“The Management and Leadership Research Group”
(Part 2: Leadership and HRM & D)
Presentation at the Department Seminar September 2013
Leadership and HRM & D

- Introduction to our group? – please notice our “interactive poster”
- One best way in leadership and management?
- We have to bring leadership into context in our analyses, because we think that good leadership is context-dependent

**Agenda (These 25 minutes)**

- Upcoming projects on leadership.
  - Middle managers and change (Mona Toft Madsen)
  - Public leadership (Anne Bøllingtoft)
- Paper on leadership
  - “The Dynamics of Shared Leadership in an Inter-Organizational R&D Team” (Pernille Smith)
- Human resource Management and Development:
  - "Developing & Managing People @Work" (Frances Jørgensen)
Management and Leadership Projects

**Multilevel projects**
1. Chinese regions
2. Corporate governance
3. Strategy as practice etc

**Organizing**
1. Public/private
2. Network

**Leadership**
1. Shared
2. Public

**“Management”**
- Planning
- Organizing
- Staffing
- Controlling
- Leading

**Organizational Change**
1. Hospital wards
2. Management of Change
3. Process consulting

**HRM & D**
1. Human capital development
2. Engagement & Commitment
3. Work Design in Public Service
4. SHRM & Sustainability

**Cross-cultural Management**
1. Creativity
2. International teams
3. Expatriation
Management and Leadership Research Group

Middle Managers and Change

Mona Toft Madsen
Topics for further investigation

• Have companies become flatter? If yes, why don’t middle managers associate with being in a flat organization?
• Do middle managers’ approach their job according to “new managerial work”- truth effects?
• Does a “Scandinavian management model” exist? Is it worth striving at?
Examples empirical contexts

- Middle managers’ identity work- Feminine vs Masculine identity (un-structured interviews)
- Line Managers’ perceptions of HR responsibility (Danish Management Barometer)
- The impact of changed organizational structure on middle manager perceptions of strategy and people management (Danish Management Barometer)
- Middle manager strategy influence and identification (Survey)
Theoretical Inspiration

• Management/Leadership discourses, and identity work (e.g. Alvesson et al., 2012; 2002; Sveningsson, 2012; 2003; Watson, 2008)

• “New managerial work” (E.g. Kanter, 1989; Peters et al., 1992; Drucker, 1988)

• Change and middle management (E.g. Balogun, 2003; Thomas et al., 2002; Huy, 2001; Newell et al., 1996)

• Scandinavian/Nordic Management (E.g Grenness, 2003; Schramm-Nielsen, 2000; Carlsson, 1985)
Leadership strategies and performance
How can leadership strategies affect performance in public and private organizations?

› The literature strongly suggests that leadership strategy can be affected through systematic leadership training

Approach:
› Field experiment (randomized) with 720 leaders and approx. 23,000 employees
› We distinguish between transactional leadership based on exchange of rewards for effort and transformational leadership where leaders are focused on changing their followers’ motivation and values

› The leaders who agree to participate in the experiment are randomly assigned to one of four groups (treatments):
  › Control group
  › Transformational treatment
  › Transactional treatment
  › Combined transactional and transformational treatment

› Three types of organizations where performance can be objectively measured: Secondary schools (stx, hhx and htx), tax sections and bank branches
› Multiple performance measures – before and after treatments

› Participants in project: Political Science, AU (Lotte Bøgh Andersen), CBS (Niels Westergaard-Nielsen), Department of Business Administration, AU (Anne Bøllingtoft) and KORA
The Dynamics of Shared Leadership in an Inter-Organizational R&D Team

Pernille Smith & Jørn Flohr Nielsen

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management 2013 (Organizational Behavior Division)
Empirical fieldwork intended to understand leadership processes would be enriched by incorporating how leadership norms are constructed in interaction” (Crevani et al., 2010, p. 80)
Research Questions

RQ1: What are the mechanisms and dynamics that underlie shared leadership in team settings characterized by high complexity and uncertainty?

RQ2: How does shared leadership affect the work that takes place in this type of setting?
Empirical Setting

- 3-year long technology project (basic research and applied research)
- Objective: develop a toolbox of applications for a not yet existing positioning technology (software platform, prototypes, domain specific knowledge)
- 4 organizations (2 firms, 1 university, 1 GTS institute)
- Structure: all partners equal status, but there was an administrative project manager and a research manager to coordinate the overall macro-level administrative activities
- Micro level:
  - Team consisting of 9-13 members
  - Self-managed and physically co-located
Methodology

- Single case study
- Longitudinal study (3 years)
- Participant observation, interviews, document analysis
- Focus on social interaction and practice
- Grounded theory techniques
Analysis
# Multiple Co-Existing Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership roles</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Phase 5</th>
<th>Phase 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity reducer</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing complexity and uncertainty</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization builder</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving direction and structure</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expert</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveying specific knowledge to team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulator</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inspiration, vision, and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team protector</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the team members from external turmoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Jack (terminology, process, objectives)
- Anne (terminology, process, objectives)
- Jack (building prototype based on existing theoretical knowledge)
- Jack (research/theory)
- Andrew (theoretical thinking)
- Anne (infrastructure)
- Paul (data collection)
- Jack (bridging theory and practice)
- Andrew (theoretical thinking + integration)
- Jack (integration)
- Paul (structure)
- Jack (roadmap, project mgmt. tools)
- Anne (weekly meetings, wiki)
- Paul (delegation of work tasks, overall decisions)
- Jack (coordination communication/procedures)
- Anne (study groups)
- Paul (general direction)
- Jack (publication plan)
- Paul (authority: ‘demo or die’)
- Peter (defining success criteria)
- Jack (coordination btw sub-teams)
- Paul (keeping focus, pushing results)
- Peter (toolbox integration)
- Jack (integration workshop)
- Paul (coordination)
- Jack (challenging)
- Jack (challenging, encouraging, inspiration)
- Paul (encouraging)
- Andrew (inspiration)
- Jack (challenging)
- Jack (challenging, encouraging, inspiration)
- Paul (encouraging)
- Andrew (inspiration)
- Paul (IPR dispute)
Leadership Emergence Based on Need for Structure and Direction in the Team

**Structure and Direction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Peter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order for organizing work</td>
<td>Overall structure</td>
<td>Micro level direction</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Interaction activities (group work)</td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Success criteria</td>
<td>Integration Toolbox integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1  Phase 2  Phase 3  Phase 4  Phase 5

“Since we will now embark on the second prototype, we need to make a status of the tracker prototype. Please find attached my suggestion for a status document. You are very welcome to give general feedback and input to ‘open issues’ and ‘conclusions’. The word file can be found under ‘vision: papers/status-tracker. You can also send me you feedback or input by email and then I will write it in the documents.”

(Email from Jack at the end of phase 2)

“We are now well on our way in the project, and we have some work tools to guide our work and its coordination. But we are not talking enough to each other! And maybe it’s because we are to many. I suggest we divide into smaller study groups based on our specific interests...”

(Anne at a weekly meeting in phase 3, fieldnotes)

“I believe I got Peter in when we started to evaluate where we were and how fast we would meet our objectives. There are a lot of perfectionists in the group, and there are cases where I think that things are good enough, and where they do not want to let go before they are super-duper finished – and sometimes we just need simple prototypes that can just crawl, not necessarily walk!”

(interview with Joe, the administrative project manager in phase 5)
Leadership Emergence Based on Need for Reduction of Complexity in the Team
Leadership Emergence Based on Need for Knowledge in the Team
Leadership Emergence Based on Need for Inspiration in the Team
“We missed some management around the framework (...) Regarding the management of the product development – well, it has been practically inexistent. We have very much been self-managed” (interview with Martin, phase 5)

“Practically, I think that Peter is simply doing what Joe (ed. the administrative project manager) used to do with respect to the daily things in the project (...) Joe has a lot of other things to do, so he is just delegating ... that’s how it works: if you are willing to take on a task, you can do it.” (interview with Jack in phase 5)

“We also had as our goal in the contract to develop this platform, and it was (...) well, I tried once to take charge, but only the part I was interested in. I mean, if it had been my formal role to do it would have been different, then I would have done it.” (interview with Andrew, phase 5)
Results and Conclusions (1)

Roles

• 5 leadership roles were identified:
  – Complexity reducer, organization builder, technical expert, vision conveyer/intellectual stimulator, and team protector

• They address different needs:
  – Need for clarity, sense-making, direction, technical knowledge, vision, and stimulation.

Antecedents

• The study provides a deeper understanding of the antecedents of shared leadership and their interrelations:
  – Expertise
  – Respect
  – Willingness
  – Centrality
Results and Conclusions (2)

The dynamics of shared leadership:

• We contribute to the shared leadership theory by providing more in-depth explanations of the dynamics of shared leadership:
  – Leadership was shared simultaneously among several individuals
  – Leadership roles are related to different situations
  – Roles were overlapping and inter-related
  – Leadership is a dynamic construct, and that holding a leadership role is not permanent
Developing & Managing People @Work: Projects in progress

- High Potential Research Group: Developing a HRM&D process model (Frances + researchers from Australia + New Zealand)

- Employee Engagement in the Public Service Sector (Mette Strange Nielsen)

- The Impact of HRM on pro-environmental behavior (Josefine Weigt-Rohrbeck)
Developing & Managing People @Work: Upcoming projects

- The influence of HR content and process on employee perceptions, behaviors, and performance (Frances, Henning, and Ann-Kristina Løkke Møller + researchers from 9 EU countries)

- Employee commitment in PSFs (Frances + Yvonne Van Rossenberg)

- People Management in High-Growth Firms (Frances + researchers from Nottingham-Trent, Bath School of Mgmt, & Warwick Business School)

- HRM in public health care (Frances, Henning, Ann-Kristina + researchers from New Zealand)
Developing & Managing People @Work: Papers in the Pipeline

- Profiling Human Resource Management practices in innovative firms (Frances + QUT)
- Balancing organizational and professional commitments in Professional Service Firms: the HR practices that matter (Frances + QUT)
- Understanding employee engagement in the public service sector (Mette)
- Job crafting for knowledge-workers: Moving beyond engagement to commitment? (Frances, Anne & Mette)
- Key HRM practices to promote pro-environmental behavior (Josefine)
Developing & Managing People @Work: Papers in the Pipeline (2)

- The employee reality: Managing talent for employer branding outcomes (Frances + QUT)
- The employee reality: Managing talent for employer branding outcomes (Frances + QUT)
- Enabling human capital development through teams (Frances + QUT)
- Learning commitment in Professional Service Firms (Frances + Bath)
- Learning commitment in Professional Service Firms (Frances + Bath)
- Enabling human capital development through teams (Frances + QUT)