal from [cultural sector leaders]: not only sound management practice, but vision, inspiration and dynamism, as well as a passion for culture and a strong commitment to promoting its benefits”

19 This article draws heavily on Summerton, Kay and Hutchins, 2006.
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society and to the wider economy. High quality cultural leadership is too important to the continued success of the cultural sector to be left to chance.” Rt Hon Tessa Jowell MP (Arts Council England, 2005)

What’s distinctive about the cultural sector?
It has long been argued that there is something distinct about the cultural sector.

Hewison (2003) maintains that cultural organisations are value-based enterprises which focus not only on “value for money” but also “money for values” which may be “moral, not monetary, expressive, not instrumental, aesthetic, not utilitarian”. In other words the priorities of cultural sector organisations are not solely or necessarily determined by a conventional private sector ‘bottom line’. Taking those who work in the subsidised arts as an example, while some of their values and associated behaviours may be shared across the wider social economy (e.g. a desire to work with others who share the same goals and beliefs; a tendency to select working practices and an environment that allow for personal growth), others are tied closely to a belief in the importance of a particular art form practice and the impulse to make, disseminate or educate through arts work, often in relation to particular contexts. Similar observations could be made of other domains such as heritage and sport.

Holden (2006) posits the view that publicly funded culture generates a mix of intrinsic, instrumental and institutional values played out in a triangular relationship between cultural professionals, politicians/policy makers and the public. According to this analysis, an over-emphasis on instrumental, economic and social outcomes can (and currently does) result in inappropriate metrics and an unbalanced view of what ‘cultural value’ is.

Cultural sector leadership is viewed as distinctive too. Hewison and Holden (2002) argue that all creative people are to some extent leaders and leadership should be geared towards creating and sustaining organisational structures that enable creativity to flourish. In addition, leadership paradigms associated with large-scale, hierarchical and bureaucratic business organisations sit uneasily with many in the subsidised parts of the sector.

Further factors contributing to this distinctiveness (which are also reflective of the not-for profit sector as a whole) include: a multiplicity of stakeholders, scarcity of resources and lack of long-term financial security, the prevalence of volunteers as board members or key staff and the need to complete short-term projects whilst ensuring constant innovation. Hewison and Holden (2002) conclude that “by addressing leadership … it is possible to revitalise institutions across the cultural sector, and … [cultural leaders] will regain the creativity and confidence that the sector is in danger of losing.”

Cultural sector leadership initiatives
Calls for improved leadership have led to the launch of a range of initiatives, a selection of which are described in Box 2.

Each of them has a discernibly different ‘take’ on ‘cultural leadership’, priorities for development and the most appropriate mix of methodologies. Whilst it is too early to judge their overall impact, evaluation of the recently completed Creating Cultural Leadership: South West pilot programme provides some useful findings.

The Clore Leadership Programme is a national scheme “designed to help develop the skills and experience of potential leaders in the visual and performing arts, heritage, museums, libraries and archives and cultural administration and policy”. Now supporting its second cohort of twenty-five Fellows, it offers a range of tuition opportunities in presentation skills, media awareness, marketing, fundraising and governance; a three/four month secondment; a research element; and mentoring, all within a one-year programme (www.cloreleadership.org).

NESTA (the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts) has instituted a small number of Cultural Leadership Awards for “individuals from science, technology and arts sectors, to undertake placements with outstanding leaders from around the world to enhance their knowledge, skills, expertise and their own behaviours as leaders” (www.nesta.org.uk).

City University has recently recruited to a new European Social Fund-supported Cultural Leadership Programme designed to give “skills, knowledge and confidence to emerging leaders”, with a main emphasis on addressing the lack of women in cultural leadership roles. Described as “more specifically tailored to the cultural sector than an MBA”, it includes workshops by practitioners and sector analysts, mentoring,
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action learning sets, research projects, online materials, advice on career development and coaching in interpersonal skills (www.city.ac.uk/cpm/CL/).

Creating Cultural Leadership: South West is a recently concluded yearlong pilot programme steered initially by Culture South West (the regional cultural consortium) and the regional cultural agencies. It catered for some thirty senior managers from across the whole of region’s cultural sector (arts, tourism, museums libraries and archives, built heritage, sport and media) and was run by two higher education institutions (the Centre for Leadership Studies at Exeter University and the Centre for Creative Enterprise & Participation (now renamed Dartington Creative Enterprise) at Dartington College of Arts). Content addressed questions of leadership relating to self, others, the workplace, the cultural field and the future. Methodologies included residential workshops, learning groups and individual coaching (www.leadershipsouthwest.com). Phase two of this programme – with a particular focus on ongoing support through action learning groups – will be part-funded through the national Cultural Leadership Programme (see below).

The Cultural Leadership Programme, launched in June 2006 by Arts Council England and partners, and funded by £12 million of Treasury money (2006-2007) ‘to promote excellence and leadership within the cultural sector’ (Arts Council England, 2006a: 1). Its six strands comprise intensive leadership development through Clore short courses; an online learning resource; a work based development initiative involving a number of partner networks; and separate development schemes for Black and minority ethnic leaders, governance bodies, and cultural entrepreneurs (www.artscouncil.org.uk).

Box 2: Leadership development in the Cultural Sector

Creating Cultural Leadership: South West was planned over a two-year period and sought to provide a development platform for cultural leadership capacity building in the South West of England. During the initial consultation (reported in Cook, 2003), second tier managers, SME chief executives, cultural entrepreneurs and development workers were asked to analyse their sector in terms of trends and challenges they perceived. Their list included:

- increased focus on the social and economic impact of culture and pressure to capture value in terms of ‘outcome’ and ‘output’,
- changes in consumer expectations in an increasingly competitive leisure marketplace,
- new technology as a management tool and as a means of cultural production and dissemination,
- demand for partnership working and engagement with a broader cross-section of bodies both within and outside the sector,
- pressure to engage in development activities and to exhibit greater ‘professionalism’,
- growing workload demands.

Development needs emerged as: networking and knowledge of ‘the system’, management of staff and organisations, individual development/support, advocacy and communication, partnership working, financial and resource management, project management, strategic thinking, creative thinking and business planning. The most cited barriers to taking up development opportunities were “time” and “money”. In terms of programme design, there was a preference for tailored provision in small groups over a period of time and at low cost, delivered in “bite sized chunks”.

One interesting issue to arise from the initial consultation was a measure of discomfort felt by second tier managers when applying the term ‘leadership’ to their current work or future aspirations and an assumption that becoming a leader would mean adopting command and control styles of behaviour. Linked to this was evidence of ‘Impostor Syndrome’, whereby high achieving consultees showed significant levels of self-doubt and a discernible inability to recognise individual success (see Cory, 2006). While these tendencies are not restricted to the cultural sector, it has been suggested (Hewison, 2006) that they are not unconnected with the increased levels of accountability that have accompanied growth in state funding for culture (largely tied to social and economic outcomes) and extensive media coverage of high profile failures (particularly of lottery funded projects) – both of which have led to greater regulation, a climate of overwork and a lowering of confidence within the workforce.

Leadership Development in Context 45
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Evaluation of Creating Cultural Leadership: South West (Schwarz, 2006) revealed unanimous support for working and learning cross-sectorally and strong endorsement of an approach based on ‘developing the leader from within… rather than focusing on functional topics’. The positive impact of the programme – measured (with caveats) through promotions and appointments to more senior posts, new projects and collaborations, funds raised, jobs created and new organisational development initiatives undertaken – was also apparent in a significant increase in delegates’ confidence in advocating for themselves, their organisations, their separate domains and the sector as a whole. There was particular endorsement of coaching and action learning groups, and support for workshop sessions that were clearly contextualised, respectful of different learning styles and applicable in content and focus to a wide range of workplace settings. Finally, there was a very strong desire to continue learning together through buddyng, peer observation and workplace visits in the future.

Priorities for cultural sector leadership development

These findings point to a number of factors that can usefully inform leadership development across the cultural sector. Building on Summerton, Kay and Hutchins (2006), these can be summarised as:

- the wide variety of contexts, domains (e.g. sport, heritage, arts) and organisational configurations, within and across which leadership is distributed (including micro businesses and freelance activity),
- the existence of multiple bottom lines that include but are not restricted to the financial,
- structural ambiguity (not least through the involvement of volunteers),
- the specific demands of facilitating and mediating cultural activity,
- the latest thinking in arts and cultural management,
- an evolving articulation of what leadership in the cultural sector might comprise, based on current debates about ‘cultural value’ (e.g. Holden, 2004 and 2006) and an appreciation of ‘home grown’ leadership practices as well as those adopted and adapted from elsewhere,
- theoretical work that allows for transferability between sectors and different organisational contexts (e.g. Boyzatis, 1982; Mintzberg, 1998; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990 and 1999) and that values cultural metaphors and practices in understanding and developing leadership (e.g. Austin and Lee, 2003; Barrett, 2000; Darsø, 2004; Grint, 2001),
- innovative professional development practice that recognises and builds on what is known about teaching and learning in the field (e.g. the activities of All Ways Learning in the South East), and above all,
- the need to raise the confidence, self-esteem and assertiveness of the sector and those who work in it.

It may be that these elements could help provide criteria by which to appraise the overall contribution of the development programmes referred to Box 2. Above all, however, they reveal the need for a development framework that makes sense within a contemporary cultural context. As Leadbeater (2005: 3) observes:

"Creativity, culture and art are central to our society as never before: influencing how we make our livings, take our leisure, enjoy ourselves, express our identities, design our environments, bind together our communities, explore our history and speculate about the future... We live in an economy in which imagination and innovation are increasingly critical, across so many walks of life. The centrality of creativity and culture to our experience of life should mean that arts [and by implication, cultural] organisations also play a central role in society. But it rarely feels that way."

There has been a long history of culture shaping social values and the ways in which we understand social processes. A renewed engagement with these issues will be beneficial not only to leaders in cultural organisations but also to the role and status of the cultural sector within society at large.

Suggestions for Further Reading


Leadership in the Not-For-Profit Sector

(By Stephen Davey)

The “not-for-profit” sector is huge; encompassing everything from small non-governmental organisations (NGOs) focused on single issues to big international voluntary organizations and the United Nations agencies. What they have in common is the way they define their purpose - to do something for the public good, using the resources available to be effective but not seeking to make a profit from their work.

Many people working in the sector are attracted to their organization because it seems to provide an opportunity to do something of evident value in their working lives. Some of the challenges that leaders, and followers, face may be particular to the sector, but most people who work there - as staff or volunteers - are neither angels in disguise nor are they incompetent do-gooders. They have skills in some areas and not in others, they can do great work and have bad days, they can succeed and they can fail as leaders.

Some characteristics of the sector

There are big differences in the size and the working culture of different organizations within the sector. However there are some characteristics that are particular to the sector and which have a bearing on leadership and leadership development. These include:

a) A constitution or charter defines the mission of the organization and the roles of governance and management in leadership.

b) The mission/goals may be tightly focussed - as in a single purpose NGO, or wide ranging as in bigger NGOs and some UN agencies, but they are almost always ambitious.

c) Services are not provided to a paying customer; there is instead a dual accountability. The organization is accountable both to those it exists to assist (through services or advocacy) and to those who provide the resources - which may be the public, the private sector or government.

d) Many of those involved are attracted by the organization’s mission and seek to use their professional skills in the organization (as staff or volunteers ) for the public good. They will often have a strong emotional commitment to the organization. They shape the organization’s culture and their professional and/or personal identity may be closely bound up with the organization.

e) Resources are usually limited in relation to the goals. This, together with concern to spend as much as possible on direct service delivery, may severely limit the resources available for training and development.

f) The organization, with its combination of ambitious goals, dual accountability, staff and volunteer engagement may well provide a rich learning environment for leadership development. This may or may not be evident to those involved.

Key Issues for leadership development

a) Leadership development is a legitimate issue

The understanding that leadership and management are as important in the not for profit sector as anywhere else has made great progress in the last two decades. The logical conclusion – that it is not only legitimate, it is also important to focus on and spend resources on leadership development is not always so evident. As elsewhere training and development budgets are vulnerable when the budget is under pressure. In the not-for-profit sector, the tendency to assess agency effectiveness on the basis of the percentage spent on overheads (which include people development), instead of the more appropriate question of what is the agency achieving, makes the problem
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worse. To the extent that leadership teams can focus their own and donors’ attention on the issue of what they achieve rather than the overheads issue, they can reframe the people and leadership development question. (Is it more effective to spend 100% of the money on people working hard but coping with some skill shortages and/or a dysfunctional team, or 10% of the money on training and development and 90% of the money the work of better trained people in a more coherent team?)

b) Board Development

Formal leadership responsibility in "not for profits" is usually shared between the governing board and its chair on the one hand, and the Director General or CEO on the other. Broadly the Board is the guardian of the mission and values of the organization, responsible for setting direction and monitoring the performance of the Director General, staff and volunteers in implementing the organization’s programmes.

The challenge facing the board is thus considerable. Yet few NGO or international organization boards invest significantly in their own development. Most plunge into action, only to later on discover that they have erroneously assumed a common understanding about the role and working processes of the board and what constitutes good conduct for a board member. Addressing the need for board development may be complicated by the sense that the board members are so senior in the structure of the organization that they should not need, or might not accept, professional development. Workshops facilitated by a knowledgeable and well briefed outsider, working closely with the chair (and designed partly for Board members only and partly for Board members and senior staff together) may provide the most effective way of tackling needs in this area.

c) The individual leadership journey

How people experience the journey from doer to leader will vary greatly according to context. Some steps along the journey may include:

- Developing personal awareness and the insight that each person has a particular working style with areas of strength and areas for development. Related to this, increasing the ability to understand and relate to the contribution of others as part of a larger team. Starting a personal emotional intelligence journey.

- Understanding that the leader’s job is more about fostering the work of the team than the leader’s own direct output. Of those attracted to a not-for-profit organization as a vehicle for using their professional skills, some get promoted to first line management. Many find the transition to the new role challenging. The role of leading and managing others is new and awkward. In addition some resent the time “lost” from what is still perceived as the “real job” of hands on service delivery. Without effective development support, the organization may lose performing stars in the front line and gain second-rate managers leading disaffected and confused teams.

- Developing and using different mindsets. Many not-for-profit organizations have an action focused and busy culture. Whilst this is often a strength organizational effectiveness also requires time to notice and respond to change in the external environment, time to assess past actions and the innovations of other agencies, in short-time to reflect. Time out, an introduction to ideas about different mindsets, and exposure to different situations with explicit learning objectives can help leaders move on to another more strategic level in their leadership journey.

- Staying energized. Over time people become more senior and experienced in the reality of working in the not-for-profit sector. With seniority, distance from the front line work of the agency increases, and issues like budgets and organizational issues become more dominant. Role changes, moves between headquarters and the field, or to another organization and effective challenging and coaching by peers and senior leaders can all be important in refocusing on the agency’s purpose and rekindling personal commitment.

- Developing other leaders. Spending time coaching and developing others in the team – as a means of fostering one’s own, and the others’ development.
Leaders in the not-for-profit sector frequently have less formal, coercive power than counterparts in other sectors. They are leading people - staff or volunteers - who are motivated by a concern to contribute which translates into a form of “emotional contract” with the organization. To the extent that leaders have the emotional intelligence to reach others on their own wavelength so as to present goals, success and difficulties in a language that is attuned to the organizational culture, they may receive extraordinary support and high commitment to performance. But an emotionally committed workforce is a challenge as well as a blessing. Where leadership is perceived to be out of touch with reality or worse in contradiction with the mission, the cost is high. Energy is diverted from output to internal dispute.

How can this ability to connect (fundamental to leadership in the sector) be developed? Different leaders will provide different answers. It is related to personal capacities such as self-awareness, and the ability to listen, as well as to empathy with organizational values, goals and working styles. It takes time.

**Effective approaches to leadership development**

To return to an earlier theme – there are similarities as well as differences with other sectors when it comes to training and development. In-house training can be effective to orientate emerging leaders to issues of concern to many in the organization such as leading people, or developing effective team work. External courses have their place for more specialist needs.

For bigger organizations and particularly those with staff in different countries, distance learning and modular approaches to learning - combining sections to be worked through at the workplace with more limited face to face sessions - are attractive. The CLS experience with the development “close learning” (e-learning supported by online coaching) may provide valuable lessons particularly in overcoming the problems of high drop-out rates associated with “ordinary” or distance e-learning.

Taking into account that budgets for staff and leadership development will often be limited much depends on the organization’s ability to capitalise on the richness of the learning environment that the organization itself represents. Learning opportunities abound in most organizations and particularly so in not for profits – with opportunities to learn about setting goals, motivating people, working across cultures, adapting leadership to different situations and people, and much more. The challenge is to develop the self-awareness, confidence and skills so that people are present in the organization equally as actor (with a job to do), as learner (drawing on lessons of the day to day experiences to grow as a leader) and as coach and mentor (supporting the development of others). The learning mindset required for this is

> “Whilst participating in this activity (which may be about delivering services or setting strategy, communicating new ideas or...) as an actor with a contribution to make, what can I learn from the (brilliance, mediocrity or awfulness) of the way in which we are tackling the task? And how can I apply my learning to support the development of others.”

Given the amount of time people spend on the job (maybe 98%) compared with time spent in formal training (maybe 2%) the impact that can be achieved from learning through the “actor, learner and coach” approach is enormous. But the change in the mindset that is involved is significant. Explicit commitment from the top team, to explore the philosophy and practice of “present as actor, learner and coach” mindset and external support to facilitate the process may be needed to support this approach to leadership development.

**Suggestions for Further Reading**
The following is a selection of websites focusing on different aspects of the not-for-profit sector. All include some useful material on management and/or leadership development.

- [www.ngomanager.org](http://www.ngomanager.org)
- [www.pfd.org](http://www.pfd.org)
- [www.managementcentre.co.uk](http://www.managementcentre.co.uk)
Summary and Conclusions

This report has drawn together a range of perspectives on leadership development in a number of contexts. In Part One we saw how the priorities of different individuals and organisations could be addressed, whilst Part Two took a sector and occupational perspective on leadership development.

In this final section of the report we will endeavour to draw together some of the common strands; the evidence of how to get the most out of leadership development; and some best practice principles: but first a tale of ‘roadmaps, pipelines and the path of discovery’.

Roadmaps, Pipelines and the Path of Discovery

(By Jonathan Gosling)

The business world is full of intriguing metaphors: here are two for a start: Have you come across a strategy ‘roadmap’? The phrase implies a well-charted territory already explored, surveyed and developed, the main routes and destinations well known, the by-ways and dead-ends easily identified. Surely any chart of the future should be more like the monster-filled atlases used by Christopher Columbus and other explorers: we may know which direction to start out, but our expectations of what we’ll find are fuelled by past experience, anxiety and more than a little wishful thinking! One of the reasons that strategy roadmaps are often confined to the desk drawer is that by the time we set out they have fulfilled their purpose – which was to give us enough confidence to start out; but once on the way, we’d be foolish to mistake the map for the territory (in Macluchan’s memorable phrase).

Another popular metaphor is of a leadership ‘pipeline’. We should simply be able to turn on the tap to fill our buckets with ready-made leaders. Somewhere at the other end of the pipeline is, perhaps, a reservoir of talent, maybe a refinery turning crude into refined, high-octane, high-performance material. Perhaps we should look on MBA programs as akin to oil-pumps, and in-company development processes (programs, assignments, mentoring and coaching) as refineries.

The pipeline metaphor is useful in several ways – it is, like the roadmap, reassuring that we know and control our essential resources. But we shouldn’t take it too literally. In reality, leaders are not made in MBA programs; leadership is not turned on at only one end of a career; and nor is it of one homogenous material.

On the other hand, leadership does need to be nurtured; here’s another way of looking at it. I call it the Leadership Formula. Again, it’s a kind of metaphor, but I think it points us towards more realistic actions.

\[ L = I:F \]

Where: 

- **L** stands for Leadership
- **I** stands for the individual qualities of people in leadership roles
- **F** stands for Followership

Most leadership development concentrates on improving the ‘I’ factor. Promising young people (and talented older ones) are sent on courses, coached, mentored and trained in the hope that they alone will secure the fortunes of the company. But what turns these individuals into leaders is the presence of followers - without that we don’t have leadership, at least not in any sophisticated and effective sense of the term. ‘I’ must be in relation to ‘F’.

We generally put a lot of effort and resources into developing ‘I’ because it impresses the people who pay the bills – usually the individuals in question. (No wonder so much leadership development becomes entertainment). Personality type, early experiences, genetics – all manner of factors influence the quality of the individuals who take up leadership roles. I won’t go further into the constituents of ‘I’, but let’s look briefly at what lies behind Followership.

\[ F = I:C \]

Where: **C** stands for culture

In other words, Followership is a function of the relations between individual organisational members and the culture of the place. Culture is a catch-all, often defined as ‘the way we do things around here’. There is nothing accidental about this: relationships between people are shaped by the technology they use, their beliefs about the importance of their work
and the legitimacy of their leaders, the
degree of risk involved in the work itself
and in the consequences of not having that
job and many other factors.

For example, if the members of an
organisation are able and willing to follow a
lead, to co-operate with those in charge, to
subject themselves to necessary
regulations and order their activities in line
with the production process – we have a
culture characterised as much by
Followership as by Leadership.

More specifically, an organisation in which
individuals must respond precisely to the
timed behaviour of robots and conveyor
belts must necessarily have a different kind
discipline to one in which journalists
research and write up news stories for a
weekly TV show. The kind of leadership
and followership in each case is a function
of the specific ways in which value is
produced. Personal characteristics ("I")
play a part in this; but when we look for a
'good fit' between the situation and the
person, we are admitting that the actual
observable leadership behaviour is driven
just as much by the factors lumped under
the heading of 'culture'.

So what are the implications for Leadership
Development? Henry Mintzberg and I have
distilled these from several years working
with practicing managers and leaders
(Gosling and Mintzberg, 2004).

1. Management and leadership education
should be restricted to practicing
managers, selected on the basis of
their demonstrated performance. They
are the best judge of what is important
and what will make a difference to
doing the job.

2. These managers should stay on the
job, so that they can weave their
education through their practice. They
are responsible for the effects of their
actions, so are likely to be pragmatic,
experimental and realistic.

3. Management education can then
leverage work and life experience as
fully as possible.

4. The key to the learning is thoughtful
reflection on experience. This includes
reflexivity about personal experience
and re-membering (making
connections between old and new
knowledge).

5. From reflection in the classroom should
follow impact on the organization.
There are many ways for this to
happen – seamlessly, through the
questioning attitude instilled by
education; or more formally via new
initiatives and ways of doing things.

6. Put this all together and management
education becomes a process of
interactive learning. Professors need
to be at least as interested in the
predicaments of practicing managers
as in their own expertise.

7. All of this has profound implications for
the architecture, the faculty, and the
pedagogy of management education,
which has to be facilitating.
Classrooms should be arranged so that
participants can discuss amongst
themselves at least as much as listen
to the professors; and teachers must
become facilitators of learning –
adapting both their teaching objectives
and their skills accordingly.

These tenets emphasise the classroom
experience in juxtaposition to work
experience. But many people in leadership
roles (or with other responsibilities) find it
hard to get away from work for extended
periods. So we have developed a new
approach – we call it 'close learning', that
is, learning which happens as close as
possible to the time and place where it
matters most – in the midst of managerial
practice, rather than 'distance learning',
which happens through books and CDs, far
from the supposed seat of knowledge in
the ivy-covered towers of academe. A
carefully crafted series of questions and
provocations, regular discussion with a
coach and a learning group, and timely
on-line materials combine to stimulate
thoughtful, well-informed and progressive
reflection on current leadership issues.21
This course is the ultimate in customisation
while sacrificing none of the challenge and
surprise of external points of view. At its
core is the practicing leaders who stand as
if in a country which can only be traversed
a step at a time, in which intimate
knowledge of the terrain is at least as
important as the descriptions of earlier
travellers or the maps produced by distant
observers.

21 The course, offered by the CLS, is in 7 phases
and can lead to postgraduate degrees in
Leadership and in Leadership Research. Visit
www.leadership-studies.com for further details.
Emerging Themes
(BY RIchard Bolden)

The preceding article by Jonathan Gosling reflects many of the themes raised in this report, perhaps the most significant of which is the importance of taking a system-wide view of leadership and leadership development. These activities don’t occur in isolation – they are integrally related to other organisational and social processes. Leadership is a practice that occurs in a specific (and frequently changing) situational context. To be effective, leadership development must recognise this and be instigated in a fashion that will optimise its impact within the wider environment in which it occurs. Thus, much of what is reported in this document speaks of the value and importance of development activities that give participants the opportunity to gather and reflect on the experience of managing and leading. Work placements, exchanges and practical assignments are all examples of developmental approaches that extend the experience of participants and offer different perspectives on shared challenges; action learning sets and facilitated discussions give the opportunity to explore and reflect on experience within a group setting; and one-to-one coaching and mentoring offer support in interpreting and making sense of the personal challenges of leadership.

Many of the articles stress the importance of self-awareness and the ability to be ‘reflective’ – that is, the capacity to reflect critically, yet appreciatively, on knowledge and experience. Whilst many of the authors discuss the value of participating in a structured development programme containing theoretical and informational input, all emphasise that it is the interpretation and application of this knowledge that is of fundamental importance. Thus, as Kurt Lewin (1935) famously said “there is nothing as practical as a good theory”, meaning that every practice is the expression of a theory, even if it has never been articulated. Reflection is a process of making these theories explicit thus enabling them to be assessed, tidied-up and adopted with more of a measure of ‘wisdom’.

Another commonly occurring theme in these articles is the need for ethical leadership. From the sector perspective this is most strongly emphasised in the sections on police and military leadership which argue for a strong ethical framework for leaders to use as a guide to acceptable behaviour. Indeed, in such environments the means are equally important as the ends: we need look no further than the events at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq for graphic evidence of what happens when ethical values are not upheld. Yet the impact of unethical actions can be equally insidious (and disastrous) in other sectors of activity. The fall of Barings Bank, for example, shows how a climate of risk-taking can go astray when not kept in check and the fate of Worldcom and Enron demonstrate the perils of an unchecked ethic of greed at a senior level. Such collapses not only threaten members of these organisations themselves but the wider community that depends on them – good and poor leadership doesn’t stop at the company door; its influence is felt much further afield.

In a similar vein, many of the articles stress the importance of choosing the right metrics for assessing the effectiveness of leadership. In the cultural sector, for example, the concept of ‘value for money’ can be misleading – the effects of cultural outputs are largely determined at a social rather than economic level and may remain highly subjective. Many of the sectors discussed in this report are strongly value centred, attracting their employees through a desire to contribute to a social purpose rather than a desire solely for material gain. In such a context the choice to lead often comes more out of a desire to better serve this purpose than for personal benefit. All of this points to a need for leadership development sensitive to the needs and priorities of the sector and those within it.

The leadership of professionals demands credibility, usually arising from professional excellence within a given domain of activity (be it education, healthcare, artistic performance, etc.). Thus leaders must be multi-skilled – expert practitioners, communicators and strategists. Where the incentives and rewards for professional expertise greatly outweigh those for leadership and management engagement then finding people willing to take on this work will be challenging.

The rising importance of partnerships and alliances further push the need for ethical and inclusive leadership. Partnership working is dependent on trust,
collaboration and influence rather than heavy-handed control. Hence the need to develop and nurture mutual understanding and respect: something that can only come out of dialogue and exchange. This is perhaps most fundamental for public and not-for-profit organisations where the delivery of social objectives is wholly dependent on collective rather than individual effort. Throughout such organisations we now hear calls for “leadership at all levels”, not just for those in positions of formal power and responsibility. Here, leadership development can be instrumental in breaking down barriers, in opening dialogue and increasing dialogue, but it calls for a “light touch” – not the implementation of rigid frameworks, but facilitation and adaptation drawn from a true understanding of the nature of the work.

Recognition of the need for leadership spread throughout organisations highlights the importance of succession planning, of developing a so-called “pipeline” where future leaders can progress through a clear career/development pathway, rather than simply being thrown in at the deep end and left to sink or swim. Leadership development in this case becomes part of the core organisational mission – too important to be left to a small group of people who may or may not have the senior level support required to push through the kinds of changes needed.

Here, the areas of leadership, management and organisational development overlap. Finance, HR policies, career structures and working practices are all integral in shaping how leadership is distributed and enacted within organisations. Without effective management, leadership is set adrift; without a supportive organisational environment, leadership is stifled. If organisations really want to tackle problems of poor and ineffective leadership they may need to take some tough decisions and make some serious investment.

A final point I would like to draw out from these articles is the wider socio-political context of the moment. Those who step up to positions of leadership, whether out of choice or necessity, put themselves on a public stage and are held personally accountable. Thus, whilst it may be useful to consider leadership as distributed throughout organisations the truth is that there remain certain pressure points, pivotal roles that require highly capable leaders. Focussing on these alone will not transform leadership within organisations, but neglect them at your peril!

Together the writings in this report speak of the need to take account of individual, organisational, professional and sectoral factors when devising and delivering a leadership development strategy. All of this occurs in an environment of complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity, where there are few quick fixes or answers. In such a context asking questions may be more valuable than seeking solutions. Questions can encourage us to challenge the status quo, to progress, experiment and move things forward and, after all, if there is one thing that leadership theorists tend to agree on it’s that leadership is about change. The question now is what will you do about leadership?

An Integrated Framework for Leadership Development

(By Richard Bolden)

This report along with the previous one, What is Leadership Development: Purpose and Practice (Bolden, 2005), presents a wide range of perspectives on leadership development. What is clear however is the dynamic inter-relationship between a diverse number of factors. Thus, for example, developing senior leaders will be insufficient for improving leadership across the entire organisation, nor will organisational restructuring alone resolve all challenges (although it may significantly improve many). It seems, instead, that leadership development is rather like a journey where the final destination remains somewhere beyond the horizon. What is important is the process of travel itself, rather than the final destination. In effect, it is the processes of enquiry, experience, dialogue and reflection that are the keys to moving forward. They provide a sense of location in relation to the past and the
future. They challenge us to seek improvements and to achieve a purpose.

By way of conclusion to this report it may be helpful to provide a map of where we have travelled and what we have seen. This is not to provide a definitive guide to the terrain but to place some key milestones and landmarks that should be of value to fellow travellers.

Figure 7 presents this map as an integrated framework for leadership development, aiming to capture the principle arguments and insights from this and the previous report. It is not static but in a continual state of flow as indicated by the dotted lines and arrows, whereby each element informs and influences the others. The diagram presents five main steps to integrated leadership development, each of which needs to be considered at the individual and organisational level, and all of which is infused and informed by the wider context.

The first step is labelled direction setting and is underpinned by the processes of dialogue, understanding and creating shared purpose. At an individual level this involves identifying motivations, ambitions, identity and personal strengths and weaknesses. It is summed up by questions such as “who am I?” and “why am I here?” These can be deeply philosophical questions and may remain with the individual throughout the leadership development process if not their whole life. At an organisational level it involves identifying a common and connecting set of values, objectives, shared identity and strategic priorities. It is about how the organisation determines who/what it is and what it seeks to achieve. Such expressions may be captured in ethics or value statements, organisational mission and business plans and defines the ultimate purpose, and hence desirable form, of leadership within the organisation.

The second step involves examining organisational structure & processes and incorporates a review of systems, roles and functions. At an individual level this means focussing on formal and informal roles (both within and outside the organisation), career progression and development opportunities, networks and relationships (again within and beyond the organisation), and an in-depth and practical understanding of how the system works. Such a perspective should help reveal any barriers, conflicts and sources of support for taking-on/developing a leadership role. At the organisational level it involves reviewing how human resource (HR) practices, resource allocation, communication processes, management and leadership approaches, and partnership working influences the distribution of power and resistance to change within the system.

The third step, leadership development, relates to the actual process of enhancing leadership capability of individuals and the wider organisation. For individuals this involves offering opportunities for learning, reflection and experimentation that builds on and extends prior experience. Whilst an element of this may be about straight skills and knowledge acquisition, it must also go deeper so as to engage with the bigger questions and issues raised in steps one and two. At the organisational level this requires the integration of organisational development (OD), management development (MD) and leadership development (LD). It may occur at a number of levels, through multiple channels, be associated with organisational change, and involve longer-term planning for staff development and succession. Ultimately the question here is “how can we facilitate an active engagement with leadership?”

The fourth step is about learning transfer. Without application to, and implementation in, the work and life context of individuals and organisations leadership development will fail to bear fruit. Thus individual leaders will require ongoing support, opportunities to apply their learning, and the ability to be recognised as credible in front of their peers and colleagues. They need to take stock of their situation and discover how they can influence the system from their position within it. For organisations, the transfer involves embedding the learning within organisational systems and processes, eliminating barriers, developing a sense of community and the establishment of new systems and processes where required. Fundamentally, to be effective leadership development requires long-term top-level support and investment and an ongoing commitment to supporting and developing participants.
**An Integrated Framework for Leadership Development**

**INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL**
- Occupation
- Personality
- Life experience
- Motivations
- Aims & ambitions
- Personal identity
- Needs analysis: strengths & weaknesses

**ORGANISATIONAL-LEVEL**
- Socio-political
- Economic
- Sector/activity
- Values: ethics, principles
- Objectives: economic, social, other
- Culture & social identity
- Strategic priorities

**CONTEXT**
- Motivations
- Aims & ambitions
- Personal identity
- Needs analysis: strengths & weaknesses

**DIRECTION**
- Values: ethics, principles
- Objectives: economic, social, other
- Culture & social identity
- Strategic priorities

**SETTING**
- HR systems: recruitment, retention, reward, performance mgmt, succession planning
- Resources: financial, other
- Communication: up, down, across
- Mgmt & Leadership: distributed or localised?
- Teams and partnerships

**SYSTEMS ROLES FUNCTIONS**
- Roles: formal & informal
- Career pathway
- Networks & relationships
- Knowledge of the system

**LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**
- Reflection
- Practice
- Self awareness & confidence
- Skills and knowledge
- Personal needs

**LEARNING REFLECTION EXPERIMENTATION**
- Personal support
- Opportunities to apply learning
- Progression opportunities
- Relevance to work/life situation
- Professional credibility

**LEARNING TRANSFER**
- Removing barriers
- System-wide perspective
- Developing community
- Ongoing commitment & support
- Putting in place new systems

**EMBEDDING EXPERIENCE ADAPTATION**
- Personal transformation
- Developing others
- Through life development

**EVALUATION & REVIEW**
- Metrics & indicators
- Future orientation
- Learning organisation
- Celebrating success

**Figure 7: An Integrated Framework for Leadership Development**
Finally, the leadership development process requires **evaluation & review**. Without personal transformation, sharing the learning with others and a commitment to life-long learning individuals will not maximise on the value of their development. Likewise, at the organisational level there should be attempts to identify success, future needs and requirements and meaningful measures and indicators of impact and performance.

Each of these steps influences the others, affects the overall context and helps define future directions and priorities.

It is hoped that this map, along with the text of this report and its predecessors, will offer some practical guidance to those charged with leadership and leadership development in organisations. It is hoped that this material has raised your awareness and interest in this field and given some useful food for thought. For those of you who are inspired to learn more, we invite you to visit our website (www.leadership-studies.com) and/or contact us to find out more.

“The real act of discovery consists not in finding new lands but seeing with new eyes.” Marcel Proust
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Leadership South West is based at the Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter. As a major European window onto leadership studies, development and practice, the CLS aims to offer first-class leadership development, educate the next generation of leadership developers and assess the value and underlying assumptions of this field in general. Here is a list of our current activities. For further details please visit:
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- MBA Specialising in Leadership
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- Advanced Leadership Programme

Leadership South West
Through the creation of strategic partnerships and application of the latest leadership thinking, LSW aims to enhance awareness of the value of leadership development and to improve the availability, relevance and effectiveness of all forms of support, education and policy within the region.

Our major South West activities include:

- Leadership Matters - Quarterly Review
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- Regional strategic support
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- Excellence in the boardroom - Director Development
- Leadership in education
- Diversity initiatives: gender (Inspire) and disability (Ascend)
- Not for Profit support and development
- Sector support - Leadership development solutions
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We are at the cutting edge of leadership research and offer a wide range of services from applied research and evaluation to post-graduate and PhD research opportunities. We believe that research should be an emerging dialogue between experts, marrying conceptual thought with practical application, and continually seek ways of engaging research users and decision makers with our activities. Our primary interests can be grouped into four broad themes:

- Personal challenges of leadership
- New ways of thinking about leadership
- How to improve leadership development
- The relationship between leadership and organisational performance.

Professional Network
The Professional Network is a series of initiatives organised and managed by the CLS for the benefit of both professional consultants and enterprise leaders. It is designed to build upon and leverage the unique position of the Centre among UK universities in its dedication to research and teaching associated with leadership.

The Network comprises:

- CLS Consulting Services: tailored leadership programmes, assessment and strategic development for public, private & not-for-profit organisations.
- CLS Affiliate Scheme: accreditation, professional development and networking for leadership developers.
- CLS Research Resources: tailored evaluation, research, advice & support.

Conferences and seminars
The CLS Annual Forum, based in London, seeks to stimulate debate around key leadership themes. Keynote speakers from a variety of backgrounds deliver thought provoking insights into the challenges of leadership. This high-profile event is supported by numerous seminars and workshops delivered across the UK.

For details of our free research seminar series and other events in the Region please contact lsw@exeter.ac.uk.

Exeter Leadership Partners
The Exeter Leadership Partners are major companies, which support the work of CLS. In addition to privileged access to the Centre’s teaching and research facilities an integral part of the scheme is the 4x4 Group: a strategic leadership learning community who meet about four times a year to hear from a guest speaker and discuss leadership.