

In search of a biocompatible leadership model

Introduction How leadership is defined may be viewed as a subject for academic philosophical researchers alone and not something neither a leader nor an individual that wants to exercise leadership needs to deal with. However, as K. Grint puts it in his book *Leadership: Limits and possibilities*. (2005) [1] “...the importance of the definition is not simply to delineate a space in a language game...how we define leadership has vital implications for how organizations work – and don’t work”.

The reason behind his statement is simply that how we conceive reality, will influence how we act in it. In his book, he illustrates how different views on leadership affect ...”the way leadership is perceived, enacted, recruited and supported.”

If for instance, leadership in an organization is strongly connected to result or outcome, this will influence not only how formal leaders and individuals within an organization will be evaluated but also how the organization will be organized as well as what projects will be initiated. If leadership in an organization is viewed to be strongly connected to individuals, traits or skills and behaviors, it will determine who will become a leader which in turn will affect the culture and what processes, tools, symbols and products will be visible and which will not.

My purposes with the process of writing this essay were to:

- 1) develop a deeper understanding of my own leadership theory preferences,
- 2) reveal what leadership theory is advocated and why in literature relevant to my research area; innovation management and engineering
- 3) understand how and what leadership theory will influence my research project

This essay will not fulfill these purposes completely in any sense. It must rather be viewed as a design prototype. I use the term prototype here in the same way as we do within an R & D setting. A prototype is an experimental design, physical or virtual, which is often used as part of the product design process to allow engineers and designers the ability to explore design alternatives, test theories and confirm performance prior to starting production of a new product (which in this case would be a more complete or mature fulfillment of the purposes stated above).

Further, I write process, as I see the reading, my use of the theories and models during the reading of papers within my research area and the writing of the essay as part of a process where my learning is the goal.

The title of the essay refers to a key term in biomaterial science; biocompatibility, which if directly translated would mean compatible with life. This term is used to characterize the desirable feature of non-biological materials or components that function as intended in a biological environment (i.e. inside the body).

Leadership Research During the course and reading of the literature some categorization of the field as well as some trends or tendencies regarding the field of leadership research have emerged:

1) Research methods

The field is dominated by the use of quantitative methods and the most common instrument is the use of self-administered questionnaire. The number of studies using an qualitative approach has increased but are still in minority [Bryman, 2004][2]. In an investigation of studies performed that made use of both qualitative and quantitative methods the question whether these methods are studying sufficiently similar leadership phenomena in order to be useful was raised. Research that results in rich, highly contextualized findings can be difficult to link with quantitative studies that seek to generate lawlike findings that transcend time and space. The result from the investigation pinpointed at some areas where qualitative researchers on leadership have made important contributions; in understanding leadership in relation to the change process; leaders as meaning- or sense-makers, in the uncovering of new aspects of leadership like shared leadership, the impact of contextual factors etc. The author emphasize the importance for the researcher being clear about the distinctiveness of what each method has to offer, and engaging with a wider variety of approaches to data collection.[2].

Another perspective as important as the selection of research method is an attention for the researcher to use the appropriate level of analysis in her/his study in order to draw correct conclusions. The research studies are either at micro (inter or interpersonal), meso (organizational/contextual) or macro (venture, society) level or have a multiple-level approach. Most common of all are micro studies and more specifically, the study of individuals in formal leader positions in commercial businesses.

In a comprehensive investigation of 348 conceptual and empirical publications, Yammarino et al 2005 [3], showed that less than 10% of all publications addressed levels-of-analysis appropriately. This discouraging result led the authors to gather a number of recommendations on how to pursue this in order to advance theory building and theory testing in all areas of leadership research.

2) Type of research studies

The leadership research may also according to my reading, be divided into three categories regarding what types of research questions the study is answering to:

- 1) “what’s going on, what is happening?” Dominated by research emanating from practice, using qualitative methods.
- 2) “what characterize and can be learned from a successful leadership?” Dominated by research using quantitative methods.
- 3) “what is the best way to improve leadership or organizational effectiveness?” Dominated by research using quantitative methods.

Studies with a focus on “what’s going on, what is happening”, aim to contribute to an increased understanding of what individuals, organizations etc. are doing when leadership is exercised in any form and what effect this seems to have on themselves, other

individuals, groups, things, the surroundings etc.. These types of studies are also trying to reveal what leadership is or might be and what is effecting it (relations, context factors etc.. Examples of these types of studies can be found in references [4,5]

The research that is focusing on “what characterize and can be learnt from a successful leadership”, selects study samples (individuals, teams, projects, organizations etc.) that is considered as being successful in what they are doing or who they are (successful is pre-defined *differently* in different studies like goal fulfillment, ethically etc..) and tries then to reveal what leadership characteristics can be connected to the success in order to find best practice.

Finally, research focusing on leadership, team and organizational development, aims to develop different programs, initiatives, structures etc. with the purpose to improve the leadership or organization practice. Some studies within this category are also trying to understand the effect different developmental programs have on the leadership effectiveness or quality. Exampels of these types of studies can be found in references [6,7,8].

3) Leadership models and theories

In order to describe different models or characteristics of leadership scholars have used different ways of categorization. K. Grint [1] makes his categorization using four headings: Leadership as person, results, process or position. By proceeding form these categories, he illustrate the (good and bad) consequences for organizations of different kind for each “worldview” as mentioned in the introduction of this essay.

B. Jackson and K. Parry (2008) [9] makes use of another type of categorization when trying to give a short overview of the different “schools” or perspectives of leadership research. They give a broad array of different (modern) theories within the field. The dominating field, leadership research that has a focus on leaders in a formal position (the kind of leadership research that has and still is dominating the field) is discussed together with theories where the follower is in focus ore more specifically the relationship between the follower and the leader (or between follower and followers and context). They bring in cultural as well as critical perspectives on leadership and discuss leadership models focusing on the intent of the leader (ethical, spiritual, authentic etc.) along with leadership models inspired from artistic fields (referring to that leadership is more art than science).

P. G Northouse, (2007) [10] is another scholar that in his book Leadership. Theory and Practice (2007) [xx] tries to give an overview of different leadership models. He is pedagogically illustrating different concepts by using cases and including an explicit chapter for both strengths and weaknesses or criticisms of different aspects of each concept. He also adds information of popular or common instruments used for evaluating each concept.

He starts describing the “earliest” schools of leadership research (concepts that are still vital), concepts dealing with individual traits, followed by skills and behaviors/styles. He continues with discussing the situational and contingency leadership models (context or relational dependencies) as well as Path-goal theory, leader-member exchange model (LMX) and the today most dominant theory; transformational (including charismatic)

leadership. He includes a section focusing on team leadership, the psychodynamic approach, women and leadership and finally, ethical leadership.

The most dominating leadership models or concepts are the ones dealing with traits or skills/behaviors and the transformational leadership model. The reason behind the focus on leaders' individual character is most probably due to that the leadership research field attracts many researchers in psychology in combination with that it has been formal leaders in commercial businesses that have been most eager to finance studies and learn more about leadership.

Transformational leadership has been the dominating model for the last decades. With transformational means a leadership that transform the attitudes and motivations, and consequently behaviors of followers (this expresses the same desire organizations put in innovations – the desire for a successful innovation is that it will transform the market i.e change the behavior of the customers to the benefit of the organization). What is said to bind the transformational leadership literature together is the conception “the leader as someone who defines organizational reality through the articulation of a vision and the generation of strategies to realize this vision”. [9].

Transformational leadership is many times discussed in relation to transactional leadership. Sometimes, these are viewed as forming a dichotomy where transactional refers to the more administrative tasks (represented by for instance formal contracts, performance management systems etc. :) involved in the exchange between the leader and the follower and the transformational the visionary and strategic (compare the distinction between managing and leading) task. Many studies recognize that the most successful leaders are the one's that know when to swift between transformational activities and transactional leadership. Further, key aspects of transformational leadership are leaders (moral) values and trust (between leaders and followers).

4) Personal reflections on leadership models/theories:

By participating in seminars and by reading literature that aims to give us as broad perspective as possible on leadership theory and research has been highly valuable and contributed to my understanding of what I have experienced as a formal as well as an informal leader or individual.

I have during my reading kept track of what I see, feel and think when leadership is described and defined as this or that and concluded that all definitions and theories are attractive in different aspects. I do, however, have a preference for certain orientations. I view, feel and think of leadership as a process, an interaction, an inter-relational or inter – context/hybridial (?) (in an attempt to include K. Grint's definitions of hybrids) process. Leadership exist in my perspective not only between individuals but also between an individual/groups and task, symbol, ideas, stories etc. I view Leadership as a process that involves the creation, holding and releasing of tension in some type of collaborative effort. (I find it hard to use influence as I find that word too unspecific and it does not add anything to my understanding of what is actually going on but maybe someone would call my talk about tensions influence?). The purpose of leadership has to do with some kind of sense-making. I am still in a process where I try to define this more precisely but it is not the type of sense-making that refers to creating visions; it has more to do with some kind of temporal coherence or mutual insights.

If I had to select some kind of label from the leadership research literature, it would be distributed leadership as this is the type of leadership model I most easily can apply on my experience in practice. No surprise, as distributed leadership is about leadership practice rather than leaders or their roles, functions, routines, and structures. It's a concept that takes leadership practice as its starting point. Leaders act in situations that are defined by others' actions. From a distributed perspective, it is in these interactions that leadership practice is constructed.[11] (As I will discuss later on, I find however the concept labeled Complexity Leadership Theory the most appealing of present models because this model also takes context into consideration to a larger degree than does distributed or shared leadership concepts. I have however some concerns also for that model which I will describe later in conjunction to my discussion about this model.)

The two main critique arguments towards distributed leadership, as I read them, are that it does not add something new to existing leadership models or that it will not work in practice (or is not efficient). You can not have several individuals to lead, at least not on the top”because someone has to have the final say” [11].

Even though I am not enough knowledgeable in the field of leadership research to judge whether the first argument is correct or not, I believe it fulfills an important purpose in being very clear about that leadership is not only about the formal leaders. As discussed earlier in this essay, the fact that the numbers of studies that have actually studied leadership in practice are in minority compared to the traditional ones (using questionnaires) shows that this view has not been shared by the majority of scholars. And once again, how we conceive reality will affect the way we act in it. When referring to my own experience, I honestly admit that before participating in this course, I thought that the leadership research field was an area I needed to respond to, not that it would include theories that I now realize will form part of my theory base. Naively, you could argue, since my research project is about developing organizations. Although I do not blame anybody else for this misconception, the course has been very illustrative in revealing to me how research concepts or theories that have become all too dominating within its field (in this case the focus on leaders traits/skills and the transformational model) can assist in the production of adverse feelings and prejudices in an individual about a certain research area. As a formal leader in a global, US owned company for more than ten years I have gone through several leadership development programs, both in Sweden as well as in US. I have read several “leadership handbooks” and have experienced and experimented with a vast amount of different ways to organize, communicate and lead. The dominating leadership theories in research have also been central for most of these programs/popular literature. The charismatic, inspiring (male) leader that has the ability to develop and communicate a clear vision and strategies that transform a whole organization working committed towards challenging goals is (or at least have been) an ideal that have influenced not only Americans but have been spread worldwide.

However, my experience in practice on what is viewed as an ideal are many times in contrast to what is actually happening in reality in terms of how we evaluate and promote leaders (at least on lower levels of management but interestingly, lately in my own

organization also on the upper management level) as well as how the every-day leadership turns out. An every-day leadership that is more about taking care and handle incidents and dilemmas than creating grand visions and strategies. As illustrated in Ref [4,5]

This tension, that is created between what we expect or set up as ideals (or norms) compared to how things really turns out in reality , creates frustration or confusion in leaders. Based on his research studies at Ericsson, M. Tyrstrup [5] describes this phenomenon and makes a point about the importance to make explicit what the norms are in terms of what we actually do. He noted how leaders felt relieved when they realized that it is rather this every-day- leadership (a lot of handling of incidents and dilemmas) that they are performing that is the norm rather than the planned and inspiring effort that you read about.

C. Sandahls description of all types of projections that leaders are subject to is another result from the focus on leaders as individuals. As C. Sandahl stated during his seminar “ I believe that the reason why leaders are or should be so well-paid is due to the fact that these leaders are subject to a very high degree of projections” (my translation).

A distributed leadership model means that the distribution of projections most probably also will be distributed and thus add to the stress relief of the leaders.

However, it also implicates that the power or authority will be distributed (and the salary differences...) which may be one reason why this model has not been developed to the same extent as others with a monoleader focus.

(I will return to meet the second argument towards distributed leadership; “someone has to have the final say” later in the discussion part of this essay.)

To conclude this part I would like to add that I do not say that the focus on leaders’ traits, skills/style nor the focus on encouraging a transformational leadership in organizations has no value. My point is that when a preference is becoming too dominating, it makes us tunnel visional and we are not able to see how we can do things (or are already doing) things differently and hopefully better in the sense of effectiveness or quality. And I am far from alone in expressing this – even in the 30’s this was argued among scholars (Barnard 1938).

Innovation management & engineering

Innovation is a top priority for almost all businesses today. In one way, it has always been important for a firm to generate and realize new valuable ideas. However, today, it is has become even more important to innovate at a high pace to be able to survive in the turbulent and unstable marketplace.

The purpose of my Ph D research project (started in June-09) is to contribute to a deeper understanding on how established firms improve/develop their innovation capability i.e the capability to generate and realize new ideas. The implementation and effect of the different actions an organization performs in order to improve this capability is mapped out and problematized. The management of barriers and opportunities in relation to the innovation work as well as to the change process itself are identified and analyzed. The project has a system theory perspective which means that the interplay between the parts in an organization and between the parts and the whole organization is in focus.

The project aims to improve the course of action for the innovation work and process of an organization and lead to a deeper understanding for how barriers and opportunities can be managed in an organization that wants to improve its innovation capability.

The project is performed using an interactive research approach in one company and by using different qualitative and quantitative methods in another 5-7 companies.

Presently I am involved in two sub-projects; one studying how the implementation of an innovation performance management system effects an organization and another project relating to external information absorption.

Learning leadership theory by prototyping As stated in the introduction of this essay, one of the purposes with the process of writing this essay is to try to reveal what leadership theory is advocated and why in literature relevant to my research area; innovation management and engineering.

The reason for me to pursue this is two-folded; first, I get a chance to gain some insights of how innovation is linked to leadership in extant literature and second, this exercise is a way for me to learn what I have learnt in terms of leadership research. By reading papers using “leadership eye-glasses” I will develop a deeper understanding of how leadership theory has or can have an impact on my research project.

I started with the selection of relevant journals within the area of Innovation Management and Engineering. Four papers were selected based on ranking and type of journals (Harvard Business Review (HBR), R & D Management, Journal of product innovation and management and Technovation).

Further, I decided also to select an academic peer reviewed journal within the leadership theory field. I selected Leadership Quarterly (LQ) due to that it was extensively refereed to in the literature we have been recommended to read.

I made a searches for papers no older than five years (seven years for LQ) using the combination of Innovation and Leadership in several databases accessed by KTHB.

After glancing through these papers I decided only to make use of the papers presented in HBR along with the papers selected from LQ.

The reason was that I realized I would not have the time to go through all papers and since HBR is the first choice and well spread among practitioners, I found it to be in an interesting contrast to the academic journal, LQ.

To support my reading of the HBR papers, I used the questions described below (given to us by M. Tyrstrup, during the first seminar in the course).

During my reading of the papers in LQ, I used a more traditional approach, and looked for what was written about leadership related to innovation.

The following questions served as a support during my reading of the papers in HBR and short answers for each of these questions can be found for each paper in the tables following this section.

Where do we find leadership? In persons or between persons?

What differs leadership from other social influences/interactions like caring, parenting, being violent etc.? Being visible?

When is leadership exercised? As a cause to why things happens, when things happens or afterwards (when writing the history)? Can it be performed now and then?

How is it manifested? When is leadership visible in any sense?

Why is leadership existing? Is it necessary in the world for instance for making prioritization, solve conflicts etc etc? Its raison d'être.

Who/Whom are included? Who are the agents?

Answers to these questions as described in the tables, in Appendix 1 are personal reflections and they have not been subject to any additional review by colleagues or any leadership research experts. (I have also added a column where I took notes on metaphors related to leadership, leaders and organizations etc.).

Discussion

1) Harvard Business Review papers.

All of the 11 papers selected for this essay are written either by CEO's or co-founders of commercial successful companies or by popular or influencing scholars within the area of innovation and creativity management. The target readers of these papers seem to be leaders in formal positions in different kinds of businesses that have an interest in how to improve creativity and innovation capability. Most of the papers address in some or the other way, how an organization should do (or not do) in order to become more creative and leveraging innovations.

Almost all papers (9 out of 11) state that the leader plays a major part and discuss what and how specific skills must be developed in order to become successful.

In two papers, the context or the organization itself (not individual leaders) is expressed to play the major part (Byron Reeves et al and Vijay Govindarajan et al).

In three of the papers, the mix between traits and skills of the individual leader is stated as most important to become successful (Alan Klapmeier and Jeffrey H Dyer and Jeffrey Cohn). Although, in only one of these (Alan Klapmeier) expresses the classical "hero story" – the tough and lonely guy who fights against the rest of the world.

In 7 of 11 papers, transformational leadership characteristics are advocated. In one of these, a paper by Gary Hemel regarding what I would refer to as authentic or spiritual leadership (considered to be variants of transformational) represent a mix of transformational ideals and the belief in that *everybody* can and needs to exercise leadership (distributed leadership).

When it comes to what core skills the leader needs, two papers emphasizes strong analytical skills and an ability to grasp complexity and strategy thinking (Steven Prokesh, Jeffrey Cohn and Jeffrey Dyer). Leadership in their view is more or less to function as the creative brain of the company. Other papers express the need for leaders to develop skills that enhance collaborations (Byron Reeves, Laura Hill, Ed Catmull, Teresa Amabile et al). Both Teresa Amabile and Ed Catmull mention how context like technical tools or the design of a building can support the collaborations.

Three of the authors (Gary Hemel, Byron Reeves and Vijay Govindarajan et al) believes everybody has the potential to lead now and then whereas the rest of the authors expresses that this is something that only selected individuals can do. Only two authors explicitly refer to the importance of having skills or experience in handling cultural difference (Brian Reeves and Laura Hill).

Relating to the leadership literature described earlier in this essay, it comes as no surprise that transformational leadership dominates the picture also in papers published in HBR. Most of the authors make references to the importance of effective collaborations and three puts this skill or ability of creating conditions for enhancing collaborative efforts and organizations in the forefront.

In the paper (Laura Hill) which is a conversation with Laura Hill, responsible for Harvard MBA programs, she starts talking about the leader as a shepherd (leading from behind) but during the interview her metaphors changes and she starts talking about the leader as the collective genius instead, an expression I find highly interesting. She realizes that the metaphor where people are referred to as a bundle of sheep is outdated and she invents a new metaphor where the leader instead is described as the collective genius. I first, thought that this expression meant that the collective is genius (i.e distributed leadership is preferable), but after re-reading I believe she means that the leader needs to be excellent in handling a collective...i.e transformational leadership.

I find the (Bryan Reeves) paper on Online games to be the most interesting paper. It discusses how today's leadership may learn from looking into how players in OnLine games are dealing with leadership.

One of the player's states; Leadership is a task, not an identity and when the researchers ask what would be most helpful in a successful outcome, the players refers to changes in the context. Everybody leads now and then and all decisions are taken "organically" in group settings (quickly). So, developing specific leaders is a non-issue.

When the concept of distributed leadership is criticized, one of the arguments is that "somebody has to have the last say". If we believe that our future leaders are already taking leadership courses by playing Online games that may never become a problem.

2) Leadership Quarterly papers

The seven papers selected from Leadership Quarterly can be found in the table in the Appendix 1..

I did not find many papers in LQ that included the keyword innovation, why I also included some papers older than five years (I could have included even more but I decided to concentrate my present readings to a summary of a special issue). I have not had the time to dig into this any deeper but I assume that it simply means that the research study target for this journal is more related to other aspects of leadership (strategies, communication, leader skills in administrations etc. etc.).

One of these papers describes a study on transformational leadership (Dong I.), another two are literature reviews trying to reveal what kind of leadership is considered as most successful regarding organizational innovations.

The study of transformational leadership finds a positive response between a transformational leadership and both empowerment and an innovation-supporting organizational climate. Since they find empowerment to be negatively correlated to organizational innovations they ask whether this is cultural thing or if it can be that empowerment is not an optimal leadership strategy in a creative process (something that is supported elsewhere).

The literature review on R & D leadership (Teri Elkins) shows that transformational project leaders who communicate an inspirational vision and provide intellectual

stimulation and leaders who develop a high-quality leader–member exchange (LMX) relationship with project members, are associated with project success.

The summary of the several papers in a special issue “Leading for innovation” (Mumford et al), reveals that studies of transformational leadership have been the focus for these papers. However, since the author of this summary keeps referring to his own studies all the time I need to read those papers myself in order to understand what they are concluding. Some takeaways from the summary are summarized in the table.

One paper is about spiritual leadership. It makes use of phenomenological research methods which I find very interesting and would like to learn more about. I have tried to summarize the findings of this paper in the table.

The remaining three of LQ papers reviewed (J. Hunt et al and two papers by M. Bien Uhl), describes what is referred to as Complexity Leadership Theory. This theory is based in complexity science and is referred to be a new theoretical high level model that wants to describe how leadership in a highly changing environment looks like.

This concept sees leadership as an emergent, interactive dynamic—a complex interplay between agents and the context. It is a process that only exists in, and is a function of, interaction. Leaders in this concept are viewed as individuals who act in ways that influences this dynamics and the outcomes.

I find this concept highly interesting and attractive as it aims to make a model that integrates the informal leadership and the context with formal leadership structures. It basically aims at mimicking or simulating the “real life” of an organization (complexity science like system theory has its origin from system biology).

In one sense, it can be viewed as a more complete model for the distributed leadership concept mixed with transformational forms of leadership. I need to read more before I can make a judgment whether this model adds something new to existing models or if it is “only” integrative in combining the present models. I believe though that it will add something new at least when it will be supported with more empirical data.

I believe that if this model is to become a viable leadership model that will be useful for our organizations (and not only just an interesting mathematical model), it requires a close and appreciative collaboration between mathematicians and researchers performing longitudinal qualitative leadership- or organizational studies. Based on my experiences within the field of biomaterial science, I know that cross-disciplinary collaborations are rare and require hard work but also that these collaborative efforts are able to create truly novel and meaningful knowledge.

Referring back to the title I have chosen for this essay, maybe this leadership model inherent the emergence of a biocompatible leadership?

References

- [1] Grint, K. (2005). *Leadership: Limits and possibilities*. N.Y.: Palgrave.
- [2] Bryman, A. (2004). Qualitative research on leadership: A critical but appreciative review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 6, 729-769.
- [3] Yammarino, F., Dionne, S., Chun J. & Dansereau, F. (2005). Leadership and levels of analysis: A state-of-the-science review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 6, 879-919.
- [4] Badaracco, J.L. (2002). *Leading Quietly - An Unorthodox Guide to Doing the Right Thing*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [5] Tyrstrup, M., Glover Frykman, S. (2006), *On the Brink of Failure: The Art of Impromptu Action in Everyday Leadership*, Studentlitteratur, Lund,
- [6] Newton, J., Long, S. & Sievers, B. (2006). *Coaching in Depth. The Organizational Role Analysis Approach*. London: Karnac.
- [7] Schutz, W. (1994). *The Human Element*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- [8] Wheelan, S. (2005). *Creating effective teams: a guide for members and leaders*. N.Y.: Sage
- [9] Jackson, B. & Parry, K. (2008). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about studying leadership*. N.Y.: Sage.
- [10] Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership. Theory and Practice*. N.Y.: Sage.
- [11] Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership. Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

List of papers included in the section Learning leadership research by prototyping

Harvard business review

Leadership Quarterly

The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 525–544

The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings

Dong I. Junga,* , Chee Chowb,1, Anne Wuc,2

aDepartment of Management, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182, USA

bSchool of Accountancy, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182, USA

cDepartment of Accounting, National Chengchi University, Wenshan, Taipei, Taiwan

The Leadership Quarterly 16 (2005) 689–722 Spiritual leadership through ego-transcendence:

Exceptional responses to challenging circumstances

Sangeeta Parameshwar *

University of Illinois at Springfield, Department of Management, Springfield, IL 62703-5407, United States

The Leadership Quarterly 15 (2004) 163–171 Leading for innovation: Conclusions, issues, and directions

Michael D. Mumford*, Brian Licuanan

Department of Psychology, The University of Oklahoma, Room 760, 455 West Lindsey, Norman, OK 73019-2007, USA

The Leadership Quarterly 20 (2009) 631–650 Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model

Mary Uhl-Bien a,□, Russ Marion b,1 a Department of Management, University of Nebraska, P.O. Box 880491, Lincoln, NE 68588-0491, United States b Educational Leadership, School of Education, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29631-0710, United States

The Leadership Quarterly 15 (2004) 79–102 Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors

An empirical investigation

Diana E. Krause* Faculty of Economics and Management, Department of Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior,

Berlin Technical University, Wilmerdorfer Str. 148, 10585 Berlin, Germany

The Leadership Quarterly 20 (2009) 503–516 The architecture of managerial leadership: Stimulation and channeling of organizational emergence ☆

James G. (Jerry) Hunt a, Richard N. Osborn b, Kimberly B. Boal a, □

a Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University, 15th and Flint, Lubbock, TX 79409, United States

b Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, United States

The Leadership Quarterly 18 (2007) 298–318 Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era ☆

Mary Uhl-Bien a, □, Russ Marion b,1, Bill McKelvey c,2

a Department of Management, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, P.O. Box 880491, Lincoln, NE 68588-

0491, USA b Educational Leadership, School of Education, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29631-0710,

USA c The UCLA Anderson School of Management, 110 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1481,

USA

Non referenced literature:

Herscovitch, L. & Meyer, J.P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 474–487.

Larsson, G., Sjöberg, M., Vrbanjac, A. & Björkman, T. (2005). Indirect leadership in a military context: A qualitative study on how to do it. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*, 215-227.

Nilsson, S., Wallenius, C., Johansson, E., & Larsson, G. (in press). When the going gets tough, the tough get going: Stressors and challenges working in a military multinational environment. In P. Bartone, J. Eid, B-H. Johnsen, J. M. Violanti & J. C. Laberg (Eds.). *On patrol: The operational psychology of security operations*. Chicago: Thomas

Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., Näswall, K., Göransson, S. & Öhrming, J. (2008). Employee participation in organizational change: Investigating the effects of proactive vs. reactive implementation of downsizing in Swedish hospitals. *German Journal of Human Resource Research, 22*, 111-129.

Sy, T., Coté, S. & Saavedra, R. (2005). The Contagious leader: Impact of the Leader's Mood on the Mood of Group Members, Group Affective Tone, and Group Processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 2, 295-305.

Tyler, T.R. & De Cremer, D. (2005). Process-based leadership: Fair procedures and reactions to organizational change. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 529–545.

van Knippenberg, D., De Cremer, D. & van Knippenberg, B. (2007). Leadership and fairness: The state of the art. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 16*, 113-140.