

Understanding the Impact of Differing Leadership Schemas
in Inter-Organizational Groups

by

Colin Magee

A Thesis
presented to
The University of Guelph

In partial fulfilment of requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Management

Guelph, Ontario, Canada

©Colin Magee, December 2014

ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF DIFFERING LEADERSHIP SCHEMAS IN INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL GROUPS

Colin Magee
University of Guelph, 2014

Advisor:
Professor E van Duren

Using a qualitative, phenomenological approach, this idiographic study examined the impact of individual leadership schemas on inter-organisational groups brought together to deal with complex problems. Framed by its focus on inter-organisational leadership delivering an integrated security solution to complex problems, the research examined the interaction of the Canadian Forces, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Canadian International Development Agency operating in Afghanistan during the period 2005 to 2011.

The study shows that differing leadership schemas impact on how leadership is enacted within an ad hoc inter-organisational group. Responding to Lord's (2003) question asking if leader schemas are dynamic, the study shows that participants from different organisations not only have different leadership schemas, but that through interaction a new schema was developed to deal with the new context faced by the group. The study also helps to understand how collaborative leadership is enacted, reinforcing the importance of the leader, but refining the role to an enabler and initiator of the socially constructed leadership functions.

Academically, the research contributes to the ongoing debate within the literature on whether leadership schemas are static or context based, while providing insights into the interaction of differing schemas and the social context in which leadership occurs. The practitioner will gain a greater understanding of inter-organizational leadership within the public sector needed to deal with complex problems. Whilst focused on a specific inter-organizational group, the results are expected to be applicable across a range of ad hoc collaborative groups, working to solve complex problems.

Dedication

This research is dedicated to my loving wife Linda who has supported me through this journey of study and learning. It is also dedicated to the men and women who have and continue to exercise leadership in dangerous conditions far from home and loved ones.

Acknowledgments

It is impossible to complete a PhD without the help, advice and support of others, and like all who have taken this journey I am indebted to many people. First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Erna van Duren, Dr. Michael Cox and Dr. Alan Okros, for their mentorship, patience, encouragement and friendship over these past years. In addition to guiding me through my academic journey, my committee has helped me to make the transition from a practitioner to an independent scholar. I look forward to working with each of you in the future.

As an Army Officer, I have had to balance these studies with my professional responsibilities and duties, something I could not have done so without the support of the Canadian Forces. Captain Gary Hatton was not only my boss, but was key in allowing me the time, opportunity and continued support to complete this PhD. Dr. Barbara Falk and the other academics at the Canadian Forces College were instrumental in encouraging and mentoring me as they helped me understand the academic world into which I was entering.

The staff of the University of Guelph continues to be the unsung heroes for students and professors alike. Their help and constant reminders ensured I met the administrative requirements for the program and proved invaluable to my success. A task that was not easy given the last portion of my work was completed from Australia.

Finally, I would like to thank my family who have stood by me during this adventure. To my daughter Sara thank you for the encouragement you gave me to continue through this journey. Your own passion for learning was a constant inspiration for me when it seemed that the work would never end. To my darling wife Linda, who has supported me pursuing first my undergraduate degree, then my Masters and finally a PhD, all part-time through our marriage, I love you and thank you for the motivation and understanding you have shown, without your support and love this would not have been possible.

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
List of Tables	vii
Glossary of Key Terms and Conceptual Definitions	viii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	6
1.2 Purpose of the Research.....	7
1.3 Research Questions	8
1.4 Significance of the Study	9
2 Literature Review.....	10
2.1 A Review of Leadership Theory	13
2.2 Gender and Leadership	27
2.3 Public Sector Leadership	33
2.4 Leadership a Change of Focus	37
2.5 Shared Leadership.....	44
2.6 Perceptions of Leadership.....	47
2.7 Inter-organizational Collaboration.....	68
2.8 Whole of Government Approach.....	78
2.9 Findings from the Literature Review.....	82
3 Research Design and Methodology	89
3.1 Introduction.....	89
3.2 Purpose.....	89
3.3 Research Design and Rationale	90
3.4 Development of Questions.....	93
3.5 Population and Sample	100
3.6 Specific Context of the Study	102
3.7 Methods.....	104
3.8 Summary	136
4 Findings.....	137
4.1 Introduction.....	137
4.2 A Framework for the Leadership/Leader Construct	138
4.3 Leadership – A Common Perspective.....	141
4.4 Leader – A common perspective	152
4.5 Leadership – Differing views.....	176
5 Discussion.....	227
5.1 Discussion of the Findings.....	227
5.2 Leadership – A Common Schema	229
5.3 Management.....	234
5.4 Leader – As a Common Schema.....	235
5.5 Does context shape or change the schemas?.....	237
5.6 Leadership within the inter-organisational group.	243
5.7 Summary of Conclusions	246
5.8 Limitations	249

5.9	Implications.....	250
5.10	Application.....	255
5.11	Areas for Future Research	257
	References	259
	Appendix A. Relationship between Research and Interview Questions.....	273
	Appendix B. Participant Information Letter	274
	Appendix C. Participant Consent Form	276
	Appendix D. Interview Protocol	279
	Appendix E. Sample Transcript.....	281
	Appendix F. Sample Transcript Description of Nodes and Sub-Nodes	284
	Appendix G. Consolidation of Behaviour Descriptors	285
	Appendix H. Comparison of attributes and behaviours from the literature.....	287

List of Tables

<i>Number</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 1.1 – Overview of approaches and theories used to examine leadership	15
Table 3.1 - Consolidated list of leader behaviours.....	123
Table 4.1 - Comparison of perceptions of self to others.....	208

Glossary of Key Terms and Conceptual Definitions

CF. The Canadian Forces, also seen as CAF for Canadian Armed Forces. The term military is used for this study.

CIDA. Canadian International Development Agency.

DART. Disaster Assistance Response Team is a 200 person military force is designed to rapidly respond to disasters by providing emergency services until long-term aid arrives. When deployed DART works under DFAIT and with CIDA. The Strategic Survey Team consisting of individuals from DFAIT, CIDA and the CF deploy in advance of DART to determine options for the Government.

DFAIT. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

DND. The Department of National Defence.

JIMP. Joint, Interagency, Multinational, Public

PRT. Provincial Reconstruction Team is a civilian led organization consisting of members from DFAIT, CIDA, civilian police, correctional services and the military. The Canadian PRT is known as PRT-K, to denote the Kandahar focus of the team.

SAT-A. The Canadian Strategic Advisory Team, Afghanistan operated in Kabul from 2005 to 2008. This team comprised a small group of military members, a defence scientist, and a CIDA ‘co-operant’ working in consultation with the Canadian Embassy toward strengthening the national government of Afghanistan, and serving as a tool at the operational and strategic level.

START. Stabilisation and Reconstruction Task Force is a DFAIT lead organization is designed to help answer the growing international demand for Canadian support and involvement in complex crises – conflict or natural disaster related – and to coordinate whole-of-government policy and program engagements in fragile states, such as Afghanistan, Haiti and Sudan.

Whole of Government. Whole of Government is a strategy which brings together public service agencies working across portfolio boundaries to achieve a shared goal and an integrated government response to particular issues. Approaches can be formal and informal. They can focus on policy development, program management and service delivery.

3D+C. Is the acronym for defence, diplomacy, development and commerce. It is derived from an interest on the part of government officials to take a more collaborative, integrated approach to operations as first articulated in Canada’s International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World Defence, (Ottawa: 2005),

1 Introduction

A growing trend in business, government and non-profit organizations is the recognition of the need for collaboration (Crosby & Bryson, 2010). There are many reasons why a move towards more collaborative systems is seen to be of benefit. In the private sector, one reason is the pressure placed on organizations by a dynamic and often unstable global environment. The ability and the need to move goods and services is at an all-time high and as a result many organizations rely less upon existing hierarchical systems, which are seen as slow and unresponsive, and more on systems which can adapt to change and are more responsive to the needs of a globalised world. Often this requires working collaboratively with other organizations. Many of the same conditions and requirements can be found in the public sector as different agencies and departments face situations in which they are increasingly required to work in an inter-organizational collaborative manner to resolve complex problems. Problems are seen as complex when neither the issues being dealt with, nor their solutions are clear-cut; many of them lack a predetermined outcome, or end goal, often due to the social nature of the issues being examined. In fact, the root causes of the problem are often unknown or so interconnected with other factors that one agency, or sector within a community, cannot effectively deal with them. From an international human security and stability perspective, complexity translates into the idea that there are strong linkages among stability, poverty, conflict, security, and development, which requires a holistic approach to deal with the problem. In the 2005 International Policy Statement, the Government of Canada acknowledged that

... today's complex security environment will require, more than ever, a "whole of government approach" to international missions, bringing together military and civilian resources in a focused and coherent fashion. As part of this strategy, and building on recent experience gained in Afghanistan and elsewhere, the

Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces will work more closely with other government departments and agencies, including Foreign Affairs and the Canadian International Development Agency, to further develop the integrated “3D (+C) approach (defence, diplomacy, development and commerce) to complex conflict and post-conflict situations. (p. 26)

The acknowledgement of the need for a holistic approach has resulted in acknowledging the requirement for cooperation and collaboration among military forces, international diplomatic and aid efforts, alongside of humanitarian and developmental agencies (Fitz-Gerald; Natsios, 2005). This type of operating environment is being dealt with by the Canadian government through a building on the post-Cold War concept of human security and the resultant 3D+C approach.¹ This approach takes a multi-disciplinary, or comprehensive, approach to understanding and dealing with complex problems by involving defence, diplomacy, development, the private sector and NGOs working in a collaborative manner to develop integrative solutions in support of fragile and failed states, natural disasters, pandemics and civil community (Axworthy, 1996; Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2005; King & Murray, 2001).

The literature suggests an increased interest in a collaborative approach, which began amongst government departments, now includes organizations from both the private and non-profit sectors. Depending on the organisations involved and the problems being solved, a range of terms and definitions defines this approach. The Canadian Treasury Board Secretariat uses the term the whole-of-government framework for aligning and reporting spending. The Canadian public service school uses the term horizontal management (Bakvis, 2002; Sproule-Jones, 2000) while others use the terms joined up government (Fitz-Gerald, 2005) or

¹ 3D+C is the acronym for defence, diplomacy, development and commerce. It is derived from an interest on the part of government officials to take a more collaborative, integrated approach to operations as first articulated in *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World Defence*, (Ottawa: 2005),

networked governance (Stoker, 2006). Regardless of the term, the underlying theme is the collaboration between government departments, agencies and the public. It is in this environment that individuals from different governmental organisations, each with specific departmental mandates, roles and organisational cultures, and at times differing perspectives of leadership, come together with the need to quickly understand the differences and similarities between their perspectives and develop ways to overcome any potential issues.

Against this backdrop of an increased desire for collaboration, the literature notes that the study of leadership has generally been viewed as a top-down process, often focused internally within a formal organisation. Within such a framework a significant amount of the literature examines leadership through the description of a formally appointed leader within an organisation who influences members of a group in order to achieve specific goals (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Cleveland, 1972; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Huxham, 1993, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kanter, 1994; Longoria, 2005; Morse, 2010). This leader-follower-goal perspective of leadership can be described, and is examined, in terms of the role, purpose, and characteristics of the leader or as a reflection of a specific outcome (Bennis, 2007; Campbell, 1991). However, the leader-follower-goal framework used to examine leadership may not be suitable for the inter-organisational collaboration needed to solve today's problems. Thus, the challenge for organisations is that leadership theory and concepts for studying leadership are lagging behind, many still focused on the old paradigm of a difficult intra-organisational challenge, which are ill-suited for the collaborative inter-organisational groups being used today.

Practitioners in the governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999; Linden, 2002), healthcare (Alexander, Comfort, Weiner, & Bogue, 2001; Mittman, 2004; Rubin, 2009) and national security domains (Bradford Jr & Brown, 2007; Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2008) agree that leadership within a collaborative environment is best viewed through a new framework, suggesting that a key element of collaboration maybe shared leadership. Rather than viewing leadership from the leader-follower-goal perspective, this new perspective views leadership as the result of interaction among members of the group. Leadership is then viewed, and can be understood, by the functions or tasks that must be achieved for leadership as a process to occur (Campbell, 1991; Day, 2000; Drath et al., 2008) and the leader is the individual(s) seen by the group members who enacts and/or enables the leadership functions. Thus, the focus moves from the traditional perspective of the leader-follower-goal framework, which often blurs the distinction between the terms leader and leadership, to examining leadership as a process that emerges through social interaction of the group and examining the leader as the individual who enables or enacts the functions of leadership.

Inter-organizational collaboration brings with it a unique set of challenges that stem from integrating different organizational cultures and identities (Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Huxham, 2005; Sirman, 2008; Wendt, Euwema, & van Emmerik, 2009). These differing cultures not only influence how the members of the collaborative group make sense of the problem and develop solutions to them, but also shapes how members perceives the best way to lead the group in developing the solutions for the problem(s) in a specific situation. The differences in perception of what a leader is and does, and what leadership itself is, can impact the group's performance as well as how leadership is enacted.

A leading theory in the area of perception based leader categorisation is Lord and colleagues' (1982) implicit leadership theory. Their theory emphasizes the role of leader behaviours and individually-held schemas, showing that how well the leader's behaviours match the individually-held schema of group members explains perceptions about leader performance. Implicit leadership theory remains a mainstream theory and may be useful in examining how different schemas impact the acceptance of an individual as a leader within the inter-organisational setting. However, there is an ongoing debate in the literature as to what extent individual schemas are static, with a growing body of literature suggesting that the schemas are context specific and as such dynamic in nature.

Implicit leadership theory focuses on the individual perceptions, and in doing so provides insights into what behaviours are needed for an individual to be seen as an effective leader, but this approach does not examine leadership as a group process. Day (2001) argues leadership is more than just a list of traits and characteristics of an individual; it has been conceptualised as a social process. Differentiating between the focus on individual skills and the focus on the wider relational or social context in which leadership takes place, Schyns, Kiefer, Kerschreiter and Tymon (2011) stress the importance of examining the social context of leadership, noting, along with Linden and Antonakis (2004), the lack of research in this area. The use of individually-held schemas could be extended to the study of leadership as a process where understanding an individual's perceptions of what leadership is and isn't, and how it is manifested would help to clarify and define the leadership functions that need to be enacted (Lord & Emrich, 2000). The challenge for researchers and organisations is that leadership theory and concepts for studying

leadership as an interaction between group members are lagging behind; with many extant theories still focused on the leader and an intra-organisational environment.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In order to deal with complex problems organisations are collaborating using inter-organisational groups to develop solutions. These are often ad hoc groups comprising of individuals with a unique perspective that influences not only how a particular problem is interpreted and eventually managed, but that also impacts on how the group is led; however, extant leadership theories and frameworks to examine leadership in this context are lacking.

In studying collaborative leadership, Day (2001), Schyns et al. (2011), and Bolden and Gosling (2006) state that leadership is more than just a set of skills or traits attributed to an individual; rather leadership can be viewed as a social process resulting from the interaction among individuals. However, much of the literature and extant theories on leadership are focused on the leader-follower-goal construct and, as such, do not provide an effective framework for examining leadership that emerges or results from social interaction between members of the group.

Collaboration among different organisations means that individuals with different organisational cultures and perspectives must work together. One dimension of this interaction is how leadership is enacted. One perspective in the leadership literature is that effective leaders and leadership are defined by individually-held implicit leadership schemas of the group members² (Cox, Pearce, & Perry, 2003; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Hogg, 2001; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Lord & Shondrick, 2011;

² Schemas are defined as a knowledge structure or cognitive shortcuts that are used to simplify information processing thereby allowing us to focus on the broader picture (Shondrick & Lord, 2010).

Manz, Shipper, & Stewart, 2009). Implicit leadership schemas represent personal assumptions about traits and abilities that characterize a leader. They are cognitive models held by individuals that help them to categorize 'leaders' from 'non-leaders' (Shondrick & Lord, 2010). This concept can be extended to an individual's perception of how leadership as a process is conducted within the group. While research regarding differences in leadership schemas has taken place, Lord et al. (2011) acknowledge a gap in the research, emphasising that there is a need to understand leadership schemas in complex leadership situations, as team members may have difficulty with perceiving leadership when it is not solely associated with one individual. They also argue that it is unclear if the schemas are static or if they are contextually based and as such dynamic in nature, highlighting the need for further research in this area.

The gap in the literature on leadership as a process resulting from interaction and the role of individual schemas leaves us unable to fully understand how effective leadership is enacted within ad hoc inter-organisational groups. A better understanding of leadership as a process, and how these schemas affect that process within a collaborative context allows for the potential of early intervention and mitigation of problems inherent within an inter-organisational group.

1.2 Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the impact differing leadership schemas have on leadership within ad hoc inter-organizational groups formed to deal with complex problems³. Thus, the research studies how a group of participants in a specific situation perceive and define leaders and leadership. In order to accomplish this examination it is necessary to draw the

³Complex Problem is a problem in which neither the issues being dealt with, nor their solutions are clear-cut; often lacking a predetermined outcome or end goal. The elements of the problem are inter-connected often requiring a holistic approach (definition based on literature discussing collaborative leadership such as Bono, Shen and Snyder, 2010; and Bryson and Crosby, 2010).

definitions of leadership and leader from the perceptions of the participants rather than the researcher defining the terms and attempting to make the perceptions fit a preconceived model.

Starting with existing leadership theories and concepts, which view leadership as a social construct, this research examines the role that individually-held schemas and context have on how leadership as a process is enacted. The literature contends that in order to examine individually-held schemas the examination must be done in a specific context; therefore, framed by its focus on public sector leadership delivering an integrated whole of government solution, the study examines a specific situation, the interaction of the three main Canadian organizations which operated continuously in Afghanistan during the period 2005 to 2011: Canadian Forces, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Canadian International Development Agency.

1.3 Research Questions

The primary question that this study addresses is “how do differing leadership schemas impact on leadership within an inter-organizational group?” The question is answered by examining the influences from both a general organizational and a specific collaborative situation involving three diverse Government of Canada departments; therefore, a number of subordinate questions were designed to examine the question in detail.

1. What are the individually held leadership schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) are universal and which (if any) are organizational culturally contingent?

2. What are the individually held leader schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are universal and which (if any) are organizational culturally contingent?
3. Does working in an inter-organisational group change leader behaviour outside of the schema identified within the organisational context? What can be said about how this situation affected the schemas?
4. How did leadership develop within the inter-organisational group that is used for this study?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The research contributes to the gap in the literature pertaining to understanding leadership schemas in shared and inter-organisational leadership situations. The study also addresses the question of whether leadership schemas are static or context sensitive. Building on existing research, this study furthers the understanding of leadership in contemporary complex environments, specifically as it relates to leadership as a social construct. While the study focuses on inter-organizational collaboration involving governmental departments, the examination of the impact of differences in how leaders and leadership are perceived may provide a start point or framework for examining other inter-organizational groups, whether from the private, public or non-profit sectors.

In addition to understanding the different perceptions of leadership and the impact on collaboration within the inter-organisational group, this research furthers the understanding of implicit leadership schemas in three ways. First, the content of the leadership schemas may help to better understand and ultimately predict their effect on collaborative leader behaviour and how

leadership as a process is enacted. Second, by examining leadership as a social construct leadership researchers may find that certain aspects of leadership that are commonly understood or inferred, in practice are not taken into account in current theories and models of leadership, particularly those based on the leader-follower-goal framework. Lastly, from a practical perspective, this advancement in knowledge can be used to help train and educate leaders so they are enhancing the effects of leadership schemas and maximizing their potential in a way that is most beneficial to organizations, the collaborative team, and the constituents who are impacted by these particular organizations.

2 Literature Review

Leadership has been defined as one “of the most complex and multifaceted phenomena to which ... research has been applied” (Van Seters & Field, 1990, p. 29; for similar views also see Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989; and Rost 1991). The complexity, or rather confusion, is due in part, to the lack of a common definition causing Bass (1990) to comment that “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as those who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 11). The amount of diversity and as a result, the number and variety of definitions is stunning. Bennis (1989) states that “academic analysis has given us more than 850 [different] definitions of leadership”(p. 4). Of the 587 books, chapters and articles Rost (1991) reviewed for his text, he found that only 221 (less than half) gave a definition of leadership, and of the 221 definitions offered, most tended to blend leadership with other processes used to coordinate, direct, control and govern groups. Summing up the current state of affairs, Bennis (2007) notes that "it is almost a cliché of the leadership literature that a single definition of leadership is lacking" (p. 2).

The problem of course is that "when leadership is anything anyone wants to say it is, the concept of leadership is meaningless, hence nonsense" (Rost, 1991, p. 7).

The lack of a clear definition is not due to lack of research or interest. Bass (1990) itemized and analyzed some 4,725 studies of leadership which took place prior to 1981, while Rost (1991) claims that, not counting magazine, newspaper articles and professional journals, there were 132 books published on leadership during the 1980s alone. A recent search of Amazon.com (Nov, 2014) shows 126,045 books classified under the topic of leadership. Some researchers suggest that the diverse and fragmented nature of leadership can be attributed to the varied foci of the researchers involved. A review of the literature finds leadership in almost every discipline, each with its own concept of what leadership is, and methodological preferences for studying leadership (Bass, 1990; Rost, 1991; Yukl, 1989).

The researcher's background, training and experience bring a set of implicit assumptions on how to examine and explain leadership; which, in turn, can influence the focus of research and hence how leadership is defined. However, it is more than just the focus of leadership that can cause the diversity. Leadership is so pervasive that it is found in most organizations and in order for a theory to make sense or be of use to that organisation the researcher needs to provide context for the targeted group. This contextualisation sees leadership being culturally and historically shaped and bounded and therefore, subject to cultural variation. The result is the addition of an adjective in front of the word leadership to provide context and focus for the specific organisation, such as military-leadership, political-leadership, educational-leadership, business-leadership, or strategic-leadership. This type of framing reinforces the idea that

leadership as practised in the annotated profession is different from leadership found in the other professions (Rost, 1991; Wenek, 2003).

Thus, even a cursory review of the leadership literature suggests that leadership theory is diverse and fragmented, lacking a common definition that is satisfactory to all and apparently lacking a common thread or integrating theme. This literature review is cognisant of the fact that the study of leadership is a vast undertaking with a broad range of definitions, theories and concepts; therefore, the review is focused on those theories and concepts that allow the examination of participant perceptions of leaders and leadership within an inter-organisational group. The literature guiding this research is examined in three main parts to provide the theoretical and conceptual foundations on which the research design is built. The first part is an examination of leadership. Starting with an overview of the evolution of the theories of leadership, this section situates the specific leadership theories applicable to this study. Next the need for a framework to study leadership is discussed and the framework used for the study is described. Shared leadership is examined next. Shared leadership defined by Cox et al. (2003) as a “collaborative, emergent process of group interaction . . .” that might occur “through an unfolding series of fluid, situationally appropriate exchanges of lateral influence” or “as team members negotiate shared understandings about how to navigate decisions and exercise authority” (p. 53). This view of shared leadership framework moves away from leadership being a construct that focuses on formal leader – follower influence, to a social construct resulting from interaction among group members. In this context, leadership is viewed as an emergent social construct within which leaders and leadership are perceived and categorised by

members of the group. The idea of perception being operationalized using individually-held schemas to define leaders and leadership leads to the examination of implicit leadership theory.

The second part of the review examines the literature surrounding inter-organizational collaboration, which identifies the need to view leadership outside of a formal hierarchal organization and introduces the idea of leadership as a shared and emergent process within an inter-organisational group. Third and finally, literature examining the whole of government approach will be addressed; this specific literature establishes the broad organizational and situational contexts and boundaries for the study of inter-departmental leadership in complex and dynamic contexts. This literature identifies the need for collaboration among various governmental departments and frames the inter-organizational aspect of that collaboration within the specific human security context, which eventually establishes the context for the research itself.

Each part of the literature review begins with an overview of the theory and the sub-theories that provide a thorough explanation or have historically been incorporated into the theory and concludes with a summary that highlight the main issues.

2.1 A Review of Leadership Theory

Research into the nature of leadership is perhaps best viewed as a morphing or integrating activity, leading to a number of paradigm shifts rather than evolving sequentially over time. Each contribution adds a layer of complexity on the research question of leadership by expanding what is being asked and what is being examined, resulting in a “higher stage of development in leadership thought process than in the preceding era” (Van Seters & Field, 1990, p. 30). Of note, new theories do not always replace those that have come before; instead,

theories often exist in parallel, often focusing on a particular niche, discipline or profession. The morphing of ideas combined with parallel theories can add to the confusion among researchers and practitioners. In examining leadership theories, there is no universal method for how the theories are grouped or described. Daft (1999) groups the theories into general eras and then by research perspectives. Bass (2008) does so by process models and academic discipline. Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004) use major schools of how leadership is conceived, while Higgs (2003) does so by a short summary of historical eras. Yukl (2006) describes the theories by major lines of research.

This section provides an overview of the major trends and development of leadership theory. Using the major areas of leadership research as a means to group the theories, one finds four distinct approaches,⁴ or ways that leadership can be viewed: trait, behaviour, contingency and transformational (Northouse, 2013; Van Seters & Field, 1990). While the approaches reviewed generally follow one another chronologically, it is important to re-emphasise that the development of these theories is not linear, and while there may be some connections, causation of one theory by another is often implied rather than proven. In fact, many of the theories have not been subsumed by newer ones, but have gained a revitalisation through better research methods or a reframing of the theory (Antonakis et al., 2004; Daft, 1999; Higgs, 2003; Van Seters & Field, 1990). The table below provides an overview of the major approaches and specific theories found in the literature.

⁴ The approaches chosen have focused on those that are found consistently across the literature and provide a foundational baseline for examination. In doing so a number of emerging theories or rather modifications to existing ones have been left out. Examples include servant leadership, authentic, and leadership ethics. Two areas of interest, culture and gender, are discussed separately.

Table 1.1

Overview of Approaches and Specific Theories Used to Examine Leadership

APPROACH	MAJOR THEORY	RESEARCHER(S)
Trait Approach	Great Man Theory	Various interpretations
	Trait Theory	Stogdill
	Implicit Leadership Theory	Lord
Behaviour Approach	Ohio State Studies	Various interpretations
	Michigan State Studies	Various interpretations
	Leadership (Managerial) Grid	Blake and Mouton
	Leader Motivation	McClland
	Leader-Member Exchange	Graen and Uhl-Bien
Contingency Approaches	Contingency Theory	Fielder
	Path-Goal Theory	House
	Situational Theory	Hersey and Blanchard
Transformational Approach	Transformational Leadership	Burns
		Bass; Bass and Avolio
	Charismatic Leadership	Conger and Kanungo
		Shamir, House and Arthur

Note: the approaches are consolidated from the literature.

2.1.1 Trait approach to leadership

The modern, or perhaps better termed “scientific,” approach to the study of leadership is viewed to have begun with trait theory in the late 1920s (Bass, 1990; Daft, 1999; Higgs, 2003; Northouse, 2013; Van Seters & Field, 1990). Earlier reliance on the great-man theories led to search for identifiable traits of leadership. It was believed that an understanding of leadership could be obtained by focusing on the personal attributes of successful leaders, traits are “the distinguishing personal characteristics of a leader” (Daft, 1999, p. 38). Researchers equate these traits with a stable or consistent pattern of behaviour, that is the behaviour demonstrates cross-situational consistency (Yukl, 2006). The initial approach compared leaders and non-leaders, to identify those traits possessed by one but not the other. The underlying assumption to this approach was that some people are born with the necessary traits that make them a leader. Thus,

it was believed that the researcher could identify the traits that successful leaders possessed and in doing so would allow organisations to select leaders based on an agreed to list (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2013).

One of the most cited, and influential, researcher of trait theory is Stogdill. Stogdill (1948) examined more than 100 studies and while he uncovered several general traits, he concluded that “ a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits” (p. 64). His suggestion that there was no consistent set of traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders essentially ended wide spread interest in trait theory. In 1974, Stogdill updated his initial study by reviewing and adding 163 trait studies conducted from 1949 to 1970. The findings of the second study resulted in more supportive findings of the original trait theory, concluding that “personality traits differentiate leaders from followers, successful from unsuccessful leaders, and high level from low-level leaders” (Bass, 2008, p. 86). Working with Stodgill, Bass (2008) suggested that a successful leader is characterised by⁵:

A strong drive for responsibility and completion of tasks, vigor [sic] and persistence in the pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problems solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and a sense of personal identity, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other people’s behavior [sic] and the capacity to structure social interaction systems for the purpose at hand (p. 87).

Bass and Stogdill make it clear that this is not a return to the original trait theory, but rather a modification that takes into account the elements of both the original trait theory and the pure situationalist perspective, which had been developed, in part, as a result of Stogdill’s 1948 work. This modification provides a synthesis of what Bass and Stogdill saw as two extreme views offering that “some of the variances in who emerges as a leader and who is successful and

⁵ This description is noted in the second and first editions of the handbook, which was co-authored, by Bass and Stogdill.

effective is due to traits of consequence in the situation, some is due to situational effects, and some is due to the interaction of traits and situation” (Bass, 2008, p. 87).

The adoption of trait theory, even with situational variables, suggests that leaders are not developed but that they are born with the inherent leadership traits. Therefore, selection of leaders would be based on personality type testing and leader development would focus on refining inherent traits vice learning new ones. Trait theory is intuitively appealing but research has failed to develop a conclusive list of traits that ensure an effective and successful leader. What this research has shown is that individuals develop a mental model of leaders that consist of a core set of characteristics and behaviours that are perceived as being related to leadership (Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991).

2.1.2 Behavioural approaches to leadership

In order to deal with some of the shortcomings of the trait theory, researchers focused on the behaviours and styles of leaders. In essence, what leaders in formal organisations did and how they acted replaced who they were based on the personal characteristics (traits) of the leader. The findings of the research into this approach determined that leadership comprises of two kinds of behaviours: task and relationship-focused behaviours. Task behaviours focus on achieving the desired goals in which the leader helps followers to achieve the objectives of the group, while relationship behaviours focus on the followers as individuals, meeting their personal needs (Bass, 2008; Korman, 1966; Northouse, 2013).

Some of the first studies to examine the behaviour approach were conducted at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the late 1940s. Using a questionnaire describing different aspects of leader behaviour, researchers found that subordinates’ responses

clustered around two general themes of what leaders do: initiating structure and consideration (Northouse, 2013). The Ohio State study viewed the two types of leader behaviour as distinct and independent, that is to say two different continua, meaning that the leader could be described by a combination of the two behaviours. The Michigan study focused on leader behaviour and its impact on group process and performance (Yukl, 2006). Like the Ohio State study, the Michigan study identified two types of leadership behaviours: employee orientation, and production orientation, each roughly equating to the Ohio State study's consideration and initiating structure. However, unlike the Ohio study, Michigan researchers viewed the orientations as opposite ends of a single continuum. This perspective was later modified to similar lines of the Ohio study where the two orientations were treated as independent. Through the 1950s and 1960s attempts were made to determine the best combination of task and relationship behaviours in order to establish a universal leadership theory applicable to all situations. This research developed the concept of the "high – high" leader, which posited that effective leaders would use both task and relationship-orientated behaviours. The results of the research were contradictory and unclear, most suggesting that the traits of the high-high leader are likely a positive combination, but that the actual behaviour will differ depending on the situation and the individual follower, thus highlighting the importance of context and situational variables (Bass, 1990; Bem & Allen, 1974; Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, & Stogdill, 1974; Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2006).

Building on the work of both Ohio State and Michigan studies, Blake and Mouton (1975) developed the leadership grid.⁶ The two dimensions of task and relationship orientation are

⁶ The grid was initially called the management grid, but was changed in one of the many updates to leadership grid. It is referred to as both management and leadership grid in the literature.

integrated onto a grid. Leaders are rated on a scale of one to nine (one as low orientation and 9 for high orientation) for each orientation based on the individual's endorsement of statements about managers (Bass, 2008; Blake & Mouton, 1975). The combination of numbers represents a particular leadership style. Blake and Mouton (1975) indicated that individuals usually have a dominant style, which is used in most situations. The leader grid theory demonstrates that both task and relationship orientations are present in leaders, and research by Blake and Mouton determined that a 9, 9 oriented manager, or a manager focused on both task and relationships, was more likely to advance further within a given career (Bass, 2008; Blake & Mouton, 1975).

In a shift back towards focusing on the leader, McClelland (1975; 1982) examined the motivational factors that underlie the behaviour of leaders. He argued that a particular motive pattern enables people to be effective [leaders] at the higher levels in an organization. The leadership motive pattern consists of three elements: need for power; need for affiliation; and activity inhibition. McClelland argued that successful leaders had a pattern was deemed as being at least moderately high in need for power (n Power), lower in need for affiliation (n Affiliation), and high in self-control, or activity inhibition (McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982, p. 737). The explanation for this combination is almost intuitive. High n Power is an indicator that the individual is interested in exerting influence, or having an impact on others. This highlights the fact the individual is interested in a leadership role. Lower n Affiliation indicates that being part of the group is not an essential motivator and as such allows the individual to make difficult decisions without worrying about being disliked. High self-control means the person is likely to be concerned with maintaining organizational systems and following orderly procedures (McClelland, 1975; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982; Winter, 1991). The examination of what

motivates an individual to want to take on a leadership role and identifying a predictive disposition is useful in determining selection of individuals for both leadership roles, as well as members of working groups or teams and is seen as an important element to be included into the theories of behaviour (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996).

For the most part, both trait and behaviour theories assume a general leadership style that is used on the group as a whole and in doing so fails to take into consideration the differing needs of the individual members of a group. Later researchers noted that there is a reciprocal relationship between the leader and follower. Green (1975) and Kerr et al. (1974) found that not only does the behaviour of the leader influence the group, but that subordinate performance and satisfaction can influence the leader to the extent it can cause the leader to change his/her style. The notion of an individualised leader – member relationship has evolved through a number of stages. The early concept focused on the relationships leaders made with each of their followers. These relationships were viewed as a series of vertical dyads. The relationship was classified as either in-group or out-group. A shift in focus from the dyadic model resulted in the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, which rather than focusing on in and out groups, researchers focused on how the quality of the leader-member exchange related to positive outcomes. These studies illustrated the benefits of having leaders who can create good working relationships (for further explanation see Daft, 1999, pp. 51-55; Northouse, 2013, pp. 151-155) .

2.1.3 Contingency approach to leadership

Both trait and behavioural approaches acknowledge that the situation can be a modifying factor affecting leadership, but neither of the theories takes this into account. In response, leadership research shifted from focusing on the leader to acknowledging that leadership was

dependent on a number of factors, specifically: behaviour, personality, influence and the situation. This change of perspective in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in the development of an approach to leadership that examined the situational variables under which different styles would be effective, rather than trying to identify specific traits that would be effective under all conditions, giving rise to the contingency theory of leadership (Johansen, 1990; Rost, 1991; Van Seters & Field, 1990). While there are a number of variations of this theory, all include three main elements: the leader's preferred style; the capabilities and behaviours of followers; and the situation within which the two operate. Contingency theories also agree that there is no one best way of leading, that a leadership style that is effective in some situations may not be effective in others. Thus, leaders who are effective at one place and time, may be ineffective if transplanted to another situation, or if the factors which shape the situation change. Proponents of the theory argue that this helps to explain how leaders who seem to have the 'Midas touch' can suddenly appear to become ineffective (Bass, 2008; Daft, 1999; Northouse, 2013). Three of the more well-known contingency theories are Fiedler's contingency theory (1965), House's path-goal theory (1971), and the Hersey and Blanchard's (1979) situational leadership theory.⁷ Each of these approaches to leadership is briefly described below.

The pioneer of contingency theory, Fiedler's contingency theory, is based on the relationship of three elements: leader style, situational favourability, and group task performance. The theory states that the favourability of the situation determines how effective task and person oriented leader behaviours will be. Situational favourability is determined by three variables: the quality of leader-member relationship; the level to which the task is structured; and the level of

⁷ It is acknowledged that the Hersey and Blanchard situational theory is not universally grouped with the other contingency theories; however, given the definition of contingency used by Daft and Van Seters et al. it is included it here.

position power the leader enjoys (Daft, 1999; Fiedler, 1971; Kerr et al., 1974; Northouse, 2013; Peters, Hartke, & Pohlmann, 1985; Yukl, 2006). The situation is most favourable for the leader when there is a strong relationship with the follower, there is high task structure and the leader enjoys strong positional power. At the other end of the continuum, the most unfavourable situation consists of poor leader-follower relationships, low task structure and weak position power. Fiedler (1971) shows that task-orientated leaders are more effective when the situation is either highly favourable or highly unfavourable, while the relationship orientated leaders are more effective when the situation is moderately favourable or unfavourable (also see Peters et al., 1985; Vecchio, 1983). The theory assumes that the leader has a preferred style (task or relationship) and as such that leader should be chosen based on the situation and replaced when the situation changes⁸ (Fiedler, 1971).

The Hersey-Blanchard situational theory states that the characteristics of the follower are the important element of the situation, and hence determine effective leader behaviour. Leaders balance directive (task) and supportive (relationship) behaviours based on the “maturity” of the followers. Maturity is defined by the follower’s ability and willingness to complete the task. The level of maturity is determined by two related components: job maturity, which is determined by the level of task-relevant skills and technical knowledge, which allows the follower to perform the task; and psychological maturity, which comprises of self-confidence and self-respect needed for the follower to perform the job independently (Bass, 2008; Hersey et al., 1979; Yukl, 2006). Leader styles are chosen to best meet the needs of the follower, and within the model they align against the follower’s assessed readiness levels; therefore, S1

⁸ Recent iterations of Fiedler’s theory have moved away from the view that leadership style cannot be changed; suggesting leaders can adapt their preferred leadership style to meet a range of situations (see Johansen, 1990; Papworth, Milne, & Boak, 2009).

(directive) is best suited for followers' assessed as R1 (unwilling and unable to achieve the goals), whilst S4 (delegating) is the most effective style to use with those followers who are have the ability and are willing to achieve the desired objectives (R4) (Bass, 2008; Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Nelson, 1993; Daft, 1999; Hersey et al., 1979; Northouse, 2013; Papworth et al., 2009; Thompson & Vecchio, 2009). The situational approach is similar in a number of ways to Fielder's model; however, it focuses on the leader-follower relationship. This theory acknowledges the importance of the follower in the relationship, in that it is the follower who chooses who to follow and hence who the leader is, reinforcing the fact that needs of the follower are a key element in the leader's style. Unlike Fielder's model, the Hersey-Blanchard model allows for the leader to change styles, which suggests leaders can learn and adapt to new situations and are not set on a single default style chosen.

House's (1971) path-goal theory builds on the expectancy theory of motivation where the follower will choose a type of behaviour on the basis of the valences the individual perceives to be associated with the reward of the behaviour under consideration, and the subjective estimate of the probability that his behaviour will indeed result in the outcomes and receive the desired reward associated with that outcome. The theory emphasises the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the subordinate and the work setting. The theory identifies four types of behaviour that reflect types of behaviour that every leader is able to adopt: supportive (people oriented), which shows concern for followers; directive (task-oriented), which tells subordinates exactly what they are supposed to do; participative, which consults with subordinates and is open to suggestions; and achievement-oriented, which sets clear and challenging goals, shows confidence in subordinates and assist in learning how to

achieve goals. The personal characteristics of group members are framed in a similar manner as the Hersey/Blanchard readiness scale; the work environment is characterised by task structure, nature of formal authority system, and work group characteristics. According to the theory, leader behaviour should be selected in order to meet subordinate needs by complementing or supplementing what is missing in the environment. This is done to reduce barriers to subordinates' goal attainment, strengthen subordinates' expectancy of success and provide coaching to make the path to the goals easier to obtain.

2.1.4 Transformational approach to leadership

Transformational and charismatic leadership theories are generally found grouped together in the literature and as such are looked at together in this section. Conger (1999) suggests that the rise of charismatic and transformational leadership theories in the 1980s was due to the “dissatisfaction with the earlier models of leadership which have seemed too narrow and simplistic to explain leaders in change agent roles” (p. 147). Of note is the focus on the leader as an agent of change, which helps define the author's view of the role of a leader within organisations. Transformational leadership transforms the organisation, as well as addressing followers' needs for meaning and personal development, while transactional leaders maintain the status quo (Bass, 1985; Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1987).

Burns (1978) argued that leader influence is based on the parties being engaged in contractual transactions, an exchange of rewards for compliance. Under this paradigm, leadership is based on a motive of self-interest. Seeing this as a limitation, Burns (1978) proposed that transformational leadership “seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower” (p. 4) and in doing so “leaders and followers raise one another to higher

levels of motivation” (p. 20). Examining the relationship between leaders and followers in which the main idea was to tap into the motivates of followers to help release human potential, Burns defined leadership as “inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations, of both leaders and followers” (as cited in Northouse, 2013, p. 19). Linking transactional and transformational leadership together, Burns viewed them as two ends of a continuum, with the leader operating between the two extremes. His work established the foundation of transformational leadership standing in contrast to the older transactional approaches. Unlike the "traditional" leadership theories before it, which emphasized rational processes, transformational leadership emphasizes emotions and values, often stressing the importance of symbolic behaviour (Yukl, 1999).

Building on Burns’ theory, Bass (1985) demonstrated that transactional and transformational leadership are separate, yet independent, dimensions and showed that a leader uses both types of leadership behaviours (also in Antonakis et al., 2004; Conger, 1999; Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2006). In analysing transformational leaders Bass and Avolio (1994) stated that transformational leadership is broken down into four behavioural areas: charisma; individualised consideration; intellectual stimulation; and motivation. By engaging in transformational leadership behaviours, leaders transform followers from being self-centred individuals to becoming committed members of the group. In practice what is observed is that group goals and values are adopted by the followers as their own, resulting in performance and results at levels beyond what would normally be expected (Bono, Shen, & Snyder, 2010; Conger, 1999; Van Seters & Field, 1990).

Conger and Kanungo's (1987) model builds on the idea that "charismatic leadership is an attribution based on the followers' perceptions of their leader's behaviour" (p. 153). Thus, it is the follower that categorises an individual as the leader. This variation of transformational leadership, shares a number of common points to others, including the importance of vision, articulation of vision and goals, follower trust in the goals and the ability to achieve them. Moving away from a strictly leader-centric theory, Conger and Kanungo's theory emphasises the fact that the vision may result out of opportunities in the external environment and that the leader may not be the sole or original source of the vision (Conger, 1999). Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) argue that charismatic leadership transforms the follower's self-concepts and achieves its motivational outcomes through: changing the perception of the nature of the task; offering an appealing vision of the future; developing a collective identity amongst the followers; and increasing individual and group efficacy. The intent of the leader is to change the followers from seeking extrinsic rewards towards the intrinsic aspects of work. The adoption of transformational leadership brought with it the distinction between managers and leaders, which further complicated and confused the leadership discussion. Within this construct, managers are viewed as those that display transactional behaviours, while leaders display transformational behaviours. Conger (1999) suggests that this perspective was a return of leadership, in part, to the "great man" theories of the past, but where the leader has a real desire to develop others.

2.1.5 Summary

The lack of an agreed to definition or unifying theory of leadership provides both challenges and opportunities for researchers and practitioners. The challenge is to ensure that the research is clearly situated within the broader leadership literature. The opportunity is that the

research can draw on a number of theories and concepts to refine or develop the understanding of leadership. This research draws on a number of theories to examine and explain the leadership in an inter-organisational group. While primarily focused on Lord et al. (1984) implicit leadership theory to examine the impact of individually-held leadership schemas. It does so by focusing on examining the behaviours of the leader, thereby drawing on the behaviour approach theories. The individually-held schemas are examined in specific situations, within the parent organisation and the inter-organisational group, thereby drawing on aspects of contingency approaches. Therefore, this study does not seek to replace extant theories, rather as stated by Van Steters and Field (1990) provide “a higher stage of development in leadership theory” (p. 30).

2.2 Gender and Leadership

When examining gender and leadership the researcher is faced with the question “are there leadership style and effectiveness differences between women and men?” The answer to this question depends on the specific literature examined, but in broad terms the literature would answer in the affirmative, cautioning that it is neither clear nor simple when examined in the organisational context. A review of the literature shows a difference between academic papers examining leadership and publications directed to the general public and managers in organisations. Eagly et al. (1995), citing, Book (2009), Helgesen (2011) and Loden (1985), note that books and magazine articles directed to the general public suggest there is a substantial difference between male and female leaders and approaches to leadership. However, while academic writers have presented a range of views concerning gender differences and similarities in leadership styles (see Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Jogulu & Wood, 2006), most have maintained

that female and male leaders do not differ or that there are far more similarities than differences (Bartol & Martin, 1986; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001; Kolb, 1999; Northouse, 2013). In fact, recent literature suggest that the “ideal leader” displays a combination of both female and male approaches to leadership, resulting in an androgynous approach to leadership (Goktepe & Schneier, 1988; Korabik, 1990; Northouse, 2013; Sargent, 1981).

It was not until the late 1970s that literature on gender differences began to be published. This research began to report on differences in behaviour, attitudes, and skills between males and females in general and was later extended to consider leadership. However, this broadening of research to consider gender was constrained by the ongoing perception of the “think manager-think male” attitude, which continues to be found in much of the literature, leading Schein (2001) to observe that “despite the many historical, political, and cultural differences that exist...the view of women as less likely than men to possess requisite management characteristics is a commonly held belief among male management students around the world” (p. 683). This statement suggests that perceptions of leaders and leadership both in practise, as well as the various leadership theories, are not gender neutral but are seen to be male (Acker, 1990; Bowring, 2004; Jogulu & Wood, 2006). Such a perspective influences how leadership is viewed, how it is described, and the behaviours expected of leaders. Leader traits and behaviours are described as being either masculine or feminine, with masculine traits and behaviours preferred, or seen to be more desirable, in leaders and managers than those traits described as feminine (Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Eagly et al., 1995; Engen et al., 2001; Schein, 1973; Scott & Brown, 2006). This research focused on style differences between men and women using

interpersonally-oriented and task-oriented as well as democratic and autocratic styles to classify behaviours of observed individuals. The findings indicated that men tended to be task-oriented and used an autocratic approach, while women tended to be interpersonally-oriented, using a democratic approach.

Eagly and Johnson (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of the 162 available studies that compared men and women leadership styles. Their research, which surveyed studies from the period 1961–1987, found that leadership styles were gender stereotypic in laboratory experiments that used student participants, and in assessment studies that investigated the leadership styles of individuals not in leadership roles. In both of these studies, women adopted interpersonally-oriented and democratic styles, while men tended to be task-oriented and use autocratic styles. When examined in organisational studies these differences were less evident. The only demonstrated difference between female and male managers was that women adopted a somewhat more democratic and a less autocratic or directive style than men. The study showed that in the organisational context, male and female leaders did not differ in their tendencies to use interpersonally-oriented and task-oriented styles. Van Engen et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis that surveyed studies published between 1987 and 2000 produced similar findings, leading to the conclusion that female and male leaders do not differ. However, following this study, Eagly and Karau (1991) conducted a second meta-analysis of 54 studies on the emergence of males and female leaders in groups. The findings indicated that men emerged as leaders to a greater extent than did women. The research showed that male leadership was most likely in short-term groups and groups carrying out tasks that did not require complex social interactions. Women were found to emerge as social leaders, engaging in leader behaviour which showed agreement with

other group members, solidarity of views and understanding of other group members. These insights are consistent with their earlier study, that is to say, gender differences in leadership styles are supported. Eagly and Karau (1991) concluded that because of men's tendency to specialise in task-oriented behaviours, there is a socially-accepted tendency for men to take up leadership roles. It can be also be assumed that senior management roles are be seen as requiring task-oriented behaviour. According to Eagly and Karau (1991), "men's specialization relative to women in strictly task-oriented behaviors is one key to their emergence as group leaders" (p. 705). Thus, men were seen as a "better fit" than women in the role of leader. This conclusion was based on the perspective that the attributes presumed to impact on a leader's performance are primarily task-oriented leadership, and males were seen as exhibiting this style of leadership more than women. Therefore, the behaviours exhibited by males appear to equip them more comfortably to fill the role of leader, as leaders were seen to be task-oriented, displaying masculine behaviours (Lord et al., 1986; Lord et al., 1984; Northouse, 2013; Orser, 1994).

While the both studies demonstrate that men and women tended to use different leadership behaviours, that is the use of democratic or autocratic behaviours, the studies provide different conclusions on the use of task-oriented and interpersonally-oriented approaches, specifically within the organisational setting. To account for similarities in the leadership behaviour of men and women in the organisational setting, Eagly et al. (2000), using social role theory, suggest that leadership roles, like other organizational roles, provide norms that regulate the performance of many tasks. Eagly et al. (1990) state that "when women and men occupy the same managerial role, behaviour may be less stereotypic because organisational leadership roles provide fairly clear guidelines about the conduct of behaviour" (p. 234). This conclusion is

consistent with Kanter's (1977) argument that any differences in the behaviour of organisational leaders is due to positions within the organisation and not due to the gender of the individual. In explaining the differences in behaviours, democratic or autocratic, Eagly et al. (1990) suggest that differences were due "ingrained sex differences in personality traits and behavioral [sic] tendencies, differences that are not nullified by organisational socialisation" (p. 235).

The two studies conducted by Eagly and colleagues (1990; 1991) have a number of conclusions that should be considered in any research. First, the studies suggest that men and women approach leadership differently and that the differences are more likely to be prominent when there is no formal leader and the lack of organisational structure. Secondly, because of men's tendency to use task-oriented behaviours, there is a socially-accepted tendency for men to take up leadership positions as the role of the leader was seen to be that of accomplishing tasks. Finally, this accepted tendency suggests that leader schemas are biased towards masculine behaviours.

Northouse (2013) states that research findings stem from the culturally-defined role of women in society and therefore, these findings may not be generalizable across cultures in which roles of men and women differ (p. 365). Although Northouse is cautioning readers about applying the findings associated with North American studies, his statement underscores an important issue regarding expectations of leaders and leadership. As stated above, a review of the literature suggests that the leadership theories are not gender neutral; rather they evolved from a primarily male-centric perspective to one that acknowledges and incorporates both male and female perspectives. Early leadership studies examined organisations, which themselves

were not gender neutral. Since the majority of the leaders⁹ were men, these theories described men and male leadership (Acker, 1990; Jogulu & Wood, 2006; Schein, 1973; Scott & Brown, 2006). Although the importance given to the masculine aspects of leader has decreased, Northouse (2013) reminds the reader that “it remains pervasive and robust” (p. 359). This exposes two issues. First, notwithstanding the increase in literature and understanding of women as leaders, many perceptions of what is leader is and how leadership should be enacted are based on the masculine model (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011; Northouse, 2013). These perceptions of expected leader behaviour and approach to leadership could influence individually-held leader and leadership schemas¹⁰ (Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Rush et al., 1977). Secondly, as women fulfill the role of leader, their behaviours may not meet other group members’ individually-held schemas of women and/or leader. As Bowering (2004) notes “we are unable to disassociate our ideas about gender identity from the performances of gender and leadership in organizations” (p. 402) placing women in a difficult position of deciding what schema to fill: leader or female.

There is a growing body of literature that suggest that effective leaders adopt the best of the other sex’s qualities, that is to say that effective leaders’ behaviours are androgynous (Appelbaum, Audet, & Miller, 2003; Helgesen, 2011; Korabik, 1990; Sargent, 1981). Driven by the acceptance of transformational leadership theory by organisations as a way to effectively accomplish organisational change, transformational leaders characterise a more feminine model

⁹ The literature uses both the term leader and manager to indicate a formal position within the organisation. The use of the term is influenced by the background of the researcher and the targeted journal and audience of the article. For consistency the term leader is used for this study.

¹⁰ A schema refers to personal assumptions about traits and abilities that characterize a leader. It is also referred to in the literature as prototypical model, script, narrative, or implicit leadership theory (Lord & Shondrick, 2011). This concept is examined in greater detail in section 2.6.

of leadership. This approach to leadership is built around cooperation, lower levels of control, collaboration and collective problem solving (Bass, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2013). Bass and Avolio (1994) state that transformational leadership is seen to be linked to leader effectiveness, and since women leaders tend to be more transformational they are likely to be viewed as more effective as leaders. This shift towards transformational leadership and an androgynous leader is likely, over time, to influence how individuals view leaders and leadership, however, at present the literature suggests that leadership and leaders continue to be viewed as masculine.

2.3 Public Sector Leadership

A review of the literature suggests that public sector leadership is emerging as a distinctive domain within public administration and public management studies (Kellerman & Webster, 2002; Mau, 2008; Orazi, Turrini, & Valotti, 2013; Raffel, Leisink, & Middlebrooks, 2009; Ryan, 2001; Van Wart, 2003). Although the consensus is that the literature is still underdeveloped, compared to business administration studies, there is agreement that progress is being made and that there is a need for further development and examination in order to define a comprehensive model for public sector leadership. Van Wart (2003) states that there are three reasons for the lack of public sector leadership research: first, is the belief that administrative leadership does not exist; secondly, bureaucracies are seen to be guided by forces that are beyond the control of the administrative leaders; and lastly, attention of researchers is drawn away by other aspects of leadership in the wider public sector. Stating that “there is a tendency to treat all situations in which leadership is important as a single monolith, rather than exploring the ramifications of different types of leadership in different contexts, with varying missions,

organizational structures, accountability mechanisms, [and] environmental constraints” (Van Wart, 2003, p. 223), Van Wart (2003) acknowledges the large body of leadership and management literature, but argues that “leadership needs to be considered in context of the situation that the leader is operating in” (p. 215). In discussing the need to examine public sector leadership as a specific sub-set of leadership, Anderson (2010) emphasises that the nature of leadership for administrators is more complicated by demands for rigorous democratic accountability to elected politicians, to citizens, to the taxpaying public, and other stakeholders than is leadership in the private sector.

Public sector leadership has a number of sub-categories, with the three that are most commonly used in the literature being: policy positions, working in community settings and administrative leadership with organisations¹¹ (Van Wart, 2003, p. 214). The focus of much of the early research in public sector leadership was on the political leader. Mau (2008) suggests that the view was that leadership was linked to policy development, not developing it, and that since the public sector was responsible for administering the policy it did not require leadership. The result was that there was little study on what researchers define as administrative or bureaucratic leadership (Andersen, 2010; Mau, 2008; Orazi et al., 2013; Van Wart, 2003; Van Wart, 2013).

Administrative leadership is defined as leadership that takes place in bureaucratic settings. It refers to “leadership from the frontline supervisor to the non-political head of the organization” (Van Wart, 2003, p. 216). In examining administrative leadership, the literature

¹¹ Of note, military leadership is not included as part of the public sector leadership literature. Although referred to in a number of the meta-analysis of the public sector leadership literature, it is separated from the civilian political and bureaucratic literature.

considers both the people (at all levels within the organisation) and the accompanying processes and networks that lead, manage, and guide government agencies. Thus, the focus is on the civil service and appointed leaders, rather than political leaders, and examines the implementation and the technical aspects of policy development over policy advocacy (Van Wart, 2013, p. 521). The main debate in the literature, and hence how administrative leadership is viewed and enacted, is due to differences in the level of discretion the administrative leader should have which is then translated into the proper role of the administrative leader. Van Wart's (2003) much cited review of the literature divides the role of the administrative leader into three eras, each shaping the behaviours of the leader. In the first era (1883-1940) good administrative leaders made technical decisions, but referred policy decision to political superiors. The second era (1940-1980) recognised interplay of the political and administrative worlds, with the dominant model focused on administrative responsibility. In the recent era (since 1990s), administrative leaders are encouraged to make creative and robust use of discretion and diffused authority. The use of discretion has shaped the focus of the debate within the literature in terms of leader orientation (transactional or transformational) and in doing so not only defined the role to the administrative leader but shaped the desired behaviours. Within these definitions, administrative leadership is seen to have three functions. Firstly, it is to refine and clearly articulate the vision of the politicians and obtaining commitment of the civil servants towards that vision. Secondly, is to align resources and individuals by bringing together a range of stakeholders from across policy communities to achieve the vision. Lastly, the function of public service leadership is to reinforce public sector values (Mau, 2008). Thus the concepts of leadership and management are not seen as opposing concepts, but rather are viewed as complementary with both needed to

enact administrative leadership, with any difference between the emphasis on leadership and management linked to working at different hierarchical levels, rather than an overarching concept.

To enact leadership in the modern era the literature initially suggested that public sector leaders should behave mainly as transformational leaders, moderately leveraging transactional relationships with their followers and heavily leveraging the importance of preserving integrity and ethics in the fulfillment of tasks (Orazi et al., 2013, p. 487). This perspective has changed to encouraging leaders to exhibit behaviours that reflect an integration of transformational and transactional leadership by ensuring the clarity of desired goals, motivating the followers' intrinsic motivation, recognition of accomplishments and rewarding high performance while adopting transactional interactions with subordinates (Morse, 2010; Orazi et al., 2013; Van Wart, 2003). Orazi et al. (2013) argue that it is the integrated approach that seems to be the future mainstream in public sector leadership styles and practices even though additional theories continue to emerge. A growing trend in the public sector leadership literature is an interest in dispersed and shared leadership, which emerge in networks of peer organizations and in collaborative governance arrangements (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Kellerman & Webster, 2002; Orazi et al., 2013, p. 497; Van Wart, 2013). This trend seems to reflect extant work in collaboration (Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Heenan, 1999; Huxham, 1993; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999), which is discussed in detail in section 2.5.1, but with a specific focus on the public sector.

Overall, the literature argues that the public sector context and associate constraints uniquely affect leadership and organizational effectiveness, thus requiring a model specific to the

public sector rather relying upon generalized leadership theory (Kellerman & Webster, 2002; Van Wart, 2003). The literature also shows that public sector leadership is emerging as a distinctive and separate field of study. However, like the broader leadership literature, the literature addressing public sector leadership is still rife with different definitions and descriptions of leadership styles and traits, without a coherent and universal unifying theory.

2.4 Leadership a Change of Focus

The understanding and study of leadership over the last century has generally been based on the idea of a formal leader who influences members of a group or organization, the followers, in order to achieve specified goals (Bryson et al., 2006; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Cleveland, 1972; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Huxham, 1993, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kanter, 1994; Longoria, 2005; Morse, 2010). Bennis (2007) supports this perspective, arguing “in its simplest form [leadership] is a tripod – a leader or leaders, followers, and a common goal they want to achieve” (p. 3). It is this framework, based on an underlying ontology that leadership involves leaders, followers and their shared goals that provides a consistent theme through the many and varied leadership theories (Huxham, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2003b). Using this ontology results in any discussion or examination of leadership must consist of leaders, followers and their shared goals (Bass, 2008; Burns, 1978; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Cleveland, 1972; Conger, 1999; Daft, 1999; Drath et al., 2008; Fry, 2003; Gardner, 1990; Heenan, 1999; House, 1996; Northouse, 2013; Rost, 1991; Rush et al., 1977; Smircich, 1982; Stogdill, 1950; Yukl, 2006). However, the environments within which leadership operates is increasingly becoming collaborative, even shared. When one considers the growing literature that views leadership as a social construct to

deal with this new environment, the three elements of the existing theoretical leadership framework (leader-follower-goal) may not always be appropriate to fully examine or explain leadership (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Archer & Cameron, 2009a; Campbell, 1991; Cleveland, 2002; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Drath et al., 2008; Huxham, 2005).

Another trend described in the literature is leadership as a bridging process. Bridging is the leadership work that connects different perspectives without merging them into a single point of view. Recognising the value of difference, this approach attempts to maintain the unique perspectives and capabilities found within each of the organizations that are collaborating, and as a result may develop nascent or proto-institutions (Armistead, Pettigrew, & Aves, 2007; Burns, 1978; Crosby, 2008; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Feldman, Khademian, Ingram, & Schneider, 2006; Finch, 1977; Longoria, 2005; Ospina & Foldy, 2010). This bridging process requires a particular type of leadership, called integrative leadership. Integrative leadership is, defined as “fostering collective action across boundaries to advance the common good” (Crosby, 2008, p. 1).

Integrated leadership considers leadership as a process, or functions that need to occur in order to have leadership, with leader behaviours being important as far as they are needed to initiate leadership. However, the focus of research remains on the leader and not leadership as a process in itself. Thus, simply using extant leadership frameworks to understand how leadership emerges in the inter-organizational collaborative context has two main problems. First, it is based on the assumption of the formal and static leader-follower construct. While it is possible to have hierarchical relationships in collaborative endeavours, the current literature on collaborative leadership focuses on leadership without formal leaders, or at least on the impact non-formal leaders have on the group (Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Gray, 1985;

Huxham, 2005; Rawlings, 2000; Silvia & McGuire, 2010; Sirman, 2008). While there is no consensus, there is a growing argument that suggests that inter-organizational collaboration results in the importance of formal hierarchical structure being minimized, if not eliminated. This would suggest that research on leadership, which has often depended on the underlying assumption of a formal organizational hierarchy and a formal leader-follower construct, may be limited in its ability to provide understanding and guidance on inter-organizational leadership (Drath et al., 2008; Huxham, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2003b).

The second problem is that many extant leadership concepts are centered on leaders who guide individuals and organizations towards specific identified goals. While collaborations may have specific goals that drive the collaboration, complex problems may not allow for a clearly defined goal, nor is it necessarily true that everyone shares or views those goals equally and/or participates solely for the accomplishment of the stated goals. A number of researchers point out that the strength of collaboration is that the different perspectives, abilities and organizational cultures of the members collaborating, almost guarantee that the participants will bring a wide variety of goals, constraints, and differing expectations to the collaboration. One of the main concerns is that collaborative groups are often seen as open systems with the possibility that membership of the group will change resulting in a level of ambiguity and instability regarding on who the members are. The lack of consistency in membership also makes specifying the aims of the collaborative group difficult. (Armistead et al., 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Gray, 2004; Hansen, 2009; Huxham, 1993, 2003; Kanter, 1994; Kossler, 2004; Rawlings, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a). Thus, concepts of leadership that begin from the

premise of specific goal attainment may have little utility in terms of understanding inter-organizational leadership (Day, 2001).

As leadership becomes increasingly peer-based and collaborative, it strains the existing framework of leader-follower-goal to a point where the two of the three elements, a formal leader and followers, are not always seen as appropriate. Even without a formal leader, using the leader-follower-goal framework brings with it the requirement of the need to identify someone as the leader; thus, the focus of the research remains on the leader, and not on if and how leadership emerges through social interaction. In order to examine and understand leadership in situations that may not have a formal leader a new framework is needed that examines leadership as a process, one that does not rely on the existing tripod but is applicable in collaborative, inter-organizational, non-hierarchical contexts, and that is able to separate the concepts of leader and leadership.

2.4.1 A framework for examining leadership

To fully examine leadership as a process, Drath et al. (2008) suggest that there is a need for a framework that does not rely on the paradigm of leader-follower-goals, but takes into account leadership as a social process. Such a perspective is based on examining leadership itself as the outcome, to examine “what makes things happen in a collaboration” with the achievement of the stated goals as a separate consideration, but is not the main focus (Huxham, 2005, p. 202; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a). Ospina and Foldy (2010) support the idea that leadership is a community process of meaning-making, which develops as the group sets direction, creates commitment and faces adaptive challenges. Hogan, Curphy & Hogan (1994) offer that “Leadership is persuasion, not domination ... leadership only occurs when others

willingly adopt, for a period of time, the goals of the group as their own” (p. 493). Thus, leadership is seen to be present, and as a result can be identified and confirmed, when the group, through interaction, achieves the three leadership outcomes of: 1. direction – the agreement within the group on overall goals, aims and mission; 2. alignment - the organization and coordination of knowledge, resources and work in the group; and 3. commitment – the willingness of members of the group to subsume their own interests and benefits within that of the group (Bradford Jr & Brown, 2007; Drath et al., 2008; Hackman & Wageman, 2005; Longoria, 2005; Rawlings, 2000; Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001)

A number of researchers (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; Campbell, 1991; Drath et al., 2008; Leithwood & Duke, 1998) provide a framework that could replace the current elements of the leadership tripod of leader-followers-goals. Agranoff and McGuire (2001) use the elements described as activation, framing, mobilization and synthesizing to define leadership. Campbell (1991) frames the actions of leadership in the narrative of actions, which focus resources to create desirable outcomes (p. 1). Leithwood (2004) contends that leadership in the organizational context performs three major functions: setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organisation. Drath and his associates (2008) have a similar framework consisting of three leadership outcomes: direction; alignment; and commitment. Each of these frameworks differ from the tripod by moving the focus from identifying the leader and then assessing the influence between leader and follower in order to achieve common goals, to one that examines how leadership, based on a number of identified elements, emerges within a group. The change in how leadership is viewed allows the researcher to examine the leader (an

individual) and leadership (a process) as two separate concepts, as well as exploring how the two are related.

This study uses the Drath et al. (2008) framework of direction, alignment and commitment as it provides a clear set of elements that can be used to analyse leadership. In applying the framework to shared leadership, Drath et al. (2008) point out that shared leadership is not where the leader role passes from one individual to another; rather it is seen as, to quote Pearce and Smith “a qualitatively different social process: interactive, collective influence. It is a social process that requires its own competencies, distinct from vertical leader competencies” (Cited in Drath et al., 2008, p. 639). Within this framework leadership is said to exist whenever one finds a group exhibiting direction, alignment and commitment. The three interrelated elements of direction, alignment and commitment are viewed as outcomes, which can be produced independently of one another; however, it is only when all three are realised is leadership said to be evident (Drath et al., 2008).

The three elements align with the literature examining what leadership is, or rather leadership as a result of the leader-follower interaction. Direction is described as establishing a shared direction. It includes focusing and clarifying goals, setting strategies and gaining agreement about the aim, vision and value of the group’s work or sense making. Alignment is the organization and coordination of work, knowledge and resources. It includes building teams, structuring work relationships, balancing and reconciling group resources and capabilities with environmental demands. Commitment is obtaining and maintaining the willingness of individuals to subsume their own goals to that of the group. Commitment establishes a sense of trust and collaboration where individual needs are met, often through the attainment of group

goals (Bass, 2008; Drath et al., 2008; Kotter, 1990; Northouse, 2013). Direction, alignment and commitment are produced by leadership practices which themselves are a reflection of leadership schemas. A leadership practice is described as those actions taken by the group which are aimed at producing direction, alignment and commitment. Leadership practices are collective efforts, not individual, that is actions of individuals are interpreted in relation to the group and identified by their reference to achieving specific outcomes – one or all of the leadership elements. For example, direction could be produced by brainstorming in order to develop a common understanding of the problem. Likewise, it could be achieved by assigning the leadership role to the team member with the expertise for that aspect of the problem and that individual articulates a vision on how the group should proceed. The difference in approach is largely a result of how individuals perceive the leadership practices should be enacted.

By examining how the leadership practices are enacted in order to achieve direction, alignment and commitment, the researcher is provided with a framework that not only accommodates existing practices but can identify new or evolving practices across different groups and organisations without changing the framework used to examine leadership (Drath et al., 2008, pp. 645-646). Using this framework, leadership can be understood by the tasks that must be achieved for leadership to occur (Campbell, 1991; Drath et al., 2008) and examined through the perceptions and actions of those individuals in the group who are able to accomplish the tasks. The framework assumes that individuals have beliefs about how and why it is needed to produce direction, alignment and commitment. Thus, beliefs can be viewed as individual schemas similar to those found in implicit leadership theory. These beliefs establish a disposition to behave in a certain way in order to achieve direction, alignment and commitment

(Drath et al., 2008). The framework assumes that when individuals work with other members of the group they act, at least in part, based on their individual beliefs. For example, an individual may believe that direction comes from a leader's vision, that work is distributed based on individual capacity rather than organizational responsibility, and commitment is best generated through trust built on personal relationships. These beliefs will influence how that individual sees leadership practises being developed and will drive the behaviour of that individual as the group develops leadership practices. By observing behaviours of individuals within the group, or by interviewing individuals about specific leadership events such as a group solving a problem, a researcher can identify not only the individual beliefs but examine how these the beliefs affect how direction, alignment and commitment are produced. How they are produced depends on the leadership beliefs and practices, which are moderated by a number of factors including: culture, situation and member traits. Collective leadership beliefs are developed by the integration of individual beliefs that are shared by others in the group. In mature groups the collective leadership beliefs could be relatively stable and comprehensive, while in new or ad hoc groups it can be developed over time as individuals learn about each other's beliefs and influence one another.

2.5 Shared Leadership.

Researchers and practitioners in the governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999; Linden, 2002), healthcare (Alexander et al., 2001; Mittman, 2004; Rubin, 2009) and even national security (Bradford Jr & Brown, 2007; Leslie et al., 2008) argue that collaboration is needed to solve complex problems, suggesting that a key element of collaboration may be shared leadership. The search for a new model of how leadership is

enacted is based on the argument that existing leadership models are products of top-down, bureaucratic processes built upon formal hierarchies, which are suited for relative stability. However, they are believed to be poorly suited for the paradigm of collaborative organizations solving complex problems, during times of crisis (Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Daft, 1999; Drath et al., 2008; Pearce, Conger, & Locke, 2008). As described by Cox, Pearce, & Perry (2003), shared leadership relies on an exchange of lateral influence among peers. They use the term shared leadership to underscore the condition in which members of teams collectively exert influence on other individuals within the team. An emerging theory, or rather a set of theories, that moves beyond the leading teams: theories of the past, shared leadership theory focuses on how inter-organizational collaborative teams solve complex problems (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Archer & Cameron, 2009b; Armistead et al., 2007; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Hansen, 2009; Huxham, 2005; Kanter, 1994; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Morse, 2010; Pearce et al., 2008; Rawlings, 2000; Sirman, 2008). In this sense, shared leadership is a “collaborative, emergent process of group interaction . . .” that occurs “through an unfolding series of fluid, situationally appropriate exchanges of lateral influence” or “as team members negotiate shared understandings about how to navigate decisions and exercise authority” (Cox et al., 2003, p. 53). Shared leadership is based on the notion that “power doesn’t reside in a single person or corner office. Rather power and responsibility are dispersed, giving the enterprise a whole constellation of co-stars or co-leaders with shared values and aspirations” (Heenan, 1999, p. 5), where the formal distinction between leaders and followers becomes blurred to the point of almost being meaningless.

From this perspective, there is no formal leader; rather, it is better viewed as a team of leaders, peers within the group. While the idea of collaborative relationships suggests that there is no formal chain of supervision, a deeper examination of the emerging frameworks shows that there is a clear chain of responsibility back to the parent organizations. Therefore, collaborative team members must deal with balancing the needs of the group within a shared leadership context and the needs of the parent organization within a classical formal hierarchical leadership context. This dual chain of responsibility often results in the team member not only influencing and being influenced by members of the team, but the individual influencing others outside of the team and in the parent organization.

While the idea of being a leader in a team of leaders may seem to be a paradox, academics and practitioners alike recognise that there are critical relationships that are outside of formal hierarchal systems. These relationships rely on interpersonal connections and require a horizontal style of management where leadership is based on expertise rather than on formal positions. In short, leadership in a collaborative context is about joint effort and ownership of the leadership process, in which the individual who is seen by the others in the group to have the necessary skills can be perceived as the leader (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bradford Jr & Brown, 2007; Bradford & Brown, 2008; Cleveland, 1972; Cohen, 2005; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Heenan, 1999; Huxham, 1993, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999; Kanter, 1994; Linden, 2002, p. 3; Litwak & Hylton, 1962; Rawlings, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2003b).

This perspective demands understanding leadership as a social process within a non-hierarchal system in which the classical leader-follower-goal construct may not be suitable.

Rather than focusing on the leader, as a formal position which may or may exist, it is necessary to examine leadership by focusing on the act itself, “the doing.” It is here that the use of Drath’s et al.’s (2008) direction, alignment and commitment framework to examine leadership appears to be more appropriate. It allows leadership to be examined by the acts that must enacted for leadership to occur and through those individuals who are seen by the members of the group to be able to realise the tasks, rather than attempting to identify an individual as the leader, formal or informal, who guides followers towards established goals.

2.6 Perceptions of Leadership

The examination of leadership has taken a number of approaches (Mervis & Rosch, 1981; Rosch & Mervis, 1975; Rosch, Mervis, Gray, Johnson, & Boyes-Braem, 1976; Rosch & Lloyd, 1978), yet a reoccurring theme from Stogdill (1948) to today has been an attempt to identify the traits and behaviours of effective leaders (Bass, 1990). It is how traits and behaviours have been examined that has changed. Moving from a focus on how the leader’s behaviour affects the follower, to an examination of the follower’s beliefs and perceptions of leadership, and how this influences both the leader and leadership has changed the understanding how traits are considered. Hofstede (1993) states that “managers derive their *raison d’etre* from the people managed” (p. 93), suggesting that it is the follower who allows the leader to be the leader. Gerstner and Day (1994) state that “subordinates’ perceptions of the leader can have a substantial impact on the outcomes of the leadership process” (p. 122) and argue that it is necessary to understand the interplay between perceptions of the followers and of the leaders. These two perspectives underline the shift in how a significant amount of the literature views and subsequently examines leadership. The shift is subtle, moving from a focus on the leader,

generally a formal leader, and how that individual influences others to achieve goals towards the examination of leadership as a social construct resulting from the interaction of individuals, where leadership is shared or where other members of the group identify an individual as a leader.

The social construct of the leadership is based in part by individually-held perceptions of group members, which involve a relationship that emerges when an individual perceives a group of individuals to be their followers or when members of a group begin to view themselves as led by an individual from that group. Thus, leadership is an ongoing, dynamic, two-way exchange between individuals that is structured by both parties' perceptions of each other as perceived through their individual implicit theories (Shamir, 2007).

2.6.1 Schemas and organisational culture.

Schein (2010) reminds the reader that organisational culture and leadership are both complicated topics, drawing themes from anthropology, sociology, social psychology, and cognitive psychology. With such a range of disciplines examining these topics, it is reasonable to assume that terminology may differ; therefore, it is important to ensure a common understanding of how these terms and concepts are used for this study. This section discusses and defines for the purposes of this study two aspects: schemas and organisational culture, both of which impact the study and specifically how leadership is examined.

2.6.1.1 Schemas.

Schemas represent how an individual makes sense of the world, that is, they reflect a knowledge of the co-occurrence of elements (behaviors, objects, features, etc.) that an individual has acquired through experience (Cohen & Ebbesen, 1979). Informally, a schema is a “pre-

existing assumption about the way the world is organized” (Axelrod, 1973, p. 1248). When new information is available an individual attempts to fit this new information into a pattern he or she has used in the past to interpret information about the same situation. Therefore, schemas can be defined as a knowledge structure or cognitive shortcuts that are used to simplify information processing; thereby allowing individuals to focus on the broader picture, or as described by Shondrick and Lord (2010) schemas are mental models.

Within the broader social-cognitive literature, one finds a number of terms that are used to explain this concept. These terms include prototype (Cantor & Mischel, 1977; Posner & Keele, 1970; Reed, 1972; Rosch & Lloyd, 1978), construct (Higgins & King, 1981), theme (Ostrom, Lingle, Pryor, & Geva, 1980), script (Schank & Abelson, 1977), and stereotypes (Hamilton, 1979). While there are differences amongst the terms, there is a common theme among them and that is they are used to describe how information is processed, categorized, understood and recalled from memory. This study uses the term schema. The reasoning for this choice is that the term prototype is generally used to describe a single individual or object. Construct and theme are used in other elements of the literature to describe broad ideas. Script is interpreted and used to describe the actions resulting from a schema or mental model. Stereotype has a number of negative connotations that potentially detract from the main argument and except when it is used explicitly to emphasise behaviour resulting from the schema, it is not used in this study.

Rosch and Mervis (1975) and Rosch (1978) provide a description of cognitive categories that are used as a common point of reference in much of the literature when discussing schemas. The term category is typically used to mean a number of objects that are considered equivalent,

and are generally designated by names – dog, animal, furniture. Taxonomy is a system by which categories are related to one another by means of class inclusion; the greater the inclusiveness of a category within a given taxonomy the higher the level of abstraction in the description used. Within this framework Rosch (1999) presents three levels of categorisation: superordinate, basic and subordinate. Superordinate level categories are the most abstract and inclusive as they have fewer common attributes than those at the basic level. An example of categorising an object at the superordinate level is furniture. The basic level is the most commonly used and, according to Shondrick and Lord (2010), the most useful for understanding one's world as it provides a level of detail not found at the superordinate level without being as exclusive as subordinate level. Chair is an example of an object categorised at the basic level, which falls under the broader set of furniture. The subordinate level categories are the most concrete and precise, thereby the most exclusive of the categories. Kitchen chair would be an example of this level. Therefore, an individual in a store looking for a chair would do so in the furniture department. Standing in the chair section the individual would categorise the various types of chairs – kitchen, living room, lounge chair etc., in order to choose the chair that he/she seeks. This concept of categorization can be extended to people. Rosch's (1978) research provides an explanation of this cognitive categorization suggesting that individuals (perceivers) encode initial person-based information that is used later for matching new information. Following this perspective, Cantor and Mischel (1979) argue that perceivers develop categories in which people can be grouped. Categories are defined in reference to schemas, which are the attributes most commonly shared by category members. Because classifying others into categories involves matching perceived characteristics

to the appropriate schema, schemas become a key construct for understanding an individual's perception as it relates to other people.

The use of categorisation and schemas is found in a number of areas, but those that have an impact on this study include Baldwin's (1992) relational schemas and the processing of social information, which shows people develop working mental models of their relationships that function as cognitive maps to help them navigate their social world. These cognitive structures are hypothesized to include images of self and other, along with a script for an expected pattern of interaction (behaviours), derived through generalization from repeated similar interpersonal experiences. Thus, schemas are developed through experience and as such can be refined as similar interactions are encountered and changed or new schemas developed as new situations are encountered. Schemas can be further refined through the acceptance of cultural norms and values (Baldwin, 1992; Lord et al., 1982; Rosch et al., 1976). The literature on relational schemas suggests that people react negatively to individuals and situations that do not conform to the behavioral expectations introduced by their personally-held schemas (Burgoon, 1993; Jackson, Sullivan, & Hodge, 1993). Research on behavioral expectancy violation has typically examined the consequences of people acting (in)consistently with schemas about particular social categories (e.g. race and gender), (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Howard & Renfrow, 2006). Extending this research, DeRue & Ashford, (2010) developed the concept of leadership-structure schemas, which examines whether informal leadership conforms to or violates individuals' leadership-structure schemas-driven expectations and how non-designated leaders behave can create variation in how the group reacts to non-designated leaders who engage in leadership behavior.

Most directly related to this study is the use of categorisation and schemas by Lord and his colleagues (1984; 1982) to develop a recognition-based theory of leadership that describes how categorization of individuals and the associated schemas influence perceptions and interactions with potential leaders. This aspect of schemas is described in detail in 2.6.2, implicit leadership theory.

2.6.1.2 **Organisational culture.**

Schein (2010) identifies four categories of culture: macro cultures, organisational cultures, subcultures and micro cultures. Macro cultures are national and ethnic based, but Schein also includes occupations that exist globally into this category. Organisational culture is used to define “all kinds of private, public, government and non-profit organisations” (Schein, 2010, p. 1), though he does note that some of the literature defines the private sector as corporate culture. Organisations can be divided by occupational groups that are found within the larger organisation resulting in subcultures. Micro cultures are small coherent units within the organisation, which differ from subcultures due to their specialisation and that they cut across occupational groups. For the purposes of this study, organisational culture is used as the main level to explore individual perspectives on leadership. Of note for this study, the use of micro culture is applicable when examining the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan as it was made up of individuals from across organisations.

Ayman and Korabik (2010) note that leadership researchers have used different definitions when referring to culture. In order to assist in providing a common understandings they offer Kluckhohn’s 1951 definition that “culture is an acquired and transmitted pattern of shared meaning, feeling, and behaviour that constitutes a distinctive human group” (p. 158).

This definition is supported by Lok and Crawford (2004) who offer that “organisational culture affects the way in which people consciously and subconsciously think, make decisions and ultimately the way in which they perceive, feel and act” (p. 323) and Hofstede (1980) who states that “culture consists of the unwritten rules of the social game. It is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishing the members of a group or category of people from others” (p. 3). Schein’s definition emphasises shared learning experiences that lead to shared, and eventually taken-for-granted assumptions that are held by members of the group. He continues that once the shared assumptions have come to be taken for granted, it shapes the behaviour, rules and norms of the group that are then passed onto newcomers as part of the socialisation process. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, Kluckhohn’s definition will be used as it is seen to be the definition that many are based on. The relationship between culture and schema is clearly articulated in the literature (Baldwin, 1992; Foti & Luch, 1992; Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Rosch, 1999), specifically the influence organisational culture can have on how leaders behave, think and make decisions (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, 1993; Lok & Crawford, 2004); therefore, individually-held schemas are likely to be influenced by the parent organisation of an individual, if that individual has been acculturated into the specific organisation.

2.6.2 Implicit leadership theory.

A growing body of literature based on categorization theory attempts to explain why some individuals are viewed as leaders while others are not (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Foti & Luch, 1992; Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord et al., 1986; Lord et al., 1984; Offermann, Kennedy Jr, & Wirtz, 1994; Pavitt & Sackaroff, 1990; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010). Derived from social cognition, leadership

categorization theory posits that individuals develop models of leaders that contain attributes and behaviours that reflect their belief of what is typical of leaders (Lord et al., 1986; Offermann et al., 1994; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010). This model, or schema, is an image that individuals hold about the traits and behaviours of leaders in general. The schema helps to explain, from the perspective of the observer, another person's behaviour. Depending on the literature, these models are labelled as schemas,¹² prototypes, prototypical models, exemplars or, the most commonly used term, implicit leadership theories.

As discussed in section 2.6.1.1 objects are categorized based upon their similarity or dissimilarity to mental abstractions (schemas). Within this schema-based approach to categorization, there is a three-level hierarchy that individuals use for classifying both objects and persons (Mervis & Rosch, 1981; Mischel, 1973; Rosch et al., 1976; Rosch & Lloyd, 1978). Consistent with the hierarchical structure proposed by categorization theory, the most general category of leader/non-leader is thought to constitute the superordinate or most inclusive level. Discrimination of different types of leaders (e.g. business, education, finance, labour, mass media, military, minority, political, religious, and sports) is found at the basic category level as the schemas contain contextual information, which can change what is seen to be desired of a leader in a particular setting. It is at this level that differences between categories are clear. Lastly, a more fine-grained distinction between leaders (liberal versus conservative political leader) may be found at the subordinate level (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Shondrick, 2011). The literature agrees that basic-level categories tend to be used by individuals when categorising people, because the basic level strikes the best balance between distinct, non-

¹² This research uses the term schema, as it serves to differentiate the individually held perception, a key construct in the theory, from that of the theory of implicit leadership itself, and is seen to be viewed similarly across a number of disciplines.

overlapping superordinate categories and rich, vivid subordinate categories. Building on Rosch's theory of cognitive categorisation, Lord and his colleagues (Lord et al., 2001; Lord et al., 1986; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Naidoo, Kohari, Lord, & DuBois, 2010; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010) developed a recognition-based theory of leadership that describes how categorization influences one's perceptions, memory, and interactions with a potential leader. According to this theory, when we encounter a person we engage in search for a match between the behaviours of the person being observed with the individually-held schema. If the search produces a match to a leader category, then the person is perceived as being a leader. Thus, leaders are recognised based on the fit between an observed person's behaviour and the perceiver's schema of what leaders are. Research has indicated that individuals rely on these schemas to process social information and make judgements about leaders (Lord et al., 2001; Naidoo et al., 2010).

Called implicit leadership theory, the underlying idea is that individuals have implicit beliefs, convictions and assumptions, called schemas,¹³ regarding behaviours that differentiate a leader from a non-leader (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002; Lord et al., 2001; Lord et al., 1986; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Naidoo et al., 2010; Rush et al., 1977). The two major assertions of implicit leadership theory are: firstly that accepted leaders are perceived to have leadership qualities based upon the level of similarity between their behaviours and the schema held by the follower; and secondly, that the schemas constrain, moderate, and guide the acceptance of leaders, the perception of leaders, and the degree of status and privileges available to leaders. Early studies viewed schemas as static, inflexible and

¹³ The literature by Lord uses the terms prototype, however, to be consistent the term schema is used for this study.

generalizable, resulting in an abstract representation of the leader and leadership (Lord et al., 1986; Lord et al., 1984; Lord et al., 1982; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010). It portrays an individual constantly sorting others into superordinate, then basic and perhaps subordinate categories (Lord et al., 2001; Lord et al., 1986; Rush et al., 1977). Recently, some of the original researchers of implicit leadership theory have suggested that “no single prototype or style of leadership applies to all situations; positing that that leadership schemas depend upon innumerable situational and contextual factors related both to the leader being perceived and to the broader external environment” (Lord et al., 2001, p. 311). Noting that this would lead to the need to have “an improbably large number of such relatively fixed [schemas] to provide sufficient flexibility in perceiving leadership” (Lord et al., 2001, p. 311), and that individuals would need extensive experiences in a wide range of situations to develop appropriate schemas, Lord et al. (2001) suggest that leadership perception is a two-stage process, which first requires schema activation, and then the schema is compared (matched) to the individual being observed. Confident that the matching aspects of implicit leadership theory are proven, Lord et al. (2001) offer that how the schema is generated requires closer examination. Proposing that the schema can be represented as a network of associated behaviours desired in a leader, Lord et al. (2001) offer a new theory in which schemas are dynamic, flexible, sensitive to contexts, and capable of operating within the real-time constraints of social interactions. Rather than a static schema or a large series of schemas, this new model suggests that individual schemas are influenced by contextual constraints. In this situation, it is posited that the level of importance given to each desired leadership behaviour held within an individual’s schema, or in some cases the inclusion of a new behaviour into the schema, is influenced by the contextual constraints of culture, the

leader, the follower and the current task(s). Thus, the schema is generated by an individual taking into consideration the contextual constraints then determining which group or pattern of behaviours are desired of a leader in this context. Once generated, the schema is used to categorise individuals as leader or not based on how well the perceived individual's behaviour matches the schema. The result is that rather than schemas being static and slow to change, leadership schemas are "generated on-the-fly to correspond to the requirements of different contexts, tasks, subordinates, or maturational stages of a group or organization" (Lord et al., 2001, p. 314).

As general theories of leadership continue to evolve beyond a focus on hierarchical organizations towards those that conceptualise leadership as a process that sees shared leadership in which multiple individuals are associated with leadership roles, leader assessment and research tools have been re-examined for impact and relevance (Shondrick & Lord, 2010). Within the context of shared leadership, leadership is seen as a dynamic construct in which leadership emerges amongst a number of individuals and the role of leader can change over time (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Friedrich, Vessey, Schuelke, Ruark, & Mumford, 2009; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio, & Cavarretta, 2009; Pearce et al., 2008; Shondrick & Lord, 2010; Uhl-Bien, 2006). This perspective creates challenges for researchers who rely on retrospective questionnaires to capture the leadership process because such tools rely on semantic memory and reflect the assumption that leadership is portrayed by a single individual in a generally stable environment. This perspective tends to focus on a list of behaviours or characteristics of the formal leader. Another issue, caused by using semantic memory, is that schemas can cause pattern completions which fill in gaps in the perceived

behaviours of leaders resulting in inappropriate inferences and generalizations. As shown in studies, schemas relying on semantic memory can interfere with the ability to distinguish between observed and prototypical behaviour (Shondrick & Lord, 2010).

In order to overcome the challenge of semantic memory, Shondrick et al. (2010) suggest focusing on event-level evaluations of demonstrated behaviour rather than on overall trait-based judgments which result from a general description of behaviour. This shift to a context-based assessment approach is supported by Hofstede (1993), Lord et al. (2001), and Naidoo et al. (2010), who all argue that earlier work on schemas relied on semantic memories, which are less accurate than those relying on episodic memory. Shondrick et al. (2010) also acknowledge that the schemas for shared or collaborative leadership differ from schemas for traditional hierarchical leadership. This refinement in the theory is reflected in recent literature by some of the original implicit leadership theory researchers who suggest the need for a more contextualized approach when examining leadership (Boland & Bilimoria, 2011; Lord et al., 2001).

2.6.2.1 Research into Implicit Leadership Theory

Lord (2000) notes that current instruments used to study implicit leadership theory (schemas) use a combination of surveys and interviews, with quantitative methods relying on semantic memory being predominant. The traditional approach to eliciting implicit theories asks participants to generate lists of characteristics, attributes or behaviours in response to a single cue (e.g., “leader”). The list is consolidated by the researcher(s) removing behaviours and combining like words to develop a list of characteristics. Researchers then use the list with a second set of participants to confirm and refine the listed characteristics. This approach fails to take into account characteristics that may be generated due to a specific situation by the second

group. While it can be that these lists contain those characteristics central to the individually-held schema being researched, there is a concern expressed in the literature (Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord et al., 2001; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Mervis & Rosch, 1981; Naidoo et al., 2010; Rush et al., 1977) that certain characteristics of the schema may still exist without surfacing, due to poor memory search or lack of involvement in the procedures and, therefore, limit the ability to fully explore the individual schema. By developing instruments that focus on episodic memory, which uses specific examples and instances of leadership, researchers are able to capture spontaneous characteristics and examine if context shapes individual schemas.

Surveys consist of a number of traits and characteristics; however, there is no single and widely accepted measure or scale. Different researchers have developed independent lists of traits to measure the schemas,¹⁴ and as such cases of replication and scale cross-validation are difficult. A survey of the literature shows a number of different lists. Lord et al.'s (1984) scale comprises 59 items, Schien's Descriptive Index (SDI) (Schein, 1973; Deal & Stevenson, 1998) has 92 items, Offermann et al.'s (1994) scale has 41 items, and Epitropaki and Martin's (2004) scale has 21 items characterizing leaders. The Lord and Offerman lists have been adapted by others over the past couple of decades (Boland & Bilimoria, 2011), so it is possible to find similarities among the traits identified by different studies. This allows, with some synthesis and interpretation, as done by Epitropaki and Martin (2004), the development of a list that reflects the major aspects of the seminal lists and could be used in future surveys or as an initial framework for coding interviews. However, this does not resolve the conflation of leader and leadership, nor does it deal with the issues surrounding semantic memory. Regardless of the

¹⁴ See Appendix H for a comparison of the list of traits used.

factors used, one criticism that remains is that many of the lists were developed using undergraduate students in laboratory experiments. The use of these participants, lacking leadership experience in the specific contexts being studied, may make the schema overly generalizable, potentially prejudicing the lists in favour of the universality of the schemas. This makes Offermann et al.'s (1994) study of particular interest because it used samples of both undergraduate students and organizational members. It is also one of the few studies to identify context specific factors of individually-held leadership schemas; therefore, it moves beyond individual subcomponents into more collective perceptions of leadership schemas. Building on Offermann et al. (1994), Epitropaki and Martin (2004) developed a simpler list, updating concepts and ideas relating to leadership.

Boland and Bilimoria (2011) argue that asking participants to list characteristics of leadership or complete a survey produces results that may not be framed within a particular context, or may reflect participants framing the results in different contexts. They add that the inability to elaborate upon an item, or describe the characteristics in reference to a particular situation not only leads to generalization but relies on semantic rather than on episodic memory. Lord et al. (2011) and Naidoo et al. (2010) suggest that the use of a survey may capture the named trait or behaviour within the individually-held schema, however, in an inter-organizational context how that named trait or behaviour is perceived or operationalised within the group can differ between individuals. For example, *provides direction* may be seen as a leadership behaviour by participants from two different organisations; however, how that direction is implemented is potentially different, with one participant being more directive and authoritarian, whilst the second participant more collaborative and consensus driven. Hougue

and Lord (2007) and Boland and Bilimoria (2011) argue that when individuals are selecting a leader it is generally done in a particular context, suggesting that a context-free survey is not the optimal approach. Another concern regarding the extant lists is they were generated decades ago and may not take into account changing perspectives of leadership. This is of specific concern with developing concepts such as emergent and shared leadership within the contemporary human security environment.

In examining individually-held schemas it is noted that traits do not represent something inherent in an individual; rather, a trait is a perceptual abstraction used to make sense of behaviours exhibited by leaders (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). Pavitt and Sackaroff (1990) suggest that behaviour and trait are linked within the schema as co-variation beliefs. They suggest that one aspect of categorising an individual is that traits are inferred through observed behaviour. Thus, it is the behaviour, not the traits, of the individual that is compared against the schema. However, the difference between trait and behaviour is nuanced to the point that participants in any study are likely to use both traits and behaviours interchangeably when describing leaders. Therefore, the relationship between the two must be clear to the researcher when developing a specific study.

2.6.2.2 Impact of culture.

Viewed through a cross-cultural lens, leadership is even a more complicated and challenging phenomenon (Dorfman & House, 2004). Dickson, Den Hartog, and Mitchelson (2003) posit that adding a cross-cultural factor to the mix of leadership research makes examining the whole process even more difficult. However, given the different organizational cultures found within inter-organizational groups in general, and specifically within the Whole of

Government context, the influence of organisational culture is worth examining. Organizational culture was discussed above (see 2.6.1.2). This study uses the following definition, “culture is an acquired and transmitted pattern of shared meaning, feeling, and behaviour that constitutes a distinctive human group” (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 158).

As part of the GLOBE study on leadership, House et al. (2002) provide a conceptual model that argues that “the attributes and entities that distinguish a given culture from other cultures are predictive of the practices of organizations and leader attributes and behaviours that are most frequently enacted, accepted in that culture” (p. 8). The GLOBE researchers posit that the impact of organisational culture on leaders and leadership are interactive; that is, they influence each other. Specifically, the model has a number of propositions, which consider both societal as well as organisational cultures. The model suggests that: 1. leaders influence the organisational culture and practises as the leaders establish and either maintain or change the culture of the organisation that they lead; 2. organisational culture and practices affect what leaders do. Leaders in organisations respond to the organisational culture and alter their behaviours and leadership styles to align what is viewed as acceptable by the organisation; 3. Culturally specific leader schemas are developed in each culture in response to both societal and organisational cultures; 4. leaders are selected and adjust their behaviours to meet the requirements of the organisation. Leader attributes and behaviours that are congruent with the organisational espoused schemas will be more accepted than leader attributes and behaviours that are not congruent (House et al., 2002, p. 8). Since this study is focused on three government

departments all of which have the same societal culture, only the relationships between leaders, leadership and organisational culture will be discussed.¹⁵

In summary, House et al. (2002) argue that “the attributes and practices that distinguish cultures from each other are predictive of leader attributes and behaviours, and organisational practices that are most frequently perceived as acceptable are most frequently enacted” (p. 9). The GLOBE study is based on the premise that leader effectiveness is contextual in that it is “embedded in societal and organisational norms, values and beliefs of the people being led” (House et al., 2002, p. 10). This perspective supports the main themes espoused in implicit leadership theory and acknowledges that individual schemas both influence and are influenced by organisational culture and behaviour. It also reaffirms that different organisations will have different organisational cultures, which defines what is deemed to be acceptable behaviour of members of the organisation, and of importance for this study, the behaviours of the leaders. Therefore, as individuals work within a given organisation their experiences with leaders and how leadership is enacted will take place within the specific culture, which then helps to define the individual leader and leadership schemas. What is unclear is the extent of differences between organisational cultures, in particular between the organisations used for this study.

Winslow (2005) offers that there are cultural differences between the organizations working within a Whole of Government context, and that these differences can act as barriers to working effectively together. She attributes the cause of the differences to the fact that individuals from political, developmental, and military organizations interpret the world through

¹⁵ The study focus is on leader and leadership perceptions of the participants, which are focused inwards amongst the group; therefore, when discussing culture it is the culture of the organisation from which the participants of the study are drawn. The fact that the participants are all Canadians working in an international coalition of differing cultures, in addition to working in Afghanistan though important the cultural aspects relating to leader and leadership perceptions are not considered as applicable to this study.

the lens of their own organization's culture. A lack of understanding of others' culturally-shaped perspectives can result in misunderstandings, poor coordination, and even opposition between organizations, often resulting in negative stereotypes (Duffey, 2002) and eventually a lack of collaboration. Stewart, Wright and Proud's (2004) research suggest that differences in organizational culture between militaries and NGOs may be the cause of the differences in the ideologies and behaviour of individuals within each group. They posit that these fundamental differences are such that they are likely to "cause significant rifts in both individual and organisational relations" (p. 16). They also noted differences between militaries and humanitarian organizations with respect to how leadership is enacted. All of this reinforces the idea that leadership schemas are, at least in part, shaped by the organizational culture of the individual and that an examination and understanding of differences and similarities in schemas across the different organisations is required.

2.6.2.3 **Universality of schemas.**

Notwithstanding the differences in organizational culture, there is some evidence that suggests that leadership schemas are broad and universal, shared among a range of individuals (House et al., 2002; Offermann et al., 1994). In support of the universal leadership behaviour proposition, Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) found collectivistic cultures provide a more effective environment for the cultivation of transformational leaders. Bass (1997) argued the transformational components of charisma, namely, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, are almost universally effective. Supporting this argument, the GLOBE Study¹⁶

¹⁶This hypothesis was tested in 62 cultures as part of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Research Program. The results support the hypothesis that specific aspects of charismatic/transformational leadership are strongly and universally endorsed across cultures (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999).

identified charismatic, value-based leadership and team-oriented leadership as nearly universal attributes to outstanding leadership. However, the GLOBE study also identifies attributes that are culturally sensitive and as such, not universal (Javidan, House, & Dorfman, 2004). Bass (1995) shows that transformational leadership is preferred and effective world-wide; however, he also notes that the specifics of how transformational leadership is enacted can vary. Campbell (2005) describes nine universal leadership competencies that he argues transcends cultural differences. Dickson et al (2012) offer that when “viewed from a level of abstraction, there are aspects of leadership that appear to be universal across cultures” (p. 491). What is not clear in the literature is whether the schemas are universal at the superordinate or basic level. When examining schemas at the superordinate level there is support for the universality of schemas, but as discussed above, this level of schema is broad and the most inclusive of the three levels of schema, and as such may not capture some of the cultural differences in understanding and meaning of the terms used to define the behaviours. This suggests that while certain attributes or behaviours found within leader and leadership schemas may be seen as universal, this does not translate into the entire schema being universal. In order for a schema to be universal there must be congruence at least at the superordinate level and for true universality at the basic level. It is clear that more research into comparing and contrasting schemas at both the superordinate and basic level is required.

2.6.2.4 Culturally influenced schemas.

House et al. (1997) and Smith (1997) cautioned that behaviours have different meanings in different cultures. Smith argued that while Bass and Avolio (1993) provided a strong

argument for the effectiveness of charismatic leadership as a universal leadership behaviour, the research instruments they relied on were of Western design and assumed universal meaning and application of behaviours. This suggests that while charisma may be a universal leadership quality, its meaning and how it is assigned to leaders is based on culturally-specific behaviours. Thus, the challenge in using leadership behaviours to analyze cross-cultural leadership processes is the culturally-specific interpretations assigned to these behaviours (House et al., 1997; Smith, 1997). Dickson et al. (2003) and Lonner (1980) agree, stating that leader behaviours can be both universal and culturally contingent. That is to say, a specific behaviour can be universal in the broadest sense or definition, with the definition or how the behaviour is enacted differing based on cultural characteristics. This perspective mirrors the categorisation levels discussed earlier, where the superordinate level of an individually-held schema (e.g., a typical leader) appears to be relatively resistant to cultural differences, whilst the basic-level categorical instances of a leader tend to differ depending on the organization. For instance, using the leader behaviour of making a decision, Solano (2006) found that how making a decision is enacted differed between organizational cultures. In one context, the ideal leader may be someone who is participative, democratic, and has a high regard for followers' welfare, yet in a different organisation, the ideal leader is someone who makes self-focused autocratic decisions.

From a research design perspective, the fact that leader behaviours can be both universal and culturally contingent has several implications. First, interpretations of individually-held schemas need to be qualified by the level of schema used (i.e., basic, superordinate, or subordinate). Secondly, it suggests that while surveys may capture the universal or superordinate level behaviours, they may not be effective in capturing the cultural nuances of

how the behaviour is enacted or defined, thereby suggesting a level of concurrence between organizations that does not really exist. Qualitative interviews offer the potential to identify such differences in how the behaviour is enacted and viewed through by the respondents.

Notwithstanding the possibility of universal behaviours, overall research in the area of implicit leadership theory acknowledges that culture does influence schemas. Specifically, research suggests that cultural forces influence the kind of leader behaviour generally accepted, enacted, and perceived as effective within a group or collective (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Thus, leadership behaviour consistent with the values of the organisation are seen to be more acceptable and effective, compared with those behaviours conflicting with the organisation's values. It is because of cultural congruence that leadership violations of cultural norms can produce dissatisfaction, conflict, and resistance, as well as lower performance from the group (House et al., 2004). Within this paradigm, when members strongly identify with a group, constraints from the group may alter the schema guiding social interactions and perceptions of leadership (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003; Giessner, van Knippenberg, & Sleebos, 2009; Hogg, 2001; Lord et al., 2001; Shondrick & Lord, 2010; van Quaquebeke, van Knippenberg, & Brodbeck, 2011). Pavitt and Sackaroff (1990) suggest that when examining leadership it is important to determine the defining characteristics of leadership that are considered relevant by the group. This approach identifies those behaviours that should be performed if a group member wishes to be perceived as a leader by other members of the group. Of note, Pavitt and Sackaroff (1990) argue that the validity of the list can only be assured if the members are from the same cultural group and that a change in cultural group requires a new list of leader-related behaviours (p. 388). Such a perspective is shared by Lord et al. (2001)

who argue that leadership schemas are dynamic, which change over time, across contexts, and vary across perceivers. This would suggest that members of an ad hoc inter-organizational group would begin with differing and perhaps conflicting schemas of leadership and leader behaviour; however, over time the individual schemas could evolve to one that is consistent for that specific group. It also suggests that extant behaviour lists may not be suitable for inter-organizational groups, further arguing for a qualitative interview approach versus a quantitative survey-based research methodology.

2.7 Inter-organizational Collaboration.

When examining collaboration, the literature shows an evolution from cooperation to integrated collaboration and a shift of focus from intra-organizational to inter-organizational collaboration. A key element found across the literature is the need for leadership to ensure effective collaboration takes place (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Archer & Cameron, 2009b; Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2007; Burns, 1978; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Daft, 1999; Gray, 2004; Hosking, 1988; Huxham, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Northouse, 2013), yet the focus of many researchers remains on the leader-follower-goal framework, specifically on how the leader, often at the organizational level, can shape the environment to allow the collaboration process to occur. This approach leaves research at the inter-organisational collaborative group level lacking. This section will review the literature focusing on inter-organizational collaboration in order to identify the current understanding and gaps in leadership theory,

2.7.1 Collaboration.

The term collaborative leadership describes an evolving body of theory that is focused on the leadership needed to deliver results across organizational boundaries. The use of the terms

collaboration and collaborative leadership is mixed within much of the literature requiring a clear understanding of the term used and its meaning. This section will examine collaboration, with collaborative leadership examined below.

Whilst its roots can be linked to the conflict management literature, referring to a method by which competing interests reach win-win outcomes, the term collaboration as a separate area of study started to appear regularly in the mid-1990s (Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999). Interest in this area was in response to the growth of strategic alliances between private corporations, and the formation of long term public-private partnership contracts to rebuild public infrastructure, as well as the increased globalisation of corporations resulting in a steady growth of inter-organization collaborations (Heenan, 1999; Huxham, 1993; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1999; Kanter, 1994; King, 1997; Yukl, 1998). But defining what is meant by collaboration remains difficult. Longoria (2005) identified fifteen definitions of collaboration, while Mattessich and Monsey (1992) examined 133 publications, finding multiple definitions, and characterized most of the literature on collaboration as *how to manuals*. Even the most basic terminology needed to frame the subject being studied is subject to differing interpretations with little agreement over usage of terms such as partnership, alliance, collaboration, network, cooperation, coordination, participation, synchronisation or inter-organizational relations (Archer & Cameron, 2009a; Armistead et al., 2007; Chrislip, 2002; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Friedrich et al., 2009; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Korman, 1966; Nielsen, 2004; Rawlings, 2000; Sirman, 2008). The problem of defining collaboration is made more difficult as organizations, with different organizational cultures and perspectives on how collaboration should occur, attempt to collaborate (Connelly, 2007; Longoria, 2005). Thus, just attempting to standardize the term

collaboration is difficult as there does not appear to be a unified understanding of the concept. The fact that a number of terms are often used interchangeably within the literature, without clear delineation of meaning, simply compounds the problem further, making it difficult for both researchers and practitioners to study and engage in inter-organizational collaboration.

In part, this fragmentation of thought can be attributed to the varied foci of the authors and researchers involved. In examining the literature one finds collaborative leadership, or a term that approximates it, coming from a large number of disciplinary perspectives including sociology, business policy, economics, economic geography, public policy, politics and management, and across all five major sectors of society — business, government, nonprofits, media, and community (Bryson et al., 2006; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Connelly, 2007; Huxham, 2005). This suggests that while the study of collaborative leadership is developing, it is not yet a coherent school of thought.

2.7.2 Inter-organizational collaboration.

Notwithstanding the lack of a common lexicon and framework, there is general consensus that collaboration can be distilled into one of two broad themes. The first theme focuses on internal or cross-functional teams¹⁷ found within an organization. The cross-functional perspective is identified by the focus on a formal leadership structure, but can vary in how much the leader turns to the team members for input and assistance. Regardless of the amount of autonomy given to team members, the team is nested into a formal organizational structure with a formal leader. In this model, the emphasis is on sharing of power, or making the process more democratic; however, the formal leader remains a key element. Although the

¹⁷ The terms teams and groups are used interchangeably within much of the literature. While it is understood that a team may be a more mature evolution of group, within a group dynamics perspective, for this study the two terms are seen as being the same.

members of the team come from different departments, or functional areas, they tend to belong to the same organization and as such the goals, values and ethos are similar and membership is non-discretionary.¹⁸

The second theme examines inter-organizational systems focusing on organizations that collaborate in order to accomplish a common goal. The challenge with examining this model is summarised by Connelly (2007) who noted that “leadership in regards to inter-organizational systems is often mentioned but rarely studied” (p. 1). While there is a developing body of literature concerning collaborative leadership a unified theory specifically dealing with how leadership in the collaborative inter-organizational group is perceived is not well developed.¹⁹ A consistent theme throughout the literature is that inter-organisational collaborative teams are likely to be made up of members who see themselves as peers, with differing values and organizational identities, and even possibly different goals, often working without a formal leader, and each member influencing leader and leadership perceptions. In such an environment, leadership can be shared across the group members, often with membership in the group being discretionary and at times transitory. The inter-organisational group is often working within a set of constraints and restraints established by leaders in the parent organisations. These distinctions are important because they focus how leadership within the inter-organisational collaborative context is examined, specifically which leadership theories are seen to be of use to

¹⁸ It is acknowledged that different departments and/or functional areas within an organization may have different goals, values, ethos in short culture, which at times can be very pronounced; however, the organization’s goals, theories and ethos should, in theory, mitigate these differences. For the purposes of the study organisation is defined at the departmental level and therefore this assumption is believed to be valid in that individuals from the same department share a common culture. This assumption is supported by the literature discussed previously on culture.

¹⁹ Chrislip and Larson (1994) and Chrislip (2002) offer guidance for collaborative civic leaders; Linden (2002) describes qualities of government and non-profit leaders engaged in cross-agency collaboration; Armistead (2007) examines collaboration from a leadership perspective within the framework of complex partnerships; and Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2005), provide a widely cited cross-sector collaboration framework;

the researcher and which behaviours and approaches are seen as important to the group members.

Leadership is necessary, or at least perceived as necessary, for success (Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2007; Burns, 1978; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Daft, 1999; Northouse, 2013); therefore, a key element identified across much of the literature is the need for leadership to ensure effective collaboration takes place. While many extant leadership theories may be useful for examining leadership at the parent organisational level, a growing amount of the literature suggests that older models and theories of leadership are ineffective in studying leadership within the inter-organisational group. To deal with this perceived shortfall researchers are looking for a new framework which moves from defining leadership in terms of the leader-follower-goal and allow for the study and understanding of leadership within the collaborative environment (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Archer & Cameron, 2009b; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Cleveland, 2002; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Drath et al., 2008; Higgs, 2003; Huxham, 1993; Kanter, 1994; Leslie et al., 2008; Pearce et al., 2008).

2.7.3 Collaborative leadership.

To operate within an inter-organizational framework, members need to balance team and individual decision making with the desired team results and interdependencies among members. This means that individuals are working towards a team goal based on individual understanding of the shared vision (Rawlings, 2000, para 4). It is the possibility that individual team members may hold different perspectives of how the problem is interpreted that needs to be considered in any theory used to examine this phenomenon. Rod Newing (2007) offers that “if collaboration is to be effective, each party must recognise and respect the different culture of the other.” Thus,

setting direction by sense making so that all members, regardless of cultural perspective or bias, are solving the same problem and ensuring that resources are aligned in order to do so become key leadership tasks. A constructionist perspective of leadership defines this task as a community process of meaning-making, which unfolds as the group sets direction, creates commitment and faces adaptive challenges (Drath et al., 2008; Drath & Palus, 1994; Ospina & Foldy, 2010). Within the collaborative team, the process of meaning-making does not occur solely in the mind of one individual, and while it is influenced by individual perceptions, it occurs as part of the relationship and interaction between members of the group (Merron, Fisher, & Torbert, 1987; Ospina & Foldy, 2010). Leadership is widely seen as a critical ingredient in bringing parties to the table and for steering them through the collaborative process. Thus, leadership can be seen as the action, the doing, or a set of functions that results in guiding the group process of sense making (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Drath et al., 2008; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Lasker, Weiss, & Miller, 2001; Linden, 2002; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Sirman, 2008; Smith & Foti, 1998; Vangen & Huxham, 2003b).

Chrislip and Larson (2002) agree that leadership in a collaborative situation is different from leadership in single organisational situations; in short, it needs leaders who can safeguard the process and facilitate interaction of the group members. The focus on process is echoed by others who suggest that leadership is one way to think about how the various elements of the collaborative process can be brought together (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bryson et al., 2006; Finch, 1977; Huxham, 2003; Linden, 2002). In fact, much of the literature on inter-organizational collaboration, in particular the more recent public sector and governance literature, underscores the importance of the process and associated structural arrangements (Ansell & Gash, 2008;

Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Huxham, 1993, 2005; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kellerman & Webster, 2002; Morse, 2010; Ospina & Foldy, 2010; Provan & Kenis, 2008; Sirman, 2008; Van Wart, 2003). Vangen and Huxham's (2003a) work, which is used as a foundational piece for much of the recent literature on collaboration, provides a structural perspective by examining the medium through which leaders work. They posit that leadership is operationalised through "three interconnected media: structures, processes, and participants" (p. 263). This framework views leadership as managing power, controlling the agenda and developing policy to frame the collaboration. While the participants are viewed as influencing the collaborative structure and processes, they are still seen as part of the process. This suggests that there are multiple levels of leadership within the collaborative context and that leadership can be viewed as a social construct, which is generated between participants (participants and process), but is also bounded by a framework policy (structure and process) agreed to by the organizations and generated by the formal leader.

What is common in all of the above is best summarised by Day (2001) who states that "leadership is more than just a set of skills or traits attributed to an individual; it can also be viewed as a social process resulting from the interaction among individuals" (p. 583). This perspective is supported by Schyns, et al. (2011) and Bolden and Gosling (2006) who note that the social context of leadership has received considerably less attention in research than individual leadership studies, suggesting that there is a growing recognition of the need for research that examines leadership as a social construct. Grint (2010) acknowledges that leadership is defined differently in the literature and that these differences make a coherent study or discussion of leadership difficult. In order to provide some clarity, he suggests that in

examining and discussing leadership one must be clear which form of leadership is being discussed. He provides a fourfold typology that he states covers “a significant portion of our definitions of leadership” (Grint, 2010, p. 2), which uses the main themes found in leadership literature. His typology consists of four forms of leadership: 1. leadership as a position, based on where the leader operates that makes him/her the leader; 2. leadership as a person, based on who the leader is that makes him/her the leader; 3. leadership as a result, based on what the leader achieves that makes them the leader; and 4. leadership as a process, based on how leaders get things done. Regardless of the author, by describing leadership as a process helps to separate leadership and leader into two separate concepts, and reinforces the need to have a framework that examines leadership as a process and not simply the actions of a leader.

2.7.4 The collaborative leader.

While collaborative leadership theories continue to evolve, they tend to be based upon a rigid definition of leader – follower relationship founded on a hierarchal model. However, if the terms leader and follower are taken more broadly and applied in the sense of a leader as the individual displaying behaviours that ensures leadership occurs, then a number of extant concepts are useful in examining leadership in an inter-organizational group (Bass, 1995; Daft, 1999; Gardner, 1995; Gardner, 1990; Northouse, 2013; Rost, 1991; Yukl, 2006). When examining what a collaborative leader is, or rather what are the behaviours desired of a collaborative leader, one of the simplest explanations comes from Rubin (2009) who stated, “you are a collaborative leader once you have accepted responsibility for building - or helping to ensure the success of a heterogeneous team to accomplish a shared purpose” (p. 2). This definition contains a number of elements found across the literature that differentiate

collaborative leadership from other leadership theories. First, the fundamental nature of collaboration is that it is a joint activity, often voluntary at the organisational level, based on a relational system among two or more organizations resulting in a heterogeneous team. Second, an intentional planning and design process results in mutually defined and shared organizational goals and objectives that no matter how vague they may be, that provide the reason for the collaboration. Finally, structural properties emerge from the relationship between organizations, which can include a shared responsibility for leading, and a shared purpose.

Huxham (2000) suggests that when organisations collaborate there is the possibility of multiple levels, or focus areas, within the collaborative context, each level interacting with each one another. The top level is focused on governance issues and is associated with the parent organizations. The literature suggests that collaborative governance requires specific types of leadership. Ryan (2001) blends Huxham's framework with elements of a behavioural approach to leadership, identifying three components of effective collaborative leadership which helps to define the leaders' actions needed to occur at the parent organisation to ensure a successful collaboration: adequate management of the collaborative process (p. 230); maintaining technical credibility (p. 214), and ensuring that the collaborative group is empowered to make credible and convincing decisions that are acceptable to all (p. 241). Using Huxham's (2003) definition that leadership is what "makes things happen" (p. 63), governance shapes the conditions within which the collaborative group will work by determining such key factors as who may have an influence on shaping a partnership agenda, who may have power to act, what resources may be tapped, and who fills the formal leadership positions. Huxham (2005) suggests that it is the leaders in the parent organizations who first recognise the need for collaboration, then agree to

find ways to allow the organizations to work together. These individuals become champions in their own organization for the collaboration focusing on the process of how to collaborate, how to empower members of the collaborative group and ensure their involvement, and then mobilize them to move the collaboration forward. Chrislip and Larson (1994) echo this role describing the collaborative leader as “a steward of the process who focuses on promoting and safeguarding the process rather than on individual leaders taking decisive action” (p. 125). Morse (2010) describes the champion as a catalyst reducing bureaucratic obstacles that would stop or slow down potential reactions, making them facilitators of integration. Connelly (2007) suggests that this role is an opportunity for organizational leaders to shape agendas and allocate resources. The parent organization level framing is important as “people [directly] involved in collaborations do not recognise these as special organizational forms that are inherently more problematic to manage” (Huxham, 2005, p. 34). Of note, the roles and responsibilities associated with the parent organisation level are closer to those of a manager than those of a leader, with the focus on the management of organizational boundaries (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978; Finch, 1977). Within the Whole of Government context, this level of leader would be found within the different departments with the responsibility to develop the policies, strategies and process then find and apply the resources to allow collaboration to occur in the field.

Huxham’s second level focuses on the actual participants who conduct the face-to-face collaboration. It is here that the concept of equals takes form. Power does not reside in a single person; rather, power and responsibility associated with a formal leader are dispersed among group members with shared values and aspirations (Heenan, 1999). The equal status of group members highlights the fluidity of how leadership is enacted, furthering the notion that one

individual does not remain *the leader*, that leadership is shared and evolutionary, depending on the given nature of the structure determined by the parent organisation (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Connelly, 2007; Morse, 2010). This perspective appears to borrow from emergent leadership theory, but one can see elements from implicit, charismatic and even trait and situational leadership theories reflecting the behaviourist approach of the literature (for explanation see Bass, 2008; Daft, 1999; Northouse, 2013; Rost, 1991).

Connelly (2007) points out that leadership in the inter-organizational context differs in two other distinct ways that warrant investigation: issues of organizational culture, and formal and informal power/authority relationships, including organizational structure [or the lack thereof] in the inter-organizational setting (p. 1246). This perspective is supported by those who suggest that examining informal or emergent leaders (Daft, 1999; Hosking, 1988; Yukl, 2006) or elements from leaderless teams (Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Sommer, 1961; Taggar, Hackew, & Saha, 1999; Wolff, Pescosolido, & Druskat, 2002) are of greater relevance to the study of collaborative leadership than focusing on notions of hierarchy.

2.8 Whole of Government Approach

Extant literature discussing a Whole of Government approach is primarily found in political science, professional military journals or governmental documents. These venues are focused on improving the inter-governmental processes and procedures drawn primarily from lessons learned during recent or ongoing collaborations. However, these different domains have slightly different foci and as such different definitions and perspectives on the use of the whole of government approach. Political science tends to focus on the public service and governance generally with a domestic focus ((Bakvis, 2002; Christensen & Lægreid, 2007; Goldsmith &

Eggers, 2004; Guston, 2001; Hancock, 2011a, 2011b; Linden, 2002; Morse, 2010; Provan & Kenis, 2008; Rubin, 2009; Ryan, 2001; Sproule-Jones, 2000). For government reviews and documents the focus is on process, structure and accountability (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/ppg-cpr/frame-cadre-eng.aspx>; www.international.gc.ca/americas-ameriques/gov_gov.aspx?lang=eng; www.clerk.gc.ca/eng/feature.asp?pageId=349).

Professional military journals focus on integrating all aspects of national power to resolve complex problems through intervention off-shore (Bradford & Brown, 2008; Brown, Adams, Authority, & Febraro, 2010; Capstick, 2006; Fitz-Gerald, 2005; Gordon, 2006; Horn, 2006; King & Murray, 2001; Olson & Gregorian, 2007; Organization for Economic Co-Operations and Development, 2006; Vandahl, 2007). This study uses the whole of government approach focused on integrating aspects of national power to resolve complex problems off-shore. This literature is useful for two reasons: first for framing the operational context of this study; and secondly, to underscore the importance, from a practitioner's perspective, of inter-organizational collaboration and the desire to improve it (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Provan & Kenis, 2008). Thus, part of the rationale for the study becomes linking academic research to practical application.

Within the international human security domain, it is recognized that preventing and resolving conflict does not reside within a single organisation or department, but requires an approach which includes all the capabilities and competencies provided through what is termed a whole of government approach (Fitz-Gerald, 2005; Leslie et al., 2008). Roots of conflict now involve ethnic, religious, ideological and material causes, and as a result Canada and a number of Western countries have adopted a holistic strategy that incorporates diplomacy, defence and

development designed to resolve these complex problems. In dealing with contemporary conflicts a whole of government approach is critical because missions in complex security environments require the coordinated and collaborative efforts of all instruments of national and coalition power and influence in order to achieve the desired results (Department of National Defence, 2007).

In its International Policy Statement (IPS) released in April 2005, the Canadian government articulated the value of such an approach, stating the need for cross-departmental cooperation among National Defence (DND), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The central theme of the International Policy Statement is that Canada should adopt a whole of government approach to global challenges. Initially called the 3D + C (Diplomacy, Development, Defence, and Commerce) under the Paul Martin government, it was formally ratified under the term *Whole of Government* by the Harper government. The underlying tenet of a whole of government approach is to use military, political and humanitarian/development instruments in a synchronized and holistic manner to achieve stability in conflict-affected countries (Olson & Gregorian, 2007). Such an approach demands that governmental departments coordinate their actions in order to achieve a common goal and increase the impact of Canadian efforts (St-Louis & Michel-Henri, 2008). The combination of these three departments interacting dynamically “in a virtuous circle of cause and effect” where security is the prerequisite for effective governance and sustainable development, which in turn provides lasting security and results in a synergistic effect designed to resolve complex problems (The Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan, 2008, p. 11). The concept became fact during the Canadian mission to Afghanistan

with the establishment of the strategic advisory team in Afghanistan (SAT-A), then the provincial reconstruction team (PRT) in Kandahar, and finally the stabilization and reconstruction task force (START) in Ottawa. Notwithstanding concerns that progress in Afghanistan had been slow, the Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan (2008) reported that "for once, our defence, diplomacy and development assistance are all pointed at the same problem" (p. 4).

Although inter-organizational collaboration as framed in the whole of government approach has the potential to provide reinforcing synergies, such collaboration can also be more complicated than a single lead organization (Vandahl, 2007). At the organizational level, a range of factors have the potential to impact collaboration and are the focus of much of the study and thought in this area. These factors include differences in organizational culture (Duffey, 2000; English, 2004; Stewart, Wright, & Proud, 2004; Winslow, 2002), organizational structure (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Chief of Review Services, 2007; Horn, 2006; Olson & Gregorian, 2007; Scoppio, Idzenga, Miklas, & Tremblay, 2009; Winslow, 2002) and differing goals (Gordon, 2006; Olson & Gregorian, 2007; Winslow, 2002). Each of these factors provides unique perspectives on the challenges of a Whole of Government approach and offer a range of suggestions on how to best implement the concept. One area being studied is how to mitigate the negative impact these factors can have on collaboration. As will be developed later, these factors also influence how effective leader behaviour is described, perceived and measured as well as how leadership as a process is envisioned and implemented.

More recently, there has been a growing body of literature that examines whole of government from an academic perspective. Within this current work there is an examination of

organizational and individual behaviours, decision making, as well as perceptions of other actors; however, until recently this research tended to focus on the military and NGO dynamics and not on the Whole of Government actors as it relates to leadership (Dr. L Bentley, personal communication, May 2012; Dr. A Okros, personal communication, Mar 2012). A recent Defence Research and Development Canada review by Brown and Adams (2010) exploring the Whole of Government approach suggests that “working to understand how best to help diverse [Whole of Government] partners to understand the lens of the other [organisations] will be critical to future collaborative efforts” (p.42), underscore the need for further research, specifically in assisting collaborative partners to understand each other’s perceptions, organizational culture and actions.

2.9 Findings from the Literature Review.

This review of the literature suggests a number of reoccurring themes from which assumptions for this research are developed; they are presented below as a list for ease of reading and referencing later:

1. Due to increasing globalization, technology, and new organizational forms, groups of individuals who have historically been kept apart are now increasingly working together in organizational settings. Often these groups have differing organizational cultures, which influence how they perceive the world around them. This world view includes how they perceive and solve problems, and how they perceive the group should be led.
2. Collaboration is becoming more necessary in both the private and public domains, with inter-organizational collaboration relevant for this research. The term

collaborative leadership describes an evolving body of theory that is focused on the leadership needed to deliver results within an inter-organisational group through the formation and implementation of policy and an activity agenda. The focus on the leadership process, or how the elements of leadership are defined, is a major element in the literature. The need to examine leadership in the inter-organizational collaborative group, where the focus is on leadership, rather than on a formal leader, is evident in the literature. However, the use of theories that define and examine leadership using the leader-follower-goal framework may not be suitable in an environment where the conventional terms of leader and follower are not appropriate.

3. Inter-organizational collaborative groups are different than formal organizational hierarchies, and therefore may require leaders to exercise different skills and approaches to leading the inter-organisational group. The literature examines inter-organizational collaboration in two ways that are of import to this research: the first is the focus on leadership. Seen as an emergent process that is socially constructed by the group, the focus on goal achievement found in many extant leadership theories may not be appropriate. Therefore, from a research perspective the focus of study should first be on how leadership is viewed by the members of the group. In answering this question for groups from different organizational cultures, it is necessary to determine if a leader and leadership are perceived differently based on organizational affiliation. Then how leadership emerges as a social construct among members of an inter-organisational group that are

responsible to both the group and to their respective parent organizations. The second area to consider is the role of the parent organisations in establishing the conditions within which the collaborative group will work, and how the parent organisations support or restrain the group's activities. From a research perspective it is important to identify the influence that the parent organisations have at the different stages of development of the collaborative group to determine if the influence affects how leadership is enacted.

4. Implicit leadership theory reveals how schemas are important mental models that provide a predictive quality to both leadership perceptions and leadership emergence. When applied to a group operating within collaborative context, the practical importance of understanding how behaviour influences the group and the emergence of the leadership process is clear; however, the impact of differing schemas on group interaction and leadership within the inter-organisational group remains uncertain. As noted in 2.4.6, although the use of a survey remains an important research instrument it may not provide insight into differences between participants in how the behaviours are enacted and fails to take into account context. The literature suggests that the use of a qualitative approach using methods, such as interviews, which focus on episodic memory and uses a specific situation or event, creates a common context amongst participants and allows for a detailed exploration of meaning and perception across participants.
5. There are a number of organisational factors that have been suggested to account for variability in individual leader and leadership schemas. These include context,

hierarchical level, as well as societal and organizational culture. Cultural meanings are well established within mature organisations and they are shown to influence specific traits and behaviours expected from leaders within that organisational context. Organisational culture influences what individuals of that organisation perceive as normal and the correct way to do things. It shapes expectations of behaviour and processes within the organisation as the members of that organisation perceive problems then attempt to solve them. These perceptions include expectations of leaders and their behaviours within the organisation. Schemas are individual cognitive models that are formed through experience and influenced by culture. Taking these two concepts together, schemas are shaped by the organisational culture or, more precisely, leader and leadership schemas are shaped by the experiences individuals have when dealing with leaders within their organisational setting. The actions and behaviours of the leaders establish what is considered the “right way” within the organisation and as such shapes or establishes a leadership schema held by the individual. Thus, different leader and leadership schemas may occur in differing cultural profiles.

6. Although cross-cultural research emphasizes that different cultural groups are likely to have different perceptions of what leadership entails, this view is not consistent throughout the literature. What is consistent in the literature is that the superordinate level of a schema (i.e., a typical leader or the functions of leadership) appears to be relatively resistant to cultural differences and may offer a universal schema; however, how leadership is enacted may differ depending on the culture of

the organisation making the idea of a universal schema unachievable. The literature also agrees that basic-level categorical instances of a leader (e.g., military leaders or developmental leaders) tend to differ. The differences in schema are attributed to the differences in organisational culture and how that culture influences leader behaviour. This would suggest that in order to identify differences in schemas between organisations the researcher would need to examine the basic level schema.

7. The predominant use of the leader-follower-goal framework to study leadership not only constrains the researcher but also blurs any difference between leader and leadership as separate concepts. By focusing on leadership as the outcome, the framework consisting of direction, alignment and commitment, has the potential to determine how this occurs in a collaborative group, with or without a formal leader, and without being tied to and biased by the leader-follower-goal paradigm. By using such a framework, leadership can be understood by the tasks that must be achieved for leadership to occur and examined from the perspective of the individuals who are seen by the members of the group to be able to realise the tasks. The literature suggests that leadership can be viewed as a social construct, which is shaped by individual beliefs of what leadership is and how leadership should be enacted. This would suggest that in order to fully examine inter-organizational collaborative leadership within the whole of government context, individual beliefs on leadership are important considerations to understand. In

examining these beliefs, it is important to understand how the individual perceives both the leader and leadership.

8. There is debate in the literature regarding the impact of context or the situation has on schemas; specifically, if schemas are dynamic or static in nature. A static schema model would suggest that an individual has a number of discrete schemas, which are applied to specific situational contexts, resulting in either a large number of schemas, or schemas that are simplified due to heuristics to stereotype models. Dynamic schemas are argued to be more flexible and adaptive shaped by the contextual constraints. This uncertainty of the nature of schemas is one gap in the literature that needs to be examined.

9. The literature agrees that gender impacts on leadership. What is not clear in the literature is to what extent gender influences leader schemas within an organisational setting, suggesting that the acculturation process will reduce or remove differences in schemas based on gender. There is a growing body of literature that suggests that effective leaders adopt the best of the other sex's qualities, that is to say that effective leaders' behaviours are androgynous. This shift towards transformational leadership and an androgynous leader is likely, over time, to influence how individuals view leaders and leadership and as a result reduce or perhaps eliminate differences based on gender. However, at present, the literature suggests that regardless of the level of acculturation, as a general concept leadership and leaders continue to be viewed as masculine.

3 Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Introduction.

This chapter provides information on the qualitative approach used in this study, specifically the phenomenological approach, and the rationale for using this approach. It begins with an explanation of the research design and rationale behind the research plan and procedures used. It then explains how the participants were selected, showing that the number of participants interviewed is consistent with extant literature. The methods and procedures that were used to collect and analyse the data are then explained, including details about how each of the research questions were analysed.

3.2 Purpose.

The primary question that this study addresses is “how do differing leadership schemas impact on leadership within an inter-organizational group?” The question is answered by examining the how leaders and leadership are perceived from first a general organizational based perspective and then within a specific collaborative situation involving three diverse Government of Canada departments. In order to address the research question, a number of subordinate questions were designed in to examine specific aspects of the research question in detail. The subordinate questions used were:

- 1 What are the individually-held leadership schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) are universal and which (if any) are organizationally culturally contingent?

- 2 What are the individually-held leader schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are universal and which (if any) are organizational culturally contingent?
- 3 Does working in an inter-organisational group change behaviour outside of the schema identified within the organisational context? What can be said about how this context affected the schemas?
- 4 How did leadership develop within the inter-organisational group that is used for this study?

3.3 Research Design and Rationale

A qualitative, phenomenological approach was used for this idiographic study. “Qualitative research involves broadly stated questions about human experiences and realities, studied through sustained contact with people in their natural environments, generating rich, descriptive data that helps us to understand their experiences and attitudes” (Rees, 1996, p. 375). Rather than presenting the results in the form of statistics, qualitative research produces words in the form of comments and statements. A phenomenological approach to research is a particular type of qualitative research methodology in which human experiences are examined and interpreted by the researcher to better understand how the participant makes sense of and conceptualises an event, situation or concept (Patton, 1990). Its aim is to discover individual perspectives and experiences from the participants’ own point of view rather than from that of the researcher (Babbie, 2007; Patton, 1990). The objective is not to generalise the findings, but is to offer insights relevant to a particular context; for this study, the intent is to understand how

the members of the whole of government group in Afghanistan during the period 2005 to 2011 perceived leaders and leadership.

As a method, the phenomenological approach involves studying a small number of participants to identify patterns and relationships of meaning in order to understand how participants make sense of a specific event. Therefore, the context is important to the interpretation of data, as this approach requires that the researcher attempt to achieve a sense of the meaning that the participants give to their experience in a specific situation (Patton, 1990). The phenomenological approach was appropriate for this study because it allowed the development of themes based on the examination and analysis of the perceptions and insights of the participants within a specific context, and as such was determined to be the best method to capture the perceptions of the whole of government group members. The study used a qualitative approach to obtain an understanding of individual perceptions of leaders and leadership (individually-held leader and leadership schemas). Data for a qualitative study can consist of interview transcripts, field notes from observations, a wide variety of records and historical documents, and memoranda, each of them treated to rigorous ongoing analysis. For this study, transcripts resulting from interviews were used. Given that the mission to Afghanistan occurred very recently, other records and historical documents were either not available or, if available, did not address the research areas of the study. In order to gain insight into the meaning of the participant's experiences, three part of the research process were blended throughout the study: collection, coding, and analysis of data.

Collection of the data was accomplished through semi-structured individual interviews. Boland and Bilimoria (2011) state that asking participants to list characteristics of leadership, or

to complete a survey, often produces responses independent of the situation that may have influenced them. They add that the inability of participants to elaborate upon an item, or describe the characteristics, in reference to a particular situation, not only leads to generalization but relies on the use of semantic vice episodic memory (see also Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord et al., 1982; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010). Lord et al. (2011) and Naidoo et al. (2010) suggest that while a survey may capture the named trait or behaviour within a schema, within an inter-organizational group how that named trait or behaviour is enacted can differ between individuals. For example, the behaviour *provides direction* may be seen as a desired leadership behaviour by two participants; however, how that direction is enacted is potentially different. One participant may mean the leader is directive and authoritarian; while the other participant's expectation is that the leader is collaborative and consensus driven. Both behaviours are consistent with the desirable behaviour of providing direction, but the differing responses obtained from the interviews provide insight into how the behaviour is enacted, how it is viewed from the participant's perspective and how that behaviour aligns with individually-held schemas and other details that might not be elicited using a survey. To further underscore the importance of context, Hougue and Lord (2007), and Boland and Bilimoria (2011), argue that when individuals are selecting a leader it is generally done in a particular context; therefore, to draw out individual schemas that are contextually based, interviews were used rather than surveys. The interview questions were developed to answer the subordinate research questions by eliciting responses in the form of narratives to obtain personal perceptions about leaders and leadership from a context free perspective, within the context of the parent organisation, and then within the context of the inter-organisational group. The use of interview questions that focused

on specific events overcomes the challenge of semantic memory, which is deemed to be less accurate than episodic memory for the articulation of schemas (Hofstede, 1993; Lord et al., 2001)

3.4 Development of Questions

The primary research question that this study addresses is “how do differing leadership schemas impact on leadership within an inter-organizational group?” As indicated in section 1.3 a number of subordinate questions were developed to answer this question. This section describes how the subordinate questions were developed; then an explanation of how the interview questions were developed to elicit the information from the participants to answer each of the subordinate questions is provided. To answer the primary question it was necessary to determine if the participants’ individually-held schemas were different from each other, and if so identify the extent of those differences. To add to the difficulty in answering this question, the literature suggests that individuals may have separate schemas for leadership and leader (Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord et al., 1982; Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Rush et al., 1977; Shondrick & Lord, 2010); therefore, it was necessary to determine if this was true and, if so, identify the extent of any differences between the individually-held leader and leadership schemas. The first two subordinate questions, one to examine individually-held leadership schemas and one to examine individually-held leader schemas, were developed to provide the necessary information to answer these questions.

To identify the individually-held schemas it was important to understand how the participants perceived what constitutes effective leadership and an effective leader respectively. To obtain these perceptions interview questions were designed to elicit descriptions of personally

experienced examples of leadership and then to obtain a description of an individual the participant categorised as a leader. To capture the perceptions of leadership participants were asked to recount an example of when they believed they viewed leadership within their own organisation. This initial question provided the opportunity for the participant to use episodic memory and describe, in a narrative form, a specific example without the need for them to develop a formal definition of leadership. Using the same situation, they were asked to provide a description of what the leader did and what behaviours the leader displayed. By introducing a question using the same event, but focusing on the leader, the response was used to determine if the participants actually differentiated between leadership as a process and leader as a person. That is to say, did they hold a separate schema for each? By using the term “effectively lead” the question shaped the description to ensure a common approach across the participants. By limiting the example to the participant’s own organisation permitted examination of perceptions based on organisational affiliation and allowed comparison of the participant’s description with responses by other participants from both the same and different organisations, thereby, allowing the researcher to determine areas of commonality and differences within the same organisation and then between organisation-affiliated groups. This also provided a baseline when the participants were asked to describe their organisation to individuals from the other two organisations in later questions. To obtain the data from a different perspective, the participants were asked to describe a situation where they believed they demonstrated leadership and to describe what characteristics or behaviours they displayed. As with the initial question set, the participant was required to describe in narrative form how they demonstrated leadership, and then what characteristics or behaviours they displayed while doing so. The final question in this

series was to have the participant describe a situation where they believed that they were ineffectively led or viewed a poor leader. This provided a third perspective, with the understanding that the negative descriptions would be opposite of effective leadership or an effective leader. By using the same example to describe both leadership and a leader, the questions allowed the participant to describe what occurred in the group and what an individual they labelled as leader did, without having to consciously differentiate between the terms leader and leadership, or attempt to actually define the terms. This design was used to elicit what process was used by the group, what were the steps taken to enact leadership, and to gain insight into the relationship among the members of the group. That is to say, what happened and how did it happen. The use of these three questions, all of which resulted in the participant describing the same phenomenon but within different situations, not only allowed for comparison within the same interview and as such reinforcing the strength and richness of the data (Glaser & Strauss, 2009; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006), it allowed for the examination of the impact of context and identification of universal aspects of the two schemas. The specific interview questions to obtain this information were:

1. Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organization? What were the characteristics of the leader? What did they do?
2. Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
3. Can you describe for me an interaction in which you feel you were ineffectively led? What do you think the problem was?
4. How would you describe the purpose of leadership within your own organization?

5. What do you expect from leaders?

The responses to these questions provided the information needed to capture individual schemas at the superordinate level. To define the basic level schemas the participants were asked to describe their perceptions of leaders and leadership from the other organisations involved in the inter-organisational group being studied. By adding the modifier military, DFAIT and CIDA in front of the terms leader and leadership, the participant's basic level schemas were identified and then examined. To provide a common context across the participants these questions were asked within the context of the situation studied for this research, that is the provincial reconstruction team in Afghanistan. The specific questions designed to obtain this information were:

1. Can you give me examples where you saw the (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach leadership?
2. How would you describe (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach to leadership? Did you see differences in how the military, DFAIT and CIDA approach leadership? How so?
3. How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader?
4. If you were responsible to select a leader for a whole of government team what would be important to consider?

As outlined above, when describing the leader the focus was on what an individual did. Without the researcher referring to a specific individual or position as leader, the response to the questions started with the participant having to identify who they believed the leader was in a specific situation and within a specific organisation. In categorising a specific individual as a leader and then describing the behaviours that individual displayed, the participant was

articulating their individually-held schema for a leader. This also allowed for the individual being described to be either a formal or an informal leader. When describing leadership, the focus of the individual narrative was again on what occurred and how the participant perceived leadership to have been enacted or how individuals from a specific organisation conducted leadership. Thus, the focus was on what happened in the group, either as a result of being directed by the leader or as a result of the group developing what needed to be accomplished.

One of the gaps identified in the literature review was the uncertainty if schemas are static or dynamic, or if they are contextually based. In order to gain insight into this aspect of leader and leadership schemas it was necessary to determine if working in an inter-organisational group changed the leader and leadership schemas identified within the organisational context. Subordinate question 3, “Does working in an inter-organisational group change behaviour outside of the schema identified within the organisational context” was developed to determine if individual schemas changed or if new schemas developed as a result of the new situation; specifically, working the inter-organisational group. This question was also designed to determine if this was an approach participants used to mitigate any negative impact differing schemas may have had on leadership within the inter-organisational group. The idea of mitigating the impact of differences was also addressed by examining how did leadership develop, or rather, how was it enacted within the inter-organisational group specific for this study. Question 3 examines behaviour, and looks for changes in expected behaviour of the leader. The changes in expected behaviour were drawn from a description of what the participants perceived to be the necessary behaviours of a leader in the inter-organisational context, and then comparing this set of behaviours with that of the baseline superordinate and

basic schemas developed in the first two questions. To elicit the response participants were asked:

1. If you were responsible to select a leader for a whole of government team what would be important to consider?
2. Are qualities of a leader in the whole of government context different that your own environment? How so?

As in the previous set of interview questions, leadership was considered separately from those questions related to the leader, with the focus on process, interaction within the group and how leadership was enacted. To obtain this information, participants were asked:

1. What is the purpose of leadership in a group?
2. You are in charge of a whole of government team what do you do to solve a problem?

In order to compare the individual schemas related to leadership as a process, the last subordinate research question, “how did leadership develop within the inter-organisational group that is used for this study,” was asked. This question allowed participants to describe how leadership as a process was developed and enacted within the inter-organisational group. This question also provided insight into how effective the participants perceived leadership to be within the inter-organisational group.

1. What were some of the big things that happened in ... (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul).
2. Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership during one of the major activities that occurred in the ... (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul).
 - a. How did leadership work in (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul)?
 - b. Did it change over time? How?

- c. How do you define leadership?
- d. How do you view the purpose of leadership in a group?

Interview Questions

As described above, specific interview questions were developed in order to obtain the insights and perceptions of the participants, which could then be used to analyse and answer the research questions. The interview questions were designed to provide two different approaches to obtain participant perceptions of leaders and leadership: the first was a narrative format, which resulted in the participant telling a leadership story. The narrative responses were obtained by asking the participant to recall a specific event, or situation, and describe the applicable leader and leadership aspects relating to that event. Therefore, the interview question “can you tell me about a time you were ineffectively led” draws on the participant’s episodic memory providing a contextualized approach when examining leadership (Boland & Bilimoria, 2011; Lord et al., 2001). The second approach was a direct question asking the participant to state the characteristics of a leader or elements of leadership. The responses to the second approach were closer to what would be found in a survey and resulted in a list or short bullet-like statements, which was useful in establishing trends or common themes at the basic level of categorisation. A list of the questions is attached as Appendix D. The relationship between the interview questions and specific the research questions is shown at Appendix A. Note that in a number of cases a single interview question was designed to draw information that could be used to answer a number of subordinate research questions.

3.5 Population and Sample

To select the participants, purposive sampling was used. Purposive (or criteria based) sampling involves selecting participants based on criteria relevant to the topic the researcher wishes to examine. This strategy allows the researcher to obtain information that cannot be obtained as well from other sources or methods as it provides a fairly homogeneous sample (Bickman & Rog, 1998; Patton, 1990). The logic of finding a fairly homogeneous sample is to find a group for whom the research questions would be meaningful and to provide a common context for comparison between participants from different organisations but within a similar situation (Smith, 2007). As the study explored perceptions of leaders and leadership within an inter-organisational group it was necessary to find an inter-organisational group from which the researcher could identify willing and knowledgeable participants. For focus, and to provide a common context, the Canadian Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan was selected as the common experience, using the following three criteria:

1. the participant had to have been a member of the Canadian mission to Afghanistan;
2. the participant had to have experience in collaborating with one of the other organizations;
3. the participant had to be acknowledged as the lead, or had filled a senior position, of his/her organisation in the whole of government team. For the military this meant the participant was a commander or senior staff officer. For DFAIT and CIDA this meant the participant was a civilian lead, a lead for their organisation

within the provincial reconstruction team, or the officer responsible for a specific file/project.

Initial participants were acquired through the researcher's professional contacts developed in Afghanistan as a military planner and in Canada as the curriculum developer and instructor for graduate level courses specialising in operational and strategic planning within the whole of government context.²⁰ This initial entry point was used to develop a list of additional participants based on their previous employment as members of the Canadian mission in Afghanistan. The criteria outlined above limited the potential list of participants to the number of individuals who actually participated in this mission in the required roles or positions and could be contacted. The exact numbers of participants who met criteria listed above is unclear as a consolidated list was not accessible to the researcher, however, based on a number of documents²¹ it is estimated that approximately 125 Canadian civilians participated as members of the provincial reconstruction team during this period. When the requirement to be a lead within their organisation or file was applied the number of potential participants was reduced to approximately 40 individuals. At the end of the snowballing the researcher was able to identify a pool of 37 potential participants who met the criteria (14 military, 13 DFAIT and 10 CIDA). Using the list of potential participants, prospective participants were contacted by email. The email contained both an explanation of the research project and a request to participate (the participant information letter can be found at Appendix B). Once agreement to participate was received, the consent form (see Appendix C) was sent electronically and collected at the

²⁰ Discussion of impact of the researcher's background on the study can be found in section 3.7.10.

²¹ The researcher was unable to obtain a consolidated listing of personal, therefore, the estimate was developed using a number of government and academic sources. The sources include (Gammer, 2013; Hampson & Maule, 1993; Marten, 2010; <http://www.international.gc.ca/afghanistan/history-historie.aspx?lang=eng>; The Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan, 2008)

interview, or consent was taken verbally at the start of the interview. Of note, the number of participants for each organisation was limited to those available and responded to the request for participation. CIDA and the military participants were particularly difficult to access. Of the 37 potential participants identified, 9 military, 8 DFAIT and 6 CIDA agreed to be interviewed. Of the participants contacted, 2 CIDA, 2 DFAIT and 1 Military participant declined to invitation to be involved in the study. The reasons given for declining to participate were: CIDA - not being comfortable with discussing leadership within the provincial reconstruction team; CIDA - did not believe that their insights to be of any value; DFAIT - was moving and could not afford the time to participate; DFAIT – no reason given; and MILITARY – did not wish to share his experiences. Additionally, 4 military and 3 DFAIT participants identified during the snowballing could not be contacted or due to operational reasons could not be interviewed.

3.6 Specific Context of the Study

Babbie (2007) and Patton (1990) state that the objective of qualitative research is not to generalise, but is to offer insights relevant to a particular context.²² Lord et al. (2001; 1984), Lord and Shondrick (2011) and Rosch and Lloyd (1978) agree that individually-held leader and leadership schemas need to be examined within a specific context. The objective of this qualitative study is to understand how participants' perceptions of leaders and leadership influence leadership within an inter-organisational group. The specific context used for this study was the Canadian mission to Afghanistan. This section provides a brief overview of the context from which the participants' narratives are drawn. The decision to use the provincial reconstruction team in Afghanistan as the context was based on three factors. First, the

²² The object is not to generalise findings and insights, however, this study proposes that the framework and methods used to examine leader and leadership schemas could be generalised and used for future studies.

researcher had personal knowledge of the mission, both as a military officer deployed to Afghanistan as well as an academic researching and teaching inter-organisational planning and collaboration to both civilian and military audiences. Secondly, the researcher had access to a number of senior military and civilian participants who supported the research; it was believed that access that would be difficult to replicate in another organisation given the constrained timeframe of a PhD. Lastly, it was an area of study that was of personal and professional interest to the researcher and supported by the Canadian Forces.²³

The participants were members of one of three Government of Canada departments: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) or the Canadian Armed Forces (Military). A key element of the Canadian government's response to assisting the international effort in Afghanistan was the Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). The Canadian PRT was one of 25 provincial reconstruction teams, each commanded and manned by different troop contributing nations to the NATO lead international stability mission throughout the country. Introduced by the United States government to support reconstruction efforts in unstable states, the PRT was established to perform duties ranging from humanitarian work to the training of police and the military.²⁴ The specific goals for the Canadian mission in Afghanistan were government assigned projects and to establish security and governance conditions, all of which were expected to take several years to accomplish.

The Canadian led Kandahar PRT was composed of a total of 330–335 personnel during

²³ Given the knowledge and interest of the researcher in this subject care was taken to mitigate researcher imposed bias onto the analysis. The steps taken to mitigate is bias are described in section 3.7.10.

²⁴ For more details on the provincial reconstruction team see <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2007/05/23/provincial-reconstruction-teams-prt>, accessed 10 Dec 2014; <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2007/issue3/english/art2.html>, access 10 Dec 2014.

each rotation. Intended to reflect the whole of government approach to stability reconstruction and development, the PRT consisted largely of Canadian Forces personnel (315), but also included personnel from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Corrections Canada officers, and development specialists from the Canadian International Development Agency, and members from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).²⁵ However, only the Canadian Forces, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Canadian International Development Agency had members of the PRT throughout the life of the mission and as such could provide a large enough pool from which to obtain participants. The length of assignment to the provincial reconstruction team for the military participants was six to nine months and nine months to a year for CIDA and DFAIT participants.

Working in austere conditions, the members of the PRT faced danger throughout the mission. From February 2002 until the writing of this study, 158 Canadian soldiers, along with one senior Foreign Affairs official and four Canadian civilians were killed in Afghanistan due to hostile circumstances.

3.7 Methods

A semi-structured interview format was used to encourage participants to speak openly and freely, and to elaborate on their perceptions and experiences regarding collaborative leadership and leaders. Follow-up questions were used to determine the strategies that participants employed to build, maintain, and re-establish leadership, and to obtain greater clarity to initial responses. Follow-up questions were not planned but were developed at the time of the

²⁵ The civilian or non-military components of the provincial reconstruction team started with 5 in 2005. It was reduced to two police officers in 2006, later growing to 11 in 2007, then 20 in 2008 and 2009, topping out at 60 in 2010. The composition of the civilian changed with each rotation, but over the deployments of the PRT personnel from DFAIT, CIDA, RCMP, Corrections Services Canada, and CSIS participated, CIDA and DFAIT were the only consistent civilian members (Gammer, 2013; The Independent Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan, 2008)

interview. All participants were asked the planned questions listed in Appendix D. An extract from the transcripts of the interview with DFAIT 1 can be found at Appendix E. Although truncated it provides an example of the planned question, depth of response and use of follow-up questions for clarification and for realigning the discussion. The interviews lasted between 1 and 2 hours in length and were audio-recorded. Field notes were taken, but these were kept to a minimum so as not to distract the interviewer from the responses and to facilitate the observation of gestures and body language accompanying the verbal responses. Interviews were conducted in person at locations determined by the participant, or by phone if a face-to-face interview could not be arranged due to distance or schedule. Participants were interviewed based on availability of both the researcher and the participant; therefore, the participants from the different organisations were interviewed as schedules allowed, not on interviewing one organisation completely before moving to the next organisation. The researcher conducted all the interviews, and the researcher then produced the verbatim transcripts. This allowed for a “second listen” of the interview, both to assure quality of transcription, and to allow an opportunity to review the interview and to identify initial themes or focus areas. This resulted in 24.1 hours of interviews and 275 pages of transcripts.

It was emphasized to the participants that all responses would be kept confidential, and that if excerpts from the interviews were to be used in subsequent reports or publications, under no circumstances would identifying characteristics be reported, and that, where applicable, only aggregate results (i.e., with no identifying information) would be communicated.²⁶ In addition, participants were asked to recount their experiences without providing information that directly

²⁶ The confidentiality of the participants was also a requirement imposed by the University of Guelph’s Ethics Review Board before approving the study.

or indirectly identified other individuals. To provide confidentiality a code was assigned to each participant based on organisational affiliation followed by a number to differentiate between the participants within the same organisation. Therefore, CIDA1, DFAIT1 and Military1 are used in place of participants' names. Participants were given the option to review a copy of the transcribed interview so that they could indicate any aspects that might include identifying characteristics. Only two of the DFAIT participants asked for this to occur and neither indicated any concerns with the transcripts. Participants were also provided an opportunity to seek clarification or further information from the researcher before, during or after the study. To date, none have approached the researcher with follow-up questions.

3.7.1 Data analysis and reporting

Data analysis was conducted throughout the research process. Initial notes were taken during the interview, but were kept to a minimum in order to allow for a more natural conversation and interaction with the participants. The researcher's initial impressions, ideas and reflection were noted immediately following the interview as part of the field notes. These field notes focused on main topic areas or themes believed to be important or were found to underpin the interview. The notations were used once the initial coding of the transcripts was completed to allow an opportunity to confirm themes. Some examples of the themes and notations from the field notes are: from CIDA4, "overall focus was on strategic and organisational level. Reluctant to provide personal narrative without prompting. Seemed frustrated at lack of professional development within CIDA and held CF as the desired model." DFAIT2, "questions on leadership were answered using the frame leadership as a position. When defining CIDA leadership, used CIDA directors as the answer." For Military 1, "command and leadership

seemed to be linked, almost mixed as one construct.” Military 4 “spoke about working in a collaborative manner, but insisted that somebody had to be in charge, and implied that the military was the best choice.”

3.7.2 Coding

NVIVO 10 was used to review and code the transcripts. Nodes were developed to organise the information into themes and cases.²⁷ Case nodes were developed for individual participants, this allowed the transcripts to be entered into NVIVO and then examined based on individual responses. A second set of case nodes based on the interview questions was also developed. Both sets of case nodes were designed initially for administrative purposes, that is to keep the transcripts and questions organised. Thematic nodes, were developed based on the subordinate research questions. These nodes were designed to capture the related material in one place for subsequent analysis of emerging patterns, ideas and concepts. The thematic nodes also allowed for the examination of individual leader and leadership schemas as they would contain the perceptions, descriptions and beliefs of what is leadership and what an effective leader is. The thematic nodes that were initially developed were:²⁸

1. Leadership was used when the participant described leadership. This was in response to a specific question about leadership and included individual and group actions. As described in section 3.7 Drath et al.’s framework of providing direction, aligning resources and gaining commitment was used.

²⁷ For more detail on NVIVO and the use of NODES see <http://help-nv10.qsrinternational.com>, accessed 20 Dec 2014. A NODE is the term used in NVIVO to describe a category in which related material is placed.

²⁸ A consolidated list of NODES and description of them can be found at Appendix A.

2. Leader was used when the participant identified an individual as a leader. The description includes individuals in formal leadership positions, and individuals described or categorised by the participant as a leader even if they did not fill a formal leader position.
3. CIDA Leadership was used when the participant described leadership conducted by members of CIDA. This was in response to a specific question about leadership and included individual and group actions.
4. DFAIT Leadership was used when the participant described leadership conducted by members of DFAIT. This was in response to a specific question about leadership and included individual and group actions.
5. Military Leadership was used when the participant described leadership conducted by members of Military. This was in response to a specific question about leadership and included individual and group actions.
6. CIDA Leader was used when the participant described an individual from CIDA that they would categorise as a leader. The description includes individuals in formal leadership roles, individuals described or categorised by the participant as a leader, actions the individual categorised as a leader took, characteristics, traits, and behaviours of an individual categorised as a leader.
7. DFAIT Leader was used when the participant described an individual from DFAIT that they would categorise as a leader. The description includes individuals in formal leadership roles, individuals described or categorised by the participant as a leader,

actions the individual categorised as a leader took, characteristics, traits, and behaviours of an individual categorised as a leader.

8. Military Leader was used when the participant described an individual from Military that they would categorise as a leader. The description includes individuals in formal leadership roles, individuals described or categorised by the participant as a leader, actions the individual categorised as a leader took, characteristics, traits, and behaviours of an individual categorised as a leader.
9. Whole of Government was used when the participant described an individual and/or process that was unique to the whole of government context or situation within the group in Afghanistan.

3.7.3 Pilot analysis

A pilot analysis was conducted using one transcript from each organisation (DFAIT1, CIDA1 and Military1). The pilot analysis was used to: confirm that sufficient information was available in each of the transcripts; to conduct an initial cross-organisational comparison; and to confirm, and if required refine, the coding plan. A total of 10 coding passes took place during the pilot analysis in order to capture and code the appropriate information in the transcript. Initial review and coding of the transcripts consisted of a pass to review the transcript in its entirety, and then one pass for each of nodes listed above. Subsequent passes provided greater detail based on specific aspects of the terms leader and leadership. In describing a leader it was noted that participants used a combination of characteristics, “he was intelligent,” “he was a good communicator,” as well as behaviours, “somebody who could make a decision and then support the group,” “provided a clear vision of what needed to be done.” In order to capture

these differences two new nodes (leader behaviours and leader characteristics) were developed. Additionally, it was found that combining leadership and leader together within a single whole of government node did not allow for a clear analysis of leadership and a leader within this specific context. Therefore, the whole of government node was divided into leader and leadership, resulting in Whole of Government Leader and Whole of Government Leadership. Whole of Government Leader was used when the participant described an individual that they would categorise as a leader to lead a whole of government team. The description included individuals in formal leadership roles, individuals described or categorised by the participant as a leader, actions the individual categorised as a leader took, characteristics, traits, and behaviours of an individual categorised as a leader. Whole of Government Leadership was used when the participant described leadership conducted within the whole of government context, specifically within the provincial reconstruction team, but also included what the participant perceived to be the desired approach within this context. These two new nodes were examined using the same procedures as the organisationally annotated leader and leadership nodes.

An additional theme, surrounding the role of the parent organisation, emerged based on statements such as DFAIT 1 explaining that “Ottawa did not understand what was going on, on the ground. It was giving orders but didn’t understand the real situation,” and “we were never really able to get our senior management to move into that paradigm that we were consciously sending civilian personnel into an environment which was not a permissive environment,” or Military1 recounting that “our civilian counter-parts...are very much the ah the subject of a lot of scrutiny ah um, right from Deputy Ministers.” To capture this theme a node entitled strategic

direction, was established to capture comments and observations, which related to actions from outside of the whole of government group in Afghanistan.

To confirm the new nodes a second pilot test was conducted. The initial passes were conducted without regard to organisational context and focused on the terms leader and leadership (the two main nodes). Coding passes were then conducted to capture descriptions of leaders and leadership within a specific organisational context, which now included DFAIT, Military, CIDA and whole of government. Finally the node strategic direction was used to capture comments relating to organisations or actors who affected the group. Each of these passes included capturing the behaviours and characteristics of the individual identified as leader within the specific organisation. The node leadership was reviewed and coded in a similar manner increasing the level of detail with each pass. It was confirmed during the second pilot that participants used the term leadership to describe both a process, such as CIDA1 explanation that “good leadership consists of ensuring everybody understand what the goals of the group are,” and as a person or position as when DFAIT1 complained that “the leadership in Ottawa did not understand the realities on the ground in Kandahar.” In order to resolve the dual use of the term leadership (as both a noun replacing the term leader, and as a verb used as an action that someone does) two of the elements found in Grint’s (2010) leadership typology of person and process, were used by the researcher to code participant comments as leader or leadership. Using these descriptors, person becomes the individual(s) who does or enables leadership, and leadership is the thing that is happening and is a result of the group interaction, with both definitions related to resolving problems or obtaining results. This did not result in interviews being examined by only looking for comments that matched Grint’s typology; rather, it allowed

the researcher to sort the various perspectives of leadership into one of the existing nodes based on a process resulting from either social interaction or based on the actions, traits and characteristics of an individual. Therefore, leadership defined as a person or position was coded as a separate node Leadership as Person with this data analysed under the node leader.

Leadership as a process was first reviewed without regard to context or organisation. The node leadership was then reviewed and coded to capture descriptions of leadership within a specific organisational construct. The last step of the pilot was to use the auto-code feature of NVIVO to build nodes based on the interview questions. This allowed cross-participant analysis based on the interview questions. While this action did not provide analysis or trends, it allowed for the examination of participant perceptions (schemas) and thoughts based on the specific question.

The pilot analysis was also used to ensure that the responses provided sufficient information to be analysed. Sufficient information was deemed to mean that: first, the interview question was answered, that is to say there was a sufficient level of detail in the response from the participant that a coherent response could be developed. For example in responding to the question, “Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organisation?” a sufficient response would include details of the situation, location, and the event in order to properly situate the specific event being described. Secondly, a description of what occurred, this could be a description of an individual’s behaviour or actions taken by a group was at a level that allowed for insight into what the participant perceived as leadership to be developed.

3.7.4 Analysing the responses

With the coding framework developed and the transcripts reviewed and coded, the analysis was conducted using the subordinate research questions as a framework. This section provides an explanation of how the analysis was conducted, by first providing explaining the overall approach to analysing the data, followed by a detailed discussion on how each question was analysed.

In order to discern similarities, differences and patterns within the data a variation of the constant comparison method was used²⁹ (Boeije, 2002; Glaser & Strauss, 1970, 2009; Tesch, 1990). Glaser and Strauss (1970) describe the constant comparison method as an iterative and inductive process of reducing the data through recoding. He goes on to state that the analysis begins with the first data collected and constantly compares indicators, concepts and categories as the theory emerges. In doing so, the constant comparative method breaks down the data into discrete units or fragments that are then coded into categories. Of note, the categories are derived from what the researcher identifies as significant for the study being conducted, with the goal being to assist the researcher in developing insights into the social process as perceived by the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Boeije (2002) makes the point that the “literature does not make it clear how one should go about constant comparison” (p. 393) and provides a five step method for using comparative comparison to analyze interviews. This study uses a modified version of Boeije’s (2002) methods, utilising the first three steps: 1. Comparison within a single interview; 2. Comparison between interviews of the same group; and 3. Comparison of interviews from different groups. Boeije’s remaining two steps are focused on couples and are

²⁹ The constant comparison method is primarily aimed at open source coding, however, by adapting the methodology towards the approach was found to be applicable to the analysis step of the study.

not applicable to this study. The use of the constant comparative method in analysing the transcripts allowed for the examination and comparison of individually-held leader and leadership schemas of the participants by breaking down the larger individual perception, which often differed in terminology, into fragments which could be coded into like groupings and provided with common labels for comparison between individual participants. Boeije's steps allowed for the examination of individually-held schemas amongst participants within the same organisation and then between organisations.

To accomplish this, the fragments³⁰ resulting from the coded transcripts were examined within the interview, between interviews within the same group (a group being based on the organisation affiliation), and then between interviews from different groups. In-interview comparison allowed the researcher to determine if themes and ideas were repeated or if there was new information found. This was accomplished by examining word choice and the meaning subscribed to the word used. By comparing the use of a fragment, for example "provides direction," throughout the interview the researcher could determine if the term was used consistently by the participant or if there were contextual or situation factors that influenced its use. For example, "when he gave direction, he did not consult his subordinates or staff, he just gave orders" when compared to, "his direction was clear and concise; he made sure that everyone's perspective was considered" provides two very different versions of "provide direction." As such, both fragments were examined to determine why the differences are present. In-interview comparison was also used to compare responses to different questions that were designed to elicit a response to the same subject. The questions: 1. "can you give me an

³⁰ Fragments refer to the coded section of the transcript that is highlighted by the researcher that expresses a theme, idea or concept from the perspective of the participant.

example where you saw people exercise leadership in your organisation?” 2. “can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organisation?” and 3. “can you describe for me an interaction in which you feel you were ineffectively led?” were all designed to elicit the participant’s perception of leadership. By comparing the responses to these questions from the same participant the researcher was able to develop a richer description of the individually-held leader and leadership schemas based on that participant’s response. The use of multiple questions to address a single question also reduces the chance of researcher bias (Boeije, 2002; Cresswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 2009; Ritchie, Lewis, Nicholls, & Ormston, 2013). The analysis of in-interview responses of each of the participants allowed the researcher to identify individually-held leader and leadership schemas of each participant.

Comparison between participants within the same group was conducted to determine if the participants with the same organisational affiliation shared common perceptions of leaders and leadership; that is to say, was there a common schema based on organisational affiliation? This comparison was conducted by examining the in-interview responses and searching for similarities and differences between the individually-held perceptions of leadership and leaders of participants within the same parent organisation. Differences were identified and examined in order to determine if they were due to a specific incident or word usage. This analysis allowed the development of an organisational schema based on the group members’ common responses, with differences being identified and noted in the findings. An analysis of how participants’ within the same organisation viewed leadership and leaders in the other organisations was compared in a similar manner. The individual schemas were compared; similarities and differences noted, with differences further examined in an attempt to determine the cause of the

differences. This analysis was conducted for all three groups. Of note, differences between participants within the same organisation were found in two areas. The first was in word choice, which when examined in context and then examined across multiple questions resulted in any differences being negated. The second set of differences occurred when participants described leaders and leadership from the other organisations. In this case the differences are attributed to different levels of interaction and the quality of the relationship between the military and civilian group members the participant experienced. This is best seen in the DFAIT and CIDA responses before and after the establishment of the Representative of Canada in Kandahar (ROCK). Before the establishment of the ROCK, the responses tended to have a more negative and stereotypical description of the military, and a less positive perception of leadership in the provincial reconstruction team as a whole. These responses differed from the generally positive responses of participants who served in the provincial reconstruction team after the establishment of the ROCK. However, the differences were nuanced, specifically in the area of perceptions of collaboration. When the responses were considered along with the other questions and then compared within group, there was a level of agreement that was consistent within the group regardless of timeframe. These differences were noted in the analysis and suggest they were likely causes of tension within the group and are discussed in the findings.

Comparison between groups was conducted using the organisational level schemas identified for leader and leadership. The same process used for the in-group comparison was used for the between group process. That is, using the organisational level schema the perceptions of leader and leadership of the three groups were examined. Similarities and differences were identified, with differences examined to determine the cause of the differences.

The focus of the analysis was on differences and not similarities. This does not suggest that differences were viewed to be more important than similarities when examining leader and leadership schemas, rather the differences were examined in order to answer the primary research question “how do differing leadership schemas impact on leadership within an inter-organizational group?” Notwithstanding this fact, similarities within and between groups are identified and discussed in the findings.

It should be noted that comparison between groups was conducted based on organisational affiliation and not based on gender. There are two reasons for this decision. The first was based on the fact that women were not present in all three organisations; in fact, there were no women available in the military group that met the selection criteria outlined in section 3.5 and therefore, comparison between groups was not possible. Also, as discussed in section 2.2, while gender is acknowledged in the literature to impact how men and women lead, Eagly et al. (1990) suggest that “when women and men occupy the same managerial role behaviour may be less stereotypic because organisational leadership roles provide fairly clear guidelines about the conduct of behaviour” (p. 234). Therefore, based on the lack of women in all groups and acknowledging that social role theory states that leadership roles, like other organizational roles, provide norms that regulate the performance of many tasks, between group perceptions were examined based on organisational affiliation and not gender. Notwithstanding this decision, in-group comparison did examine perceptions of leader and leadership based on gender when both genders were present within the group, as was the case for CIDA and DFAIT. All the research questions were analysed using the general approach described in the preceding section; this section discusses in detail how each of the research question were answered .

3.7.5 Research Question 1 – “What are the individually held leadership schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) are universal. Within these schemas which (if any) are organizational culturally contingent?”

Question 1 consists of three components. The first identifies the individually-held leadership schemas of the participant. Once identified, the other two questions compare the individual schema to the schemas held by other participants to determine those aspects of the schema that are universal and those that are culturally contingent. In order to identify the individually-held schema it was necessary to understand how the participants perceived effective leadership. So as not to influence the participant’s schema with the researcher’s own views of leadership, a definition of leadership was not provided, rather the participant was asked to provide an example of when they viewed leadership in their organisation. Participant transcripts were coded and examined as described above. Specific ideas, themes, and expressions relating to enacting leadership were examined in detail. Participants responded to the interview questions using examples and narratives; therefore, to obtain the perceptions of leadership the researcher reviewed the transcripts and categorised the description of leadership, and then further classified the responses under one of the three functions of leadership: direction, alignment and commitment (Drath et al. 2008). The terms and themes were either a description of what the leader did, or what actions the group needed to perform, in order solve a particular problem. In both cases, the description was related to one of the three leadership functions, with none of the participants’ descriptions falling outside of the direction, commitment or alignment framework. A second examination was conducted to identify how the leadership function was enacted. For example, in describing leadership within the whole of government group, CIDA1 recounted that “basically it was by getting, um all of the management team together, and um, setting up that

common understanding and vision and priorities,” this action was coded under direction as it describes how the team established a common direction within the provincial reconstruction team. It was further annotated as collaborative, as the narrative indicated that the leader brought together the management team to develop the vision and establish the priorities. While not directly linked to the examination of how leadership was enacted, the term “management team” was noted for later examination. As the term management had not been introduced by the researcher in any of the correspondence or during the interview questions, management along with other terms that appeared outside of the leadership framework were annotated and examined in subsequent steps. By analysing the descriptions of leadership, and coding each fragment under direction, alignment or commitment, and then further coding how each function of leadership was enacted, the researcher was able to identify key ideas and terms, which resulted in a picture of the individually-held leadership schemas.

The individual narratives were then examined within organisational affiliation to identify which, if any, elements of the schema were universal and to identify any differences. As described above, when examined within organisational affiliation, the differences were minor and a common schema based on organisational affiliation could be identified. The descriptions of the schemas were then consolidated by organisation and reduced to major points, or single words, to provide clarity and ease of use in a table for comparison and further analysis (see table 4-1). By examining the perceptions along organisational affiliations, a common organisational schema for each of the organisations was developed. The three organisational-based schemas were then compared among the organisations in order to identify differences and similarities between organisations.

To compare the schemas at the basic level, it was necessary to consider perceptions of leadership within a specific context and to examine how the leadership function was enacted. To provide the context, participants were asked to describe leadership first from their own organisation, then how they perceived how leadership was enacted by each of the other two organisations during their interactions as members of the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan. These responses were consolidated and cross-referenced into perceptions of the participant's own organisation (labeled as perceptions of self) and perceptions of leadership in the other two organisations (labeled as perception of others). By placing the responses into a table the perceptions were examined and analysed to determine the common areas and differences. The results are displayed in table 4.1. An additional context was introduced with the interview question asking participants to describe leadership in the whole of government context. The examination of this new context followed the same steps as used above. Comparing the perceptions of how leadership is enacted in the participant's own organisation with that desired or perceived as needed in the inter-organisational context allowed the identification of common points as well as newly evolved points that described the whole of government approach to leadership. The whole of government schema was then compared between organisational groups, and then compared against the leadership schema held at the organisational level. Similarities and differences were examined for both "fit" into the direction, commitment and alignment framework, and then again against how leadership was perceived to be enacted.

3.7.6 Research Question 2 – “What are the individually held leader schemas of the participants? Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are universal. Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are organizational culturally contingent?”

Question 2 is also made up of three components. The first is to identify the individually held leader schemas of the participants. Once identified, the two remaining questions are used to compare the individual schema to schemas held by other participants to determine those aspects of the schemas that are universal and those that are culturally contingent. In order to identify the individually-held schema it was important to understand how the participants perceived an effective leader. The transcripts were coded as described above with specific ideas, themes and expressions relating to the description of a leader examined. Focusing on leader as an individual, an examination of how participants described the actions and behaviours of the individual they identified as a leader was conducted. The identification of an individual as a leader in the narrative by the participant allowed for both formal and informal leaders to be described. A review and consolidation of the description was conducted, capturing the key terms and themes the participants used. These terms and themes fell into either descriptions of what the leader did, which were then coded as behaviours, or characteristics of a leader, which were either physical or non-physical characteristics and subsequently coded as characteristics. A number of participants used the term leadership when referring to an individual in a formal leader position. These descriptions though initially coded under the leadership node, were re-coded and examined as part of the leader schema. By analysing how the participants described a leader, the researcher was able to identify key ideas and terms, which resulted in an understanding of individual leader schemas.

It was noted that the participants used a large number of descriptors when describing a leader. Therefore, once the individual schemas were developed, it was necessary to consolidate the descriptors into a manageable number of terms that to compare the terms across all of the participants. The initial word count query resulted in 127 words describing leader behaviours, with a number of the descriptors including characteristics. A review and consolidation of terms with a focus on behaviours, which is something that is visible that the leader does or fails to do, was developed. For example, participants described an effective leader as someone who “provides a good kind of visualisation of what his intent and desire is,” or “identifies a common aim” or “provides clarity of purpose.” These three descriptors provided by different participants were grouped under the behaviour of “providing a vision.” Appendix F shows the behaviours used for this study and the terms that were consolidated under the specific behaviour. The list used for this study was developed by the researcher reviewing and then interpreting the meaning and intent of the terms taken in the context of the narrative found in the transcripts. The selection of the behaviour list was based on that word or word stem that was used most by the participants. A review of the literature found that researchers in the field use a range of characteristics and behaviours; however, there is no agreed to list used across the discipline or within the field. A synopsis of the lists drawn from the literature review is provided in Appendix H. In considering these lists, a number of factors emerged making the existing lists impracticable for this study. First, the lists tended to use both characteristics and behaviours. Secondly, the list with behaviours consisted of 25 behaviours and 59 attributes. In considering the use of this list, the researcher concluded that the list was too long, and it lacked a description of what each of the behaviours. This meant that using the extant list as a framework would be no

more precise than developing a separate list based on the interpretation of the researcher.

Therefore, a list based on observable behaviours was developed for this study (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 – Consolidated list of leader behaviours

Consolidated behaviour	Participant’s terminology used to describe leader behaviour
Providing a vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vision ; • provides good kind of visualisation of what his intent and desire; • provide good clear indication of intent; • broad guidance setting the objectives; • clear sense of objectives, setting the direction; • identifying a common aim; • clarity of mission; • common understanding; • clarity of purpose; • identify a goal.
motivating the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • motivate; • generate excitement and enthusiasm for things ; • inspiration; • establishing high standards to make you want to be part of the team; • aspirations; • create a team of capable people; • empower; • give us the flexibility to determine our own priorities; • giving everybody a sense of ownership and responsibility; • feel valuable; • they also feel they are recognised for their work.
ensuring buy-in from the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • get the buy in and support ; • reach consensus; • consensus building; • participation; • ensuring everybody had a role to play; • ensuring that everybody’s work and views were reflected in the work; • feel like they are making a positive contribution; • get that feedback, seek feedback; • having something for themselves; • inclusive; • inculcates that sense of participation; • ask people for their ideas; • engaging with individuals; • take differing views.
providing stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stewardship; • produce the next generation of leaders; • professional development needs of the people ; • builds and allows the team and the team members to become better professionals.

understanding the environment and other actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build coalitions between yourself, your organisation and other organisations; • identifying where the natural partnerships; • make those strategic connections; • work collaboratively; • relationships.
managing the resources of the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise the limitations of what everybody was able to do; • manage the process effectively; • managing resources; • marshalled the resources ; • instil confidence; • organise other people; • coordinate; • integrator; • understand fully and completely and intimately each of the subcomponents.
effectively communicating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communication; • communicating intent; • communicate; • dialogue; • effectively express ideas.
effective and timely decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make any decisions; • making a decision; • concise decision making; • respond quickly; • turn things around quickly.
enabling the group through interaction with external agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • find a way around problems; • translator; • rise above the various competing interests; • cut through the process able to work outside of his organisation; • champion the cause; • supporting their teams; • managing up; • convincing upwards and sideways; • protect and defend his or her group; • advocacy.

Using the same process used for examining the leadership schemas, the individually-held leader schemas were compared within organisational affiliations to develop a common organisational leader schema. The three organisational schemas were then compared to identify differences and similarities between organisations. This process required that schemas be understood and viewed at the basic level. Therefore, it was necessary to consider perceptions of

leaders within specific contexts. As with leadership schemas, participants were asked to describe a leader first from their own organisation, and then asked to describe leaders in each of the other two organisations. The descriptions were then aligned with the behaviours developed for the study. The responses were cross-referenced into perceptions of self and perceptions of others. By placing the responses into a table, the perceptions were examined and analysed to identify common areas and differences. An additional context was introduced with the interview question asking participants to describe a leader in the whole of government context.

3.7.7 Research Question 3 - Does working in an inter-organisational group change behaviour outside of the prototypical schema at the organisational level? Does this context shape or change the schemas?

In order to answer this question it was first necessary to determine if the participants perceived that leadership in the whole of government context was different from leadership in their parent organisation. This included determining if the participants believed that a leader within this context needed to display different behaviours. These perceptions were captured by first confirming the leader and leadership schemas based on the parent organisation (DFAIT, CIDA and Military). These schemas were then compared to the responses to the question “are there particular personal or interpersonal characteristics or techniques that you think would be helpful to establishing/maintaining/restoring trust in whole of government contexts?” This fourth context, which was common amongst the three groups of participants, was used to examine both leadership and leader schemas. The specific procedures used mirrored those described above but used the data obtained from the responses to question 3 to develop the conclusions. Comparing the responses to this question with those of the schemas articulated for

the parent organisation allowed the researcher to explore Lord's query if context changes schemas.

3.7.8 Research Question 4 - How was leadership as a social construct enacted within the inter-organisational group?

This question was explored by examining participant narratives that described how the Provincial Reconstruction Team operated, specifically how leadership was enacted. Using the same leadership framework from question 1, direction, alignment and commitment, the transcripts were examined to identify how direction, alignment and commitment was enacted within the context of the Provincial Reconstruction Team. While the focus was on the role and actions of the various levels of formal leaders, the actions and emergence of informal leaders based on expertise to solve the problem was also studied. How each of the three leadership functions were enacted was captured and examined for differences and similarities in approaches based on parent organisation. Specific attention was paid to the interaction between participants from different organisations and their perceived role within the group. To isolate perceptions associated with the whole of government context it was necessary to draw differences between leadership within the participant's own section of the Provincial Reconstruction Team, that is, to differentiate the area they worked within their own organisational context and leadership within the whole of government context with the military and civilian leads. In addition to reviewing the specific interview questions associated with this question, the earlier questions were reviewed and if the description of leadership or leader behaviours took place within the context of the Provincial Reconstruction Team it was coded and examined for this question as well.

3.7.9 Achieving Information Redundancy

There is little agreement in the literature regarding the number of participants needed for qualitative research, though with respect to studies using the phenomenological approach recommendations range from a 1 to 3 participants (Smith, 2007) to 6 (Morse, 1994) and up to 10 (Cresswell, 1998). It is acknowledged that the disparity in sample size is influenced by a number of factors including: the actual make-up of the group being studied, Kuzel (1992) recommends six to eight participants for a homogeneous study and twelve to twenty “when trying to achieve maximum variation” (p. 41); the frequency that the situation being examined is replicated in reality; the type of qualitative study being conducted, for example Morse (1994) suggests that that least 6 participants for phenomenological studies, but thirty to fifty for ethnographies and grounded theory studies. For this study, the actual make-up of the group being examined and the frequency that the situation occurred influenced the final sample size. What is agreed in the literature is that overall number of participants for this type of study tends to be small, because qualitative studies tend to focus on the experience of the individual within a specific case or situation. Bickman and Rog (1998) note that a small sample size that has been systematically selected for typicality and relative homogeneity provides far more confidence that the conclusions adequately represent the average members of the population than does a randomly selected sample of the same size. Ritchie et al. (2003) give two reasons for this. The first is because the aim of qualitative research is not to generalise; therefore, it is not necessary to find a sample size that is statistically significant or meets positivist criteria. Second, an incident only needs to appear once to be analysed, so including a larger population does not necessarily add to the evidence. Expanding on this theme, Sandelowski (1995) notes that the importance of sample

sizes in qualitative research is based on the need to achieve data saturation, theoretical saturation, or informational redundancy.³¹ At the same time, the sample should not be too large that it is difficult to undertake a deep, case or situation-oriented analysis as constrained by the time available for the research.³² Merriam (1998), Glaser and Strauss (1967), and Guest et al. (2006) suggests that it is necessary to find sufficient numbers to obtain reasonable coverage based on the purpose of the research. For the purpose of this study, reasonable coverage was defined as obtaining sufficient insights from members of the three main government departments to explore individual perceptions of leaders and leadership. Information redundancy was achieved when the participants' description of leaders and leadership did not result in new information being obtained. Because the aim of the study was to examine leadership within the whole of government group, it was necessary to compare perceptions between groups of participants based on organisational affiliation; therefore, information redundancy was determined within parent organisation groups and not considered across the all the participants. Redundancy is described as when no additional insights or comments were seen in the review of the transcripts (Babbie, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1967, 1970; 1998; Patton, 1990; Smith, 2007; Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). In order to determine when information redundancy was achieved, analysis of the interview transcripts was conducted as described above. Determination of information redundancy was based on no new information being obtained from the participants' descriptions of leader and leadership. Specifically, when no new descriptors were identified for each of terms

³¹ Sample size is an important consideration in qualitative research. Typically, researchers want to continue sampling until having achieved informational redundancy or saturation, which is the point at which no new information or themes are emerging from the data. To know if informational redundancy or saturation is reached implies and is founded on the assumption that data collection and analysis are going hand-in-hand. In other words, data is collected and analyzed, at least in a preliminary fashion, and this analysis informs subsequent data collection decisions.

³² Time constraint for this research was a factor resulting from the time limitations imposed by the University of Guelph for completion of the PhD.

under examination: leader, leadership, CIDA leader, DFAIT leader, Military leader, CIDA leadership, DFAIT leadership, Military leadership. The descriptors for whole of government leader and leadership were drawn from the participants after the population size was established using the rule set listed above. For this study, information redundancy was reached based on differing number of participants from each organisation. Within the military participant list, redundancy was achieved at the fourth military participant; however, a fifth was included to balance the numbers with CIDA and DFAIT. Redundancy was achieved after the fifth CIDA participant and for DFAIT redundancy was not achieved until the seventh interview.

3.7.10 **Researcher bias**

Glaser and Strauss (1967, 2009) suggest that the aim of phenomenological research is to offer a glimpse of how another person perceives the world. In order that the reported perceptions are those of the participant, and not that of the researcher, it is important that the researcher attempts to offset their own bias and subjectivity. Bias refers to way in which data collection or analysis, are distorted by the researcher's theory, values or preconceptions (Bickman & Rog, 1998). It is therefore important that the researcher understands and acknowledges that their research will be shaped by their own ethnocentric lens and take steps to mitigate its effect. For this study, the researcher is a senior military officer conducting research as part of a PhD in an area of study and in a context that he has worked and studied extensively. Given the military background of the researcher there was a danger that the analysis and conclusions would be viewed through the military lens, that is to say, the perspective of the researcher would mirror that of the military participants. This risk was identified during the proposal phase of the research resulting in a number of methodology and personal steps being put in place to minimize

the influence they would have on the research, thus, allowing the researcher to be as an impartial an observer, recorder and interpreter as possible, and by not introducing inappropriate bias into the data collection and analysis.

In order to mitigate the risk of imposing a military lens on the perceptions of the participants involved in the research, the researcher's personal development and education as a PhD student focused on the academic aspects of leadership, in particular within an inter-organisational setting. This was done by consistently seeking out alternate views on how others perceived effective leadership. Since beginning the PhD program, and then throughout the development and research of this study, the researcher continued his own study of leadership as both student and instructor. First, through the required coursework as a PhD student at the University of Guelph and then as an instructor for a series of graduate courses within the University of Guelph's MA leadership program the researcher was immersed in the non-military perspective of leadership. Instructing senior level members from the military and other government departments as part of a graduate level course at the Canadian Forces College, the Royal Military College of Canada, and the Australian Defence College the researcher was exposed to both military and civilian perspectives on leadership in a collaborative context. These educational opportunities provided the researcher with the ability to interact, discuss and debate a range of professional and academic issues, but more importantly provided the opportunity to learn and understand the different perceptions and approaches to leadership found in the academic literature and held by individuals who occupied a range of formal senior leadership positions outside of the military. Professionally, the researcher was able to interact with a broad range of non-military leaders as a planner for the lead civilian political advisor to

the NATO mission in Afghanistan. This interaction, in a similar environment as the participants in the study, provided additional insights into non-military leadership and provided a level of credibility when interviewing the participants for this research. Thus, as the research plan was being conceived and developed the researcher had developed an understanding and appreciation of the wide range of differing perceptions of leadership.

The design and conduct of the research was done in such a way to recognise that the researcher, like the participants, has his own view of leadership and the assumptions and inherent bias that this brings. The interview questions were designed to allow the participants to recount specific events in which they believed that they observed leadership to occur. This approach allowed each participant to identify, and then describe, an event without the need to actually provide a formal definition of leadership. In a similar manner, when asked to describe what the leader had done during this event, the participant had to first identify an individual who they perceived as a leader, then describe the behaviours of that individual. This approach allowed the participant to describe what they believed to be leadership without influence from the researcher. The use of multiple interview questions to obtain the information needed to answer the one research question further decreased the risk of the researcher misinterpreting the participant's meaning. The open nature of the questions, asking the participant to recount an event they experienced and viewed what they perceived to be leadership, avoided inferring or imposing the researcher's own view of leadership on others. Of note, one of the design elements of the study was the decision not to use an existing definition of leadership as a point of reference, but rather to derive a definition from the data. During the conduct of the interview, care was taken to ensure that the meaning and descriptions provided by the participants were fully understood.

The use of follow-up questions and rephrasing of participant responses back to them for confirmation ensured that the researcher had gained an understanding of the participant's point of view and that understanding was acknowledged by the participant. The use of verbatim transcripts including pauses and stumbles in sentences ensured that descriptions and perceptions of the participants were captured in context and available for review as the analysis was conducted.

During the analysis of the transcripts, it was important that the findings portray the reality as perceived and expressed by the participants, not to impose the researcher's perception of reality onto others. Otherwise the study would not only fail to answer the research question, but it would fail to provide practical application of the research to those operating in similar environments in the future; a point that was important to the researcher in selecting this topic for study. By focusing on the narratives provided by the participants and coding the transcripts through several passes, with each pass becoming more definitive, themes could be identified. By focusing first on the words used by individual participant, then examining the word choices within organisational groups the definitions of leader and leadership emerged from the narrative minimising the risk of the researcher injecting his own perceptions of leadership and leaders.

The steps listed above are consistent with strategies that Bickman and Rog (1998) offer to deal with validity threats. The first is rich data. Defined as data that are detailed and complete enough that they provide a full and revealing picture of what is going on (p. 94). The use of verbatim transcripts rather than simple notes meets this requirement. The second strategy is comparison; in qualitative research comparison often incorporates implicit comparisons that contribute to the interpretability of the study (Bickman & Rog, 1998). The use of participants in

similar situations, the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan, but at different times (due to the rotation schedule of individuals) allowed for comparison within the entire participant population to take place. Comparison within a single interview, between interviews within the same group (organisational affiliation) and interviews from different groups (among the different organisations) allowed the researcher to make sense of the data and to reconstruct the perspectives of the participants (Boeije, 2002). One of the most common strategies to reduce researcher bias is the use of another researcher to conduct a limited coding and analysis for comparison. Given this research was conducted as partial fulfillment of a PhD, a second researcher was not an option for this program; however, the review and feedback from both the advisory committee and the defence committee meets, at least in part, this option. The use of triangulation is another strategy offered in the literature to add to validity, triangulation is discussed at the end of this section.

In contacting the participants for the study, they were informed that the researcher was a serving Army officer pursuing a PhD. The interviews were conducted at a place chosen by the participant, which generally resulted in their workplace. During the interviews, the researcher, with the exception of two of the military interviews, wore civilian clothing in order to reduce the sense of the researcher being military. In all cases the participants held equal, with most holding senior, positions to the researcher within the wider public service (all the military participants, all of the DFAIT participants, and 4 of the 5 CIDA participants, were senior to the researcher at the time of the interviews). The fact that the researcher was not of superior rank to the participants reduced the risk of participants modifying their responses, for the most part the participants viewed the researcher as a peer. They knew that due to the researcher's background the

researcher was knowledgeable about leadership and understood working in a whole of government background, from both an academic and practical perspective. They felt confident that the research understood what they meant when they described the operational environment, understood the main actors and relationships within the provincial reconstruction team and could relate on a personal level what they meant when they described their experiences. As a result they did not have to explain the situation as thoroughly as they would have had to another researcher. This was evident by the use of phrases such as Military1, “you know, we [the military] have a solid set of leadership doctrine and a robust leader development education at all rank levels.” CIDA2, “well you were there, so you understand the threat that we were working under.” DFAIT 3 “you know, you saw how the PRT worked once the ROCK arrived. No offence, but not all the military guys ‘got it’; some just couldn’t get past the fact that the civilians had a different point of view.” This allowed the interview to focus on the description of what happened in their personal story, resulting in a rich and descriptive narrative. It is acknowledged that the participants knowing the researcher’s background could have resulted in the participants’ having invalid assumptions concerning the researcher’s understanding of the context. However, the design of the study focused the questions on individual perceptions of leaders and leadership using the Provincial Reconstruction Team as a common venue and not on the Canadian mission to Afghanistan as a whole. While it is impossible to ensure that these assumptions did not impact on the responses provided or on the interpretation of the responses the design of the study attempts to limit that impact. The openness from the non-military participants was surprising. Initially it was assumed that interaction with the military participants would be open and free, and there was a concern that given the researcher’s background and organisational affiliation the

opposite would occur with the DFAIT and CIDA participants. However, during the conduct of the interview the opposite happened. The military participants appeared to be guarded and expressed themselves along doctrinal lines, their assumption that as the researcher and the military participants had a common understanding and way of viewing leadership potentially limited their descriptions. It took additional effort and probing to gain personal rather than organisational perspective. In dealing with the civilians, the lack of a formalised doctrine, and the fact that the researcher understood the environment, had experienced similar situations as they did, and was from outside of their own organisation, resulted in a more personal narrative, with a correspondingly higher level of criticism and openness.

Another method to reduce the impact of researcher bias and increase validity of the research and conclusions is through triangulation. Triangulation of the data was achieved by three methods. First, by examining the perspectives of participants across different organisations and deployed to Afghanistan at different times the study achieved data triangulation. Secondly, by examining individual perspectives in a general sense, then again within the organisational context and finally within the Whole of Government situation in Afghanistan the study achieved environmental triangulation. The use of Lord's implicit leadership theory framework of basic and superordinate schemas along with Drath's framework of direction, alignment and commitment the study achieves theory triangulation.

The literature cautions against researcher bias, stating that if not checked the bias can compromise the research. The literature also offers a number of strategies to mitigate the negative effects of researcher bias. This section highlights that the researcher was aware of the negative impact bias can have on any research project and outlined the steps taken in order to

mitigate the threats to validity, with the full understanding that it is impossible to remove all aspects of bias. In doing so it is also recognised that the experiences and perspectives of the researcher are not simply a source of ‘bias’ they can also provide you with a valuable source of insight, theory and data about the phenomena you are studying (Berg & Lune, 2004; Bickman & Rog, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990).

3.8 Summary

This chapter explained the method used for the study. It showed that the phenomenological approach was appropriate for the examination of leadership as it allowed the perceptions of the participants to be examined. The chapter then discussed how the participants were selected, showing that the sample size is consistent with current academic practices. Seventeen participants from three separate Government of Canada departments, all of whom had worked as part of an inter-organisational team in Afghanistan agreed to participate in the study. Finally, the chapter outlined how the data was coded, analysed and research questions answered. Although the question were developed to address leader and leadership schemas, a review of the transcripts allowed themes to emerge regardless of whether or not they matched a component of implicit leadership theory.

4 Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the main observations and themes drawn from the interviews. The findings are a result of the researcher's interpretation of the participants' perceptions relating to leadership and leaders as developed from the responses to the interview questions. Selected comments from the participants are used to illustrate the researcher's interpretation. The quotations were selected based on how well they reflect the perceptions and comments of the other participants. The themes that are captured in this chapter are an amalgamation of like ideas and perceptions of the participants and as such reflect what the researcher interprets to be the agreed upon view of the group. Where this is not the case, or where there are distinct counter-views offered by the participants, specific comments on the differences are made. This chapter remains focused on what was said by the participants and in doing so sets out to frame the information based on the research questions and research plan.

The findings chapter is divided into five sections. The first section provides a framework that differentiates between the term leader and leadership. The framework uses Grint's (2010) leadership typology (person and process) to examine individual perceptions by separating these two terms even when the participants use them interchangeably. With the framework in place the second section explores leadership at the basic level (Lord et al., 1984) showing that there is a common perspective across the three organisations. Leadership is examined using Drath's (2008) framework (direction, alignment and commitment) with each element explored as a separate leadership function. The next section examines the participants' perceptions of leader, defined as the individual who enacts the functions of leadership, at the basic level of

categorisation. The leader behaviours identified in Table 3.1 are used. In order to determine if there are differences in the leader and leadership schemas, section four examines leadership at the superordinate level. By investigating how the participants viewed first their own organisations, then how they view the other organisations, a cross-participant analysis was conducted and similarities and differences identified. Section five takes a similar approach as the previous section but examines the perceptions of the leader within the collaborative, inter-organisational group.

4.2 A Framework for the Leadership/Leader Construct

An initial examination of the transcripts showed a common trend across all participants was the use of both the term leader and leadership when referring to the formal organisational position. DFAIT4's description of formal leaders within the organisational hierarchy as "the leadership of my organisation" was echoed by CIDA5's use of the term "our political leadership" and the use of the term "the senior leadership" by MILITARY3. DFAIT4 expanded on this notion by suggesting that there are levels within the organisation by identifying the provincial reconstruction team as the "lowest level of leadership." In addition to the terms leader and leadership, a number of participants used the term management to reflect the formal leadership positions within the organisation. DFAIT1's frustration that she was "never really able to get our senior management to move into that paradigm," and CIDA2's view that "the leaders were the management," illustrate the use of a third term, management, by the non-military participants. The term management was used primarily by DFAIT and CIDA participants when describing formal leaders within their organisation. The military participants did not use the term management to describe military leaders or leadership; however, they did use the term manager

when referring to CIDA and DFAIT formal leaders. The interchangeability of the three terms, often within the same interview, shows that there were three concepts: leader, leadership and management, being used by the participants. To further cloud differences between the concepts was the use of the term leadership to describe behaviour. CIDA1's comment was typical of participant responses across the three organisations, suggesting that leadership is viewed as both something a leader does, and as a position: "I was given the position and you know of leadership, to work with a team and to work with partners to get a certain objective accomplished." Lastly, leadership was also viewed as a process. CIDA1's description of how solutions to complex problems in the Provincial Reconstruction Team were developed provides insight into leadership as a process. The participants also described leadership in terms of what they perceived to be the required behaviours of a leader:.

Getting the right people around the table at the right level who could make decisions, communicating and making the argument as to why this would be important, why it would be important for the PRT, demonstrate how it linked into the broader objectives of the Canadians there. So there was a lot of that, there was a lot of convincing, there was a lot of discussion, there was a lot of you know this is why it is important, this is the modality of what we need, this is how we can get things done, um and a lot of it needed to be very clear about what it is that you need, make the case and then go from there. It was very difficult to do at the PRT because there wasn't that shared, there was a leader, but it was a military leader and then under the military leader there were the directors of the other programs. They all had their individual priorities that didn't necessarily coincide with one another.

CIDA1's frustration when describing what she perceived as a lack of leadership helps to further illustrate leadership as a process:

It was leadership by committee there was no real, I would say that there was kind of an absence of leadership actually, because it was all a question of, ok this is what we are told to do, this is the priority we are getting, the drop down orders, whether it was from the government or from everybody else, but there were ten other things that were equally important to do, um and so I felt that leadership it didn't work until somebody came over and told them to make it work.

The use of the term leadership as a process as well as a person or position, means that it is important to have a framework with a clear and consistent definition of the terms leadership and leader in mind when examining and coding the interviews. This study used Grint's (2010) framework, "person" and "process" to differentiate between leader and leadership. This does not suggest that the interviews were examined only looking for comments that match Grint's typology; rather, it allowed the researcher to sort the various perspectives of leadership and leaders into two broad categories based on a process resulting from group interaction or based on the actions, traits and characteristics of an individual. Both of the categories, leader and leadership, were then analysed to answer the research questions. By using this process the examination of individual perceptions could be conducted by separating the two constructs even when the terminology was used interchangeably. The analysis of the transcripts identified six overarching themes from the interviews:

1. There was a general agreement across the participants regarding the purpose of leadership and why leadership is important. Specifically, the purpose of leadership is to provide direction to the group in order to achieve goals; and in doing so the direction allows for the assignment and prioritisation of resources, and the agreement of goals helps to build

commitment of the various group members towards the group's goals. From this viewpoint, leadership is seen as a set of functions orchestrated by an individual (the leader), but developed and executed by means of interaction within the group.

2. Leadership is enacted through a set of behaviours exhibited by the leader that sets the conditions for the group to establish direction, assigns resources to achieve the goals desired by the group, and develops commitment by the group members. These behaviours are seen as necessary to enact the various leadership functions.
3. Although there was agreement on the leadership functions, and on the necessary leader behaviours, how leadership is implemented within the group differed between participants based on organisational affiliation.
4. The leader has a key role in enabling the group and to initiate the leadership functions; however, the specific functions are operationalised by the members of the group as a result of social interaction.
5. Three constructs were identified when discussing leadership: leader (the person); leadership (the process, but also used to describe the person) and management (a term used as a substitute for leadership when describing CIDA and DFAIT leadership).
6. Grint's (2010) leadership typology of person and process was useful to distinguish between leadership as a process and leadership as a person.

4.3 Leadership – A Common Perspective

One of the research questions was developed to determine if there was a common perception of leadership across all participants regardless of organisational affiliation. In order to answer this question, the transcripts were examined to determine if there was a common

perspective that would indicate the presence of what Lord et al. (1986) describe as superordinate level schemas. The analysis showed that leadership was perceived by the participants as a set of functions, or things leaders do with, for, or to, the group in order to achieve the agreed to common goals. Leadership, the thing that leaders do, is discussed in this section. One overarching theme that emerged was how the participants viewed the purpose of leadership. By extracting the key elements of what the participants perceived as the purpose of leadership, the researcher was able to identify the leadership functions.

4.3.1 The Purpose of Leadership

The purpose of leadership was perceived to be to set the conditions that allow or enable a group to solve a problem(s). Many of the participants did not draw clear distinctions between leadership as a group process and leadership as a set of behaviours that the leader does. Therefore, rather than trying to interpret and define leadership from behaviours of the leader, the transcripts were first examined based on what participants believed leadership does or what the result of leadership was, which was articulated when they defined the purpose of leadership. DFAIT5 perceived the purpose of leadership to be “to keep everybody on track, to minimise those tensions, ah um yeah to keep everybody moving in the same direction to resolve issues.” MILITARY3’s perspective underscores the importance of goals, or what the group is trying to achieve stating “the need for leadership is based on um the need to have effective outcomes in order to fulfill the demands of higher level exigencies.” What is consistent across the participants is that leadership is seen to occur in the context of a group setting and is viewed in relation to achieving group goals. MILITARY5’s view on the purpose of leadership encapsulates not only what most participants identified as the discrete elements of leadership, but

provides a framework which describes the main functions of leadership that must be conducted to enable the group and the perception that the leader is responsible to oversee the process:

At the end of the day you do need to accomplish things [direction] so um you need to have set the standards, um you need to have determined the work plan [alignment of resources] you need and you need to have the spirit and um and the ability to see it through [commitment] and so um, I think really the purpose of the leader is to ensure that things get done.

In examining how the participants perceived the leadership functions, Drath's (2008) framework was used. Recall that this framework consists of three main functions: the setting direction of effort within the group by establishing goals, achieving commitment of the group that the goals are important and group will go towards achieving these goals, and finally the alignment and prioritisation of resources of the group to achieve the goals. For simplicity the framework is abbreviated to direction, alignment, commitment. Using this framework, one finds agreement across the participants regarding what leadership does. The next section examines leadership using Drath's framework.

4.3.2 **Setting Direction – the agreement within the group on overall goals, aims and mission,**

When examining leadership, the most consistent theme found in the transcripts was the idea of providing direction for the group. When asked what the purpose of leadership was, CIDA1 responded:

I think the purpose of leadership is to ensure that everybody is working towards a common goal, and a common purpose, to ensure that we are not working at cross purposes, and to ensure that all tools and assets that are actually available are used in the most efficient way possible.

In fact, she saw this as a key element of leadership and as a member of the group acknowledged that what she “really appreciated was the sense of setting the direction in terms of where we

needed to go.” CIDA2’s descriptive narrative captures the essence of the perspectives of the other participants:

I picture it kind of like it’s that person at the front of the boat making sure all the oars are going in the same direction. So it’s kind of that, using the military phrase, to ensure unity of purpose and unity of effort, and to inculcate a common vision and a common understanding so that everyone knows where we are going, why are we going that way, how we are going to get there and what their part is in that piece, and to me that is what the role of leadership is.

Providing direction was described as more than the leader giving orders; rather it underscored the basic understanding of the need for leadership within a group to set the direction of the group by establishing common goals. In describing establishing direction, CIDA2 did so in relation to sense making, that is to say, framing the problem so that the group not only agrees on what the problem is they were going to try and solve, but then agree on what the solution should look like. Thus, the leadership function of establishing direction is more than simply the leader setting the direction for the group; it consists of a number of elements. MILITARY3 perceived the importance of establishing a common goal as being able to “understand what is achievable and what is not, and through that discourse we have created a common vision of what we can do and what we need to identify to our higher headquarters as constraints and restraints.” The idea of determining the goals and the direction by the group was expressed as an important aspect of leadership, notwithstanding the fact that direction may have been given to the group from the parent organisation(s). DFAIT2 saw that establishing direction for the group was a result of a clearly articulated vision of where the group fits into the larger picture stating it was important to “take a longer term vision of where that particular tasked division might go in the fulfilling of its mandate.” MILITARY4 saw the

establishment of common goals or objectives as essential in order to “gain a degree of momentum from a group to, ah, to move forward, because often, as you mentioned at the start, you got different views and the methods and it is important to try and create a unity of effort, through a common approach.” The idea of establishing a common understanding was perceived by DFAIT5 as necessary in order to “keep everybody on track” and “to keep everybody moving in the same direction to resolve issues.”

The importance of establishing common direction was reinforced by how ineffective or poor leadership was described. When asked about how leadership worked within the Provincial Reconstruction Team, the perception of leadership was influenced by the lack of a common goal and direction within the inter-organisational group, as CIDA1 stated, “it [leadership] didn’t work very well because we had our own priority...that didn’t necessarily coincide with the priority of the PRT.” However, once established, the direction was not fixed. In fact, it was open for review and updating as the situation became clearer or changed. CIDA2 highlighted the dynamic nature of the group’s goals stressing that it was important to “recognise that if we start out on a certain path with a certain set of tools and a certain number of steps that need to be done as people were working they would come back and say wait a minute this doesn’t make sense we need to clarify this.”

MILITARY4’s views sum up the main idea that by establishing a set of common goals, leadership helps define the purpose of the group. It then allows the group to frame and identify a common focus to solve the common problem:

Leadership as a purpose onto itself, leadership ensures that you know organisational goals and objectives are achieved, whether it is operationally or non-operationally, um so it is an enabling, it is probably the enabling function, I don’t know what term you want to use, but leadership the enabler, that you know,

it is primarily operationally focused, its purpose is, it sounds again like a cliché, successful accomplishment of the mission.

4.3.3 Commitment

All the participants shared MILITARY4's belief "that leadership was a function of creating willingness in your subordinates." This leadership function was often expressed in terms of gaining consensus, buy-in, or commitment to the group's objectives. The participants believed an important step to obtaining commitment from the members of the group was establishing a common goal(s), and an agreed to direction. The common goal(s) provided a common focal point for the group. They incorporated the individual goals of the group members with those of the parent organisation. In doing so the group's goals recognised the importance of these various goals and showed how they are related to each other. CIDA1 made this point when she described some of the issues associated with working with other departments in Kandahar and noted the need to align goals.

When asked how one aligns the various objectives, she went on to highlight the importance of discussions and compromise:

Well that is where you would, getting the right people around the table at the right level who could make decisions, communicating and making the argument as to why this would be important, why it would be important for the PRT, demonstrate how it linked into the broader objectives of the Canadians there. So there was a lot of that, there was a lot of convincing, there was a lot of discussion, there was a lot of you know this is why it is important, this is the modality of what we need, this is how we can get things done, um and a lot of it was being very clear and specifically what tools and assets you needed, whether it was foreign affairs or from the Canadian Forces. Because I learned that, you know, you needed to be very clear about what it is that you need, make the case and then go from there. It was very difficult to do at the PRT because there wasn't that shared, there was a leader, but it was a military leader and then under the military leader there were the directors of the other programs. They all had their individual priorities that didn't necessarily coincide with one another.

Participants acknowledged the requirement to have input from each member of the group in determining the objectives and the general way the group should achieve them. MILITARY1, whose organisation had the majority of resources needed to solve a particular short-term problem in Kandahar, noted that it would have been easy to just go and do what his organisation thought best. But offered that would not have been beneficial in the long term as the military lacked the expertise, mandate and knowledge to solve the longer term problems without the other government departments. His approach was that “you just included them. If they are there and they are part of discussion, they will see that their opinions are valued.” DFAIT3 provided insight into how this occurred by describing the interaction within the group:

At least in the field they made strong efforts to show that when it came to decisions related to sort of reconstruction and development type stuff, um it really was everyone had one vote. So regardless of the fact that the Colonel had the biggest office and had actual support staff and all this sort of stuff and DFAIT and CIDA didn't really at all, when they sat down around the table it was sort of one shop one vote, which I think was the right way to do it, and it set the right impression but at the end of the day, just by virtue of the dynamics ah you know it was always very obvious that the military guy was in charge

The sense of giving a voice and of having each of the members of the group contribute, both in real terms, such as providing the necessary resources or expertise, as well as allowing them to voice their concerns and explain their objectives ensured, as MILITARY4 noted, “that component of the feeling that they [other group members] get, that they have an effective voice, that their input is of value.” By doing so, “they get that sense of ownership whatever decisions are made; they get a sense of feeling very accountable for that.” This ensured buy-in from the group members and aligned the group's objectives with their own. However, such an approach means that there is a level of compromise and potentially revising individual objectives to fit into the overall objectives that the group acknowledged as important. But in doing so, it is important

to ensure that the group members can see how their needs and their objectives are addressed.

CIDA1's experience was that it was important to relate the goals to the individual objectives and priorities by,

basically saying to them 'I know that clinic in Panuwayi is really important to you, and if you want it to matter to the government of Afghanistan, right now their priority is to make sure that their ministry does not look blown up.' I found that that was the best way forward, to relate the priority, to make the linkages between everybody's priorities and to try and communicate more effectively how it related to the broader picture.

What was interesting was the general agreement among the participants about the importance of having input from all members of the group, this included input by subordinates within the formal hierarchy. MILITARY4 stated that:

You just can't impose, you can't just, it won't work, ah, and you know, you can pull all sorts of examples through history that, that ah, through very recent times where they tried to do those things and plain and simply the organisation did not, did not support so where you needed ADM Pol to be an active part of what you wanted to get done, you don't need to suck up to them but you need to take them into account and their organisation's nature.

The importance of ensuring input from all members of the group had benefits beyond gaining commitment to the immediate problem. The lack of voice or consideration of the input from all group members can negatively affect commitment and agreement from group members when dealing with future problems. MILITARY4 noted that establishing a sense of participation was important because,

if guys are just constantly, just being told what to do and there, it isn't so much their views, but their input isn't apart of things, I think you lose that, that component of, of imagination and improvisation and that which, I think, especially in a military operational context, that is important, guys still think, they, you still allow them to exercise that capacity to think, um, and if, and the only way I think you can do that as a leader is you allow them that opportunity to communicate.

Noting that given the hierarchical nature of most organisation, input from members of the group may not always be necessary from a strictly boss-employee type relationship, MILITARY4 went on to underscore the longer term importance:

It is important that those who actually will execute or will enable what it is that they want that collaboration is, it may not be, it may not even be required in terms of the fact they are the boss and they are going to tell you what to do, but it is absolutely essential to ensuring the larger machine you know, continues to move things forward.

4.3.4 Alignment - the organization and coordination of knowledge, resources and work in the group

In order to achieve the goals agreed to by the group, participants agreed on the importance of coordinating knowledge, resources and work of the group. This was seen by many as the management aspect of leadership, particularly the management of resources. But it was also seen as making use of the skills and expertise of the group members, and establishing the processes and structures within the group to achieve the agreed to goals. When asked to explain leadership, CIDA4 responded that the job of the leader was to

ensure that the sub-tasks results, steps associated with working back from the desired end state to the current state and figuring out what needs to get done to get from the current state to the desired state are clear, that people are assigned responsibility clearly for those steps, and that there are adequate resources to achieve the goal, in a way that has been defined as the best way to achieve that goal by the team.

Linking the notion of leadership and resources, DFAIT1's experience was that "leadership often, in my view, followed who had command over the resources. Who could affect change, who could make things happen." In describing her perceptions of effective leadership, DFAIT2 included being "very good at managing risk, very good at managing process, very good at managing a very complex organisation." In describing his inter-organisational team and what

it did to progress towards a goal, MILITARY5 stated it was important to “mak[e] a catalogue of resources, our capabilities internally.” CIDA4 viewed one of the functions of the leader to be “managing resources, stewardship for resources and people, ah um, safety and security, and ah of individuals we are putting on the ground.” Part of aligning and allocating resources included people. As CIDA1 noted, “leadership was definitely crucial and fundamental to ensuring that anybody that had anything to contribute was given the mandate to do it.”

MILITARY5 believed that once the group’s goals had been established the leadership function shifted to “the management part and...deciding...we will do this project before that one.” CIDA2 concurred with this perspective seeing the role of leadership as “orchestrating their folks” to achieve the group’s goals by, “decid[ing] what gets prioritised in terms of people’s workloads.” CIDA5 added that leadership provides a calming influence in a time of uncertainty. In providing guidance to their staff, they provided focus, “ok this actually is a crisis, you need to handle this now, no this [other thing] isn’t as important as it seems, so we can set it aside because you need to focus on this other item here.”

In deciding priorities, DFAIT2 offered that it was more than echoing the priorities the parent organisations give to the group. Rather, in aligning the group and establishing priorities it was necessary to ensure the group’s objectives fit into those of the parent organisation:

Look at the mandates of the various component parts under his or her direction. Figure out how those, those mandates support the strategic goal they have been given and conversely looking the other way; look at the strategic goal they have been given and figure out how that trickles down and how that should define the priorities of each of the different sort of, um ah ah agencies or whatever ah working under them. Yeah? So it, again, it’s a top-up, it’s a bottom-up um and top down process and the leader is the one doing the translating in the middle of all that.

In relating his experience in Afghanistan during which the group was given broad goals but not priorities from the parent organisations, MILITARY5 saw the setting of priorities at the group level as a critical leadership function:

Recognising that we weren't getting clear priorities from the Afghans or the government at that stage we had to make some choices, so prioritising effort really became a critical leadership function, getting folks aligned to do that um is not hours and days, its weeks and some cases you know still working on their last month in theatre and for some of them was a challenge.

Managing the group was seen to be more than simply aligning resources. It included organising the members of the group to make the best use of the group members' individual expertise and knowledge of the problem. MILITARY4 believed that effective leadership ``leverages [group member] competencies to achieve the goal. `` MILITARY5 offered that once the priorities have been established, the focus of leadership was to ensure that the tasks were accomplished:

Put it [project] on a time scale and say by your milestones, that is a very engineering ah way of getting things done and it can demand leadership to make sure they stay on task and stay on time.

MILITARY4 believed that a leader must understand both the goals and the people in the group. He found this knowledge was key in aligning individual skill sets with the needs of the group, and in doing so needed to be prepared to "tailor the organisation" to the expertise of the group members. Taking a similar view, CIDA4 believed aligning individuals to tasks based on skills was important and offered that the group members need to first "understand why they have the goal" then based on their skills "thinking through from their own perspectives, skills, and experience what they can bring to that particular challenge." In this respect, DFAIT2 believed that one of the functions of leadership was to integrate, by pulling together the various factions

within the group. In doing so, the “feedback loop can’t just be between...one leader and one guy, one node; it’s gotta...come together...through an integrated process for each of the subordinate parts.”

4.3.5 Summary

The participants across the organisations agreed that leadership was an important enabler for the group to solve problems. While the terms leader and leadership were often used interchangeably, an examination of the participants’ narratives allowed leadership to be examined as a set of functions that are the result of an interactive process that helped the group establish common goals, thereby setting the direction the group would take to solve the problem(s) at hand. In developing the goals, input from the members of the group was an important element to achieve member buy-in and commitment. This was accomplished by ensuring each member of the group could see the benefit of the group’s goals and that the individual goals were reflected in the outcome. Finally, leadership had an element of resource alignment and distribution. The term resource was seen in the broadest sense of the term; therefore, it not only included physical resources, but also people and knowledge. Alignment also included the redistribution of expertise, and where necessary a change in the structure of the group to make best use of that expertise.

4.4 Leader – A common perspective

Throughout the interviews, leadership was most commonly described as set of functions (direction, alignment, commitment), as something someone did. The person enacting leadership was described as demonstrating or showing leadership, and was categorised by the participants as a leader. When describing how a leader demonstrated or showed leadership (or what the

leader did to enact direction, alignment or commitment) the participants described the actions as behaviours. Good or effective leadership was associated with something positive, and described as desired behaviours that enacted direction, alignment and commitment. Poor or ineffective leadership was associated with something not being done which inhibited the achievement of direction, alignment and commitment. Thus, a leader was perceived to be someone who demonstrated those behaviours that the participants believe to be important and/or necessary to enact the functions of leadership.

When discussing or defining a leader, participants acknowledged both formal leaders, individuals given the role of leader by the organisation who enacts or enables the leadership functions based on positional power, and informal leaders, the leader whose identity is based on an individual's expertise and therefore solely on referent power (Northouse, 2013, p. 10). Notwithstanding the participants' acknowledgement that a leader can be defined from both these perspectives, for most of the participants this distinction was lost in the individual narratives. With most participants using the term leader to refer to someone assigned as the leader by the organisation. When asked their definition of a leader, many of the participants described the leader in terms of behaviours or specific actions (e.g. sought input from subordinates) and, to a lesser degree, characteristics or traits (e.g. is knowledgeable). In both cases they described an individual rather than describing leadership as a process or the result of social interaction. CIDA1's comment was typical of participant responses suggesting that to be a leader an individual had to be assigned the position by the parent organisation, and that as the leader the individual was then responsible for enacting leadership functions to move towards accomplishing a goal: "I was given the position and you know of leadership to work with a team

and to work with partners to get a certain objective accomplished.” When describing poor leadership CIDA2 also equated the term leader to the formal position stating “that is where you expect to find it [leadership coming from the formal position] but it is not until you maybe don’t find it there that you maybe look elsewhere.” MILITARY4 was more explicit, offering that regardless of the level of good will or collaboration, someone must be assigned the leader and that even shared leadership is not workable in all situations. Recounting his experiences in Kandahar he described the problem with shared leadership:

We were doing programs and activities where two or three of us shared leadership of that activity, but that is when it is all sun and light, where everyone is happy and hugging each other. The moment that you start running into, you know, circumstances of duress, difficulty, stress, problems, conflicting institutional priorities or objectives, then it won’t work, unless somebody has been identified as in-charge.

In fact, when asked to define leadership he could not do so without first defining who the formal leader was because he believed that “you can’t actually establish a leadership model, because nobody is the leader.” However, CIDA2’s perceptions of a leader acknowledged that an individual can execute leadership without being the assigned leader:

I also tended to see people who step up and kind of take on that role regardless of the formal position. So, if, but if it, you know, for instance there would be certain people umif you were at a meeting or whatever you would have the person that is in charge but then everybody would turn to another person because that is who they respected for the good ideas or who really understood the situation or had a good way of kind of coming to, their analysis was pretty good of their ability to kind of drill down to what the heart of the problem was, so you would kind of look to them for their direction or their opinion.

CIDA3 is typical of many of the participants, who acknowledged that being a leader can be based on both positional and referent power:

Any Director or Director General or Vice President or President, or the Minister, so anybody in our sort of pecking order, is seen as being a leader, um just because

of the way we are hierarchically organised in the sense that you know direction comes from them and you know we have to sort of provide the information or deliver whatever product is required. But leadership can also be sort of based on your level of technical competence and it can be exercised horizontally with your peers in the work that you do, so I guess you know it is either, leadership can either be seen as being based on the organisational structure where you have no choice but kind of follow whatever this person is telling you what to do even if they may not be right, which in a lot of the cases they aren't or it can be based on expertise, when the person knows the file.

4.4.1 Summary

While there was discussion on the concept of a leader being formal or informal, the general perception was it could be either. What was important was that in order to be viewed, or as Lord et al. (1982) state to be categorised, as a leader the individual had to be perceived to be enacting the leadership functions and displaying the desired leader behaviours. Notwithstanding the acknowledgement that someone not formally appointed could be perceived as a leader, when asked for examples of leaders and when discussing leadership, the participants defaulted to framing the discussion and answered the questions primarily through the lens of a formal leader. Regardless of the framework used, it was agreed that a leader was an individual who enacted certain leadership functions.

4.4.2 Leader enacts leadership functions

In order to be perceived to enact the leadership functions the leader was required to demonstrate certain behaviours. During the interviews, participants often described leaders in terms of both characteristics and behaviours. This blending of terms was expected as behaviours are what the participant can see, and characteristics are often what they expect or infer; however, when asked to describe the leader enacting the leadership functions the participants used behaviours. Therefore, for the purposes of this study behaviours are believed to be the

observable manifestation of characteristics. While specific descriptions of behaviours varied across the participants, they clustered into two broad areas: behaviours that are focused inwards towards the group; and behaviours that are focused outwards from the group. These two clusters will be used to discuss leader behaviours in this section.

4.4.2.1 Leader behaviour focused inwards towards the group

The participants agreed that the reason for establishing the inter-organisational group was to achieve goals or objectives, which solved a problem faced by the parent organisations that could not be solved by a single department on its own. The participants viewed the main role of the leader as enabling the group to solve problem(s). Thus, the leader was expected to set the conditions that would enable the group to succeed in accomplishing the objectives. Of note, actually achieving the goals was not explicitly stated as a requirement for effective leadership or to be described as a good leader. The focus of the participants was the leader establishing the conditions which would give the group the best chance to accomplish the goals.

The majority of the behaviours expected by the group members from a leader are focused inwards, on the group itself. In this respect the leader was seen as an enabler, and not as the sole decision maker or direction giver. The desired behaviours described by the participants were introduced in Table 3.1. The behaviours that focus inwards towards the group are: providing a vision, communicating, ensuring buy-in, motivating the group, stewardship, supporting the group, understanding the environment and other actors involved, managing, and decision making. Each of the behaviours is discussed below.

4.4.2.1.1 Vision

A function of leadership is the establishment of direction goals for the group. Regardless of organisation, the participants agreed that the leadership function direction involves setting the goals and establishing priorities. This was not perceived to mean that the leader establishes or defines all the goals or objectives for the group. Instead, the leader's role, as described by CIDA4, is to identify a common aim or a commonality in what people are trying to achieve, by articulating a "broad guidance and direction as to what our priorities as an organisation are." Or as DFAIT1 suggested, "provide strategic direction, while being open to receiving input." While many of the participants used the term 'identifies a goal,' in exploring the wider narrative, this was seen to mean the leader providing a vision, a description of the direction the group should take and a clear articulation of what needs to be achieved. This important aspect of goal setting included both the creation, and then effective communication of a vision by the leader.

The purpose of vision was described by the participants as articulating clarity of purpose, and setting the framework for a common direction for the group. CIDA2 described articulating the vision as, "here is what I see us doing, and here is my vision for where we are going. Here is what I think we need to do." CIDA1 "thought that setting the objectives ensuring there is a clear sense of objectives where we needed to go" was an important role for the leader and when in a leadership role herself she felt it was important that she "demonstrate clarity of purpose." CIDA4's belief that a leader needs to have a clear sense of vision in order to develop "a clear sense of ...what they want to accomplish and how they want to go about doing it" was echoed by MILITARY4 who believed it important that the leader "provides a good kind of visualisation of what his intent and desire is," but added that "the vision must be communicated to the group."

MILITARY3 agreed that there are two elements to the leader establishing direction for the group. First, the leader must be “able to produce a coherent vision” and then secondly be able to “communicate [it] to others.” In defining leadership CIDA1, captured the main elements discussed above, stating that the leader must have “the ability to define, and communicate, objectives and priorities and a vision and a way forward.” In short, leaders help to make sense of the complexity of the situation.

4.4.2.1.2 Communicating

All the participants stated that the ability to effectively communicate is a key ability required to be a leader. As noted by CIDA2 “a lot of people have vision but they don’t communicate that vision down.” The ability to communicate a compelling vision to the group was viewed as essential for framing the objectives and goals. When in a leadership position, DFAIT2 believed it was vital that he “communicate [his] goals and vision very clearly.” In describing what he believed to be a requirement of an effective leader, DFAIT4 linked the ability to effectively communicate the leader’s vision to achieving buy-in from the group stating “a leader knows where he is going, knows how to communicate that and knows how to bring other people along so that they want to do it as well.” CIDA2 agreed that “you have to be very articulate; you have to be able to ... make convincing arguments to people who might be a bit sceptical about what it is you are trying to do.” DFAIT2 believed that “communicating that common vision and making it clear where the connectivity is, and identifying where the natural partnerships [among the actors] are” was important for the group members to accept the vision. When developing and articulating a vision, CIDA2 believed that the leader needs to articulate the vision in a way that “you would be able to see, ok, this is where I think we need throw our effort

in and you communicate that back and you get the buy in and support for that direction.” Based on her own experience, CIDA2 stated that the leader needs to effectively communicate the vision in order to “get everyone to a common understanding to share, a shared understanding of what, the situation is” and then ensure “a common understanding of what the solution could be.” She stressed that this is important because “if you see something as a problem and nobody else sees it as a problem, then right there you are lost, because nobody is going to dedicate resources or um people to a non-problem.”

4.4.2.1.3 Achieving Buy-in

Establishing the vision to help bound the problem, that is to say delineate a complex problem, then effectively communicating the direction the group should go, provides the basis upon which the group can develop solutions to the agreed upon problem. An important aspect of developing solutions and motivating the group is achieving buy-in from the group members. The idea of buy-in ensures commitment from individuals to achieve the goals of the group. While the leader was seen as responsible for developing and providing the vision, this did not translate to meaning the leader was also responsible for developing the specific details of how to achieve the goals; rather, the concept of developing and agreeing to the goals of the group was perceived by the participants to be a collaborative or group activity. CIDA1 stated:

I really appreciated the sense of setting the direction in terms of where we needed to go but leaving the how to get there, the creativity to the staff, so giving it, giving us really the flexibility. We were told explicitly to think outside the box. We need to get to this place; we need to do it quickly so think outside the box. If there are rules or issues that constrain you let’s talk about them because we need to find a way around them. I thought that was very, very positive.

In developing those goals, CIDA1 went on to explain that it was important to “ensure everybody was reflected in and could see their place in what we were doing.” When in a formal

leadership role, CIDA1 “tried to hone the skill of ensuring that everybody was reflected in and could see their place in what we were trying to do so that we felt a sense of purpose, and therefore could contribute to what we were doing.” Such an approach required two-way communication, a large part of which means the leader was expected to listen to the input and ideas from members of the group. As a leader, DFAIT2 would “communicate [her] goals and vision very clearly, seek feedback responses and input on it. Make it clear to the people that I am directing, that their input does shape influence and does have an impact on how we as a group operate.” MILITARY4 believed that by seeking feedback and input from the group a leader:

Inculcates that sense of participation...if people are just constantly just being told what to do and [if] their input isn't a part of things, I think you lose that, that component of, of imagination and improvisation.

CIDA5 offered that it was more than simply collaborating on solutions by asking “people for their ideas,..., ask[ing] the group what do you think the problems are and once we identify the problems, out of that list what are the... ones that we think are the most important.” Regardless, the dialogue allowed all members of the group “that opportunity to communicate” (MILITARY4) and in doing so the leader received feedback from the group, thereby obtaining a level of ownership by the members of the group. By doing this CIDA2 believed that the leader can “make sure that the management reflects the views of their staff and is as well able to capitalise on that.” DFAIT4 made a connection between communicating the vision, achieving buy-in and motivating. He believed that a leader “knows how to bring other people along so that they want to do it, and so that they also feel they are achieving something for themselves.” DFAIT5 offered that this approach “allows the people working under that leader to feel valuable

and to feel like they are making a positive contribution, um so that they want to be there they understand why they are there.” This sense of buy-in provided a sense of ownership of the solution and, to differing degrees amongst the participants, a sense of self-fulfilment, both of which created a level of commitment of the group to achieve the goals.

To develop the sense of ownership of the solution, the leader must be willing to empower the members of the group by allowing the group to develop solutions without any perceived interference from the leader. Such a view was provided by DFAIT2 stating that it means “being inclusive and taking on feedback and allowing subordinates to get in there and to shape and influence how things work.” CIDA6’s description of an effective leader as one who “know[s] when to step in and help their staff and when to allow their people to run with things themselves” was supported by MILITARY1 who was thankful that while in Kandahar he was not subject to interference or micro-management or as he termed it the “10,000 km screw driver.”

4.4.2.1.4 Motivating the group

Closely associated with achieving buy-in and gaining commitment is the need to motivate the group. When discussing motivation, the participants described motivation as inspiring individuals towards achieving the goal, with a key element being the participation of group members by ensuring individuals perceiving that they had an important role to play. CIDA1 built on this idea by stating the leader not only needs to “ensur[e] everybody had a role to play in the organisation” but that “each role was contributing to something more [than individual goals].” CIDA2 indicated that when motivating the members of the group each approach needed to be tailored to the individual and that the leader needed to “inspire them based on their [the follower’s] own professional competence.”

CIDA2 suggested that another element of inspiration is the need to “generate excitement and enthusiasm for things” with the idea that this excitement needs to be focused, which according to CIDA2 meant that the leader needed to have an “ability to inspire or excite people around them, around that vision.” Thus, the reason for motivating the group in the first place is to accept the vision and goals. This was supported by CIDA4’s own actions as a leader. He focused on gaining buy-in for the vision: “I had to kind of motivate and inspire people and get them, you know, not necessarily excited but to get them to agree to do it in a very, very limited timeframe.” MILITARY1’s view of the role of the leader as “influencing people to do things that they might not actually enjoy doing, something that they might not otherwise want to do” showed the dual importance of motivating to convince the importance of, and to gain commitment to, the goals of the group. The importance of motivating the members of the group was also expressed by DFAIT7. Describing an ineffective leader, she suggested that the ineffective leader could have been more successful had the leader “engaged more with the individuals.”

DFAIT2 offered that one way of motivating the group was to establish high standards. Describing what he called the “inspirational effect,” he argued that “people want to be the best at what they do, um I firmly believe that; and if you set the goal at being the absolute best, then people will work hard towards it.” DFAIT2’s perspective requires the leader to also influence outside the group, arguing that

motivating your staff and personnel... taking the steps necessary to defend their interests and their well-being and potentially sticking your neck out to chart the right course, which is to defend the course of action that you think is correct.

4.4.2.1.5 Stewardship

One behaviour that affected both the group and the parent organisation, though in the latter case it was done with the longer term in mind, was described as taking care of the group; specifically, meeting the professional needs of the group members. The participants viewed this behaviour as supporting the individual's professional and, at times, personal development. They believed that such an investment would benefit the organisation over the longer term by investing in the personnel of the organisation to improve their knowledge and competencies to take on greater challenges and responsibility. This behaviour was seen by the participants as an incentive to remain with the organisation, and provided the participant with a sense of worth and a tangible demonstration that the organisation believed the individual to be of value. When describing an ineffective leader, CIDA2 complained about the lack of support for professional and personal development opportunities from the organisation. Perceiving this as short sighted and focused on the immediate task rather than investing in the future, CIDA2 stated that "there wasn't a balance between being able to um do your current work tasks and also prepare for future roles and assignments or taking on future responsibilities." She went on to explain that:

That person [the ineffective leader] didn't necessarily feel like... professional development was important, or was something the organisation should be supporting. They felt that, that was something employees should do on their own time. Um there was kind of this, I guess this, lack of stewardship of the organisation, because they felt they didn't need to develop the people within it, but it also then felt that person, that leader, ...weren't managing the organisation, you know, the professional development and skills and capabilities of their, the people who were in it [the organisation] for the future, but they also weren't taking care of them in the moment, so there is a feeling that they are just kind of just being neglected.

She believed that the problem was that the leader was

just so concerned with the day-to-day and not with you know where the organisation is going, the purpose any of those kind of stewardship elements. They are just so focused on getting the tasks done of the day and furthering their own career.

She described an effective leader as one who is able to manage their resources (including personnel) to accomplish the tasks that are required to be completed today, while at the same time investing in the future but developing their subordinates for the future. Agreeing with the need to look to the future wellbeing of both the organisation and the individual, CIDA3 described a good leader as “somebody who actually...builds and allows the team and the team members to become better professionals, to grow as professionals, to learn new skills and for, you know, even help produce the next generation of leader.” Frustrated with the lack of attention various leaders in his organisation paid towards development of future leaders, DFAIT2 pointed out this was an organisational weakness in that

they expect you to just walk in and do the job for six months before you are exposed to any formal training. And that training when you get it is largely about financial management, HR processes and sort of the legalities of being the person in charge. How not to get grieved by your employees. Um, it is not so much about the principles of leadership.

Stewardship was seen by the participants as an investment in the future of the organisation and an indication by the organisation that it valued the individual enough to provide professional development opportunities. Leaders who displayed this behaviour were perceived to care for both the organisation and the individual members of the group. Those leaders who did not demonstrate this behaviour were perceived to be uncaring and focused on accomplishing tasks to make them, the leader, look effective in the eyes of the higher level leadership of the organisation.

4.4.2.1.6 Support

A leader behaviour described as critical and having an impact that was perceived to be more immediate than stewardship was the leader supporting the group from influences that originate outside of the group. Aside from resourcing and management issues associated with program development and delivery, participants viewed supporting the group, by building an effective team and establishing a conducive environment, for the team to operate in, as important. In developing a team, the leader needed to be “an agent of cooperation” (CIDA3), able to rise above the competing interests and provide an integrating function to align differing needs and agendas inherent in an inter-organisational group. This was seen from two aspects: internal to the group, which included many of the behaviours already discussed; and external to the group.

CIDA1 believed that “a good leader is one...that champions your cause. The leader understands the importance of program and what it is accomplishing, and why it either needs to stay the course or change the course.” Championing the cause was described as acting on the group’s behalf with external agencies and organisations. The perception that the leader is not

effectively interacting outside of the group may undermine confidence in the leader and the overall goals, as CIDA2 suggested when asked to give an example of a time when she was ineffectively led. She stated that the “person [leader] wasn’t communicating the concerns of the team upwards and so what ended up happening was there felt like there was a disconnect in being able to raise concerns.” MILITARY2 added that at times the support needed to be demonstrated physically, often just by being physically present. In describing an experience of working for who he believed to be an ineffective leader, he described a military training situation with a higher than normal level of risk. When the leader’s presence would have been a sign of support he “got into his vehicle and said something about an important exercise at the other end of the country and disappeared. The impression I got was instead of...being present to accept responsibility he wanted to leave in case things went sideways.”

While supporting the group was associated by a number of participants with stewardship, the fundamental difference in participant descriptions of the two behaviours was the timeframe involved. Stewardship was seen as a longer-term aspect and was viewed from an organisational perspective; while, supporting the group was seen as more immediate, dealing with the specific problem(s) at hand and was viewed from the group level. These differences result in two distinct leader behaviours that merit separate evaluation.

4.4.2.1.7 Understanding

Understanding was described as being professionally knowledgeable, which was equated to being professionally competent and knowledgeable about the environment and the key actors that can influence the group. MILITARY2 believed it important for leaders to “instantly demonstrate they know the file, or where they don’t know it, they are clear where they don’t

know it and that they are working hard to get to know it.” Professional knowledge was associated with the competency of the leader, and by extension, the confidence the group members have in the leader’s decisions and in the leader’s vision. In assuming a formal leadership position in Kandahar, DFAIT 4 stated it was important that he “project a sense of real knowledge and experience” so that his advice to the whole of government team would be taken seriously, and his direction to the DFAIT members of the provincial reconstruction team would be accepted. CIDA2 stated that knowledge and professional understanding is important to allow a leader to “better understand the advice [their] officers are giving” which permits for better informed decisions and direction, and that the leader “is able to provide useful advice to his team.”

For most of the participants, knowledge was perceived as a prerequisite to making effective decisions. In recounting a situation when she believed she was ineffectively led, CIDA2 believed that “they [the leaders] were too nervous to make any decisions because they didn’t know what the right decision would be, so they kind of just postponed making a decision.” She attributed the indecision of the leader to a lack of confidence and the fact that the leader did not have the professional knowledge needed to make decisions. In expanding on the characteristic of professional knowledge, DFAIT2 suggested that in order for the leader to enact the leadership functions, as well as to demonstrate a number of the other desired behaviours, “the leader needs to understand fully and completely and intimately each of the subcomponents. You know, each of the bits and pieces [personnel, policy, equipment, capabilities, restrictions] under the leader’s command, or under their authority.” By understanding the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the group the leader is in a better position to align resources to achieve the

agreed to goals. Likewise, CIDA2 believed that it is important that the leader “gain a better understanding of what each of them [team members] was doing and why they were doing what they were doing and how they were doing it.” DFAIT1 explained that knowledge of both the file and the various components of the group was tremendously important and an advantage, as it gave her an “ability to capture the objections of the other departments to what we were trying to do, because of my understanding and me and my staff, we worked very hard to try and understand our counterpart organisations.” In demonstrating knowledge as a behaviour, DFAIT3 simply stated, “you know you demonstrate through sheer competence.” By having an understanding of the environment that the inter-organisational group is working in, including an understanding of the main actors who may influence the inter-organisational group, the leader is able to identify where the natural partnerships may be, and make strategic connections and build coalitions between the inter-organisational group and other organisations (DFAIT1).

Participants have stated that as group members they have more confidence in the decisions of a leader they perceive as knowledgeable. That confidence extends to accepting the leader’s vision and committing to the goals and direction developed by the leader and the group members. As leaders, the participants found they were more effective in articulating their vision and aligning resources if they understood the different organisationally affiliated sub-groups within the inter-organisational group.

4.4.2.1.8 Manage

The participants all agreed that managing the resources of the group was an important part of being a leader. They viewed managing the group as primarily an administrative role, but it was more than just paperwork; it was managing the process to enable the group to move

forward in the agreed to direction, and managing the people and the resources to align them with the goals of the group. CIDA4 stated that “leadership involves ... managing resources...and people [including] safety and security, of individuals we are putting on the ground.” In this context managing people did not mean “micro-management”; rather it was coordinating the activities of the group and ensuring the group had the needed resources to achieve the aim.

CIDA1’s definition of leadership summed these aspects up when she stated:

I think the purpose of leadership is to ensure that everybody is working towards a common goal, and a common purpose, to ensure that we are not working at cross purposes, and to ensure that all tools and assets that are actually available are used in the most efficient way possible.

In doing so she went on to emphasize that:

the other thing that was important to do as a leader was to recognise the limitations of what everybody was able to do because there was only so far that people could go and I thought it was really important to understand very clearly what the limitations were and what the constraints were that people were operating within.

Coordination was seen to have two aspects: the first, as CIDA5 described, is the “willingness to organise other people and bring them together to have the necessary conversations so that they are coordinated.” The second, as DFAIT1 highlighted, is “an ability to conflict manage with none of the traditional tools to do so.” What this means is establishing priorities within the agreed to goals. The leader needs to understand the needs and capabilities of the various elements found within the inter-organisational group (which in the case of the provincial reconstruction team were based on organisational affiliation) and deconflict differences in priorities and approaches by ensuring that they align with the agreed to priorities of the inter-organisational group. CIDA1’s description of the leader assigning responsibility was reflected in her story of establishing priorities, and assigning tasks to different groups:

We really needed a leader that was able to say no I am actually going to tell the civilian police that they need to support this project right now; no, I am going over to tell the military that they need to do this. So that leadership was definitely crucial and fundamental to ensuring that anybody that had anything to contribute was given the mandate [direction by the leader] to do it. Because operating on our own, nobody even [tried to coordinate by placing their own priorities on hold] though you could see that there were opportunities [to do so] it took the leader to be able to go ‘I have the authority as well as the leadership capability to get those pieces at the table [and coordinate]’.

Once the leader has “marshalled the resources of the organisation to achieve that goal,” CIDA1 expects that “[her] leader is going to give me the space and the tools to get that done.” Whether it is CIDA1 getting the “space” or DFAIT 3 being “empowered,” or Military1 not being subjected to the “10,000km screw driver,” the expected behaviour of the leader is consistent across all participants. The expectation is that the leader will set the conditions for the group, by aligning the resources and efforts of the group to accomplish the agreed to objective and then allow the members of the group to develop how they will accomplish the tasks without interference.

The use of the term bureaucracy with the stereotypical negative connotations was prevalent among the participants. Linking together the expected leader behaviours of supporting the group with managing resources, the participants perceived an effective leader as an individual who can deal with the processes within which the group had to work. It was acknowledged that a number of processes are imposed within any organisation; however, the participants believed that it is the role of the leader to protect them from the process when that process inhibits the successful completion of the goal, and to leverage the process when it can assist the group. To do this CIDA4 argued that the leader needs to be “managing up properly,

and working across government effectively”; that the leader has “to be able to be a problem solver...without being a micro-manager.” As CIDA1 explained, a leader is expected to

find solutions to problems as well, where as we might suggest recommended ways forward...inevitably there are obstacles and there are, you know, problems and process just presents itself so we expect leaders to, or I expect a leader to be able to cut through the process and to be able to manage the process effectively.

4.4.2.1.9 Decision making

One area that was only occasionally discussed³³ was the need for the leader to make decisions. While a number of participants expected “clear and concise decision making,” it did not emerge as a major theme from the majority of the participants. CIDA1 framed the importance of decision making within the context of an emergency, emphasising that “timely decision making is important in regard to what we do, um particularly when you are dealing with emergencies or humanitarian emergencies.” Most described decision making as a deliberate behaviour that was the formal leader’s responsibility due to position. The view that decision making is the role of the formal leader may, in part, explain the lack of emphasis given to this behaviour by the participants during the interviews. That is to say, they simply believed that this was a ‘given’ and as such focused on how the decisions are developed, not who makes the final decision. An analysis of the transcripts showed that the participants believed that the decision-making is done as a collaborative effort within the group, through how the three leadership function direction, alignment and commitment are achieved and as such, with a number of exceptions, the leader is not put in a position to make a decision in isolation. This perspective can be interpreted several ways. The first is that all decisions are made collectively as a group.

³³ A word search was conducted using NVIVO to determine how often participants referred to leader and decision. There was only seven separate references were made to this behaviour.

This interpretation is not supported by the participants' descriptions of this behaviour, who like CIDA4 "expect a leader to make informed and timely decisions." A second interpretation is that an effective leader is open to input from their subordinates, and others, as options are being developed and considered. This interpretation differentiates between developing options and deciding on which option will be used. This interpretation is supported by the participants' descriptions of expected leader behaviours. For example, DFAIT5's experience: "[the leader] that will take my opinion, will take it into consideration and then make the decision" is similar to that of Military4: "so when it comes point when decisions are made and things go forward, they [members of the group] have had that opportunity to vent their issues, and have a meaningful discussion about it [with the commander]" in that they both distinguished between developing and selecting an option. The differences in approaches and how much collaboration and input into the decision making process are discussed in section 4.5 where the differences based on organisational affiliation are examined.

4.4.2.2 **Leader behaviour focused external from the group**

The participants believed that a link between the group and the parent organisations³⁴ was important to allow the group to do what it needed to do. In describing this aspect of leadership, there was a sense that the parent organisations often constrained or restrained the group without fully understanding the situation the group was actually dealing with. The participants' view was that it is the job of the leader to manage that relationship and to "protect" the group from the parent organisations. This took a number of forms, but was generally perceived as the leader supporting or protecting the group.

³⁴ This was referred to by the participants as the strategic level, the parent organisation, or by the department name.

There was a level of dissatisfaction with the parent organisations imposing constraints and restraints on the group. This dissatisfaction was termed as a lack of good leadership in the interviews. In some cases, it was seen as a failing of the leader of the inter-organisational group in setting the conditions for the group to succeed. Related to the belief that the leader is the one to champion the cause outside the group, and in doing so deals with the parent organisations, when the parent organisation was perceived to be an obstacle to the inter-organisational group achieving the agreed to objectives, then the leader was viewed as ineffective. CIDA1 echoed many of the participants' views that the leader needs to interact outside of the group. In most of the examples given, this meant to represent the group and its interests to the parent organisations, and in doing so set a favourable environment that enables the group to move forward.

I think one of the negative things was there wasn't necessarily a lot of shelter [provided by] the leadership...the leaders champion the cause. In that sense [they] are good communicators, in terms at the political level of what it is we are doing, and can carve out the place for the development practitioners to be able to do what it is that they need to do without being necessarily constrained by that upper echelon people bringing to bear other factors that might determine what it is that we do.

In explaining how she would deal with the parent organisations, CIDA1 offered:

It is really important to communicate to ensure that everybody is clear that it should have the same level of priority amongst the government departments. I would demonstrate leadership by um doing whatever it took as well to make sure that...everybody was supported in their own government departments to make that the priority that it need to be. Because that is again where there was a bit of a failing, leaders didn't necessarily see the issues being championed the same way.

What this implies is that the participants expected the leader to ensure that the vision and objectives of the inter-organisational group were communicated to outside organisations; and that the parent organisations understand and supported the vision, and agreed to objectives of the inter-organisational group. Or as DFAIT2 expressed it, that the "message [be] heard and be

convincing upwards and sideways.” In this respect, the leader was viewed as both an integrator and translator. This perspective also suggests the importance of the parent organisations in setting the conditions of the group, in that they have a major role in framing how well the collaborative group works.

As part of enabling the group, participants acknowledged the need to work with other organisations and saw the need for, and benefit in, collaborating outside of the group. Identifying partnerships and building coalitions with other organisations was seen as the responsibility of the leader. CIDA2 believed that “an effective leader has to be able to work outside of his organisation and make those strategic connections that are going to make sure that he can deliver on what his organisation needs to deliver on.” In order to do this, the leader must understand their parent organisation and those associated with the group, which then allows them to identify where the likely partnerships are. CIDA3 viewed this leader behaviour³⁵ as key “to be able to build coalitions between yourself, your organisation and other organisations...to find ways to develop a win-win situation.” From the perspective of the participants, the leader needs to be able to “work across government [departments] effectively and develop and maintain bilateral relationships” (DFAIT4), as well as working collaboratively with other parts of the parent organisation. A key aspect of collaboration ‘up and across’ was the idea that in dealing with these other groups, the leader is taking the necessary steps to defend the interests and well-being of the group. As DFAIT2 noted, “potentially sticking your [the leader] neck out to chart the right course, which is to defend the course of action that you think is correct.”

³⁵ The leader behaviour “understand” described in section 4.4 relates to understanding the leader’s own organisation, understanding the environment the group is working in, and understanding the other organisations and key actors which can influence the group in achieving its goals.

4.4.3 Summary

Since behaviours are the observable manifestation of specific characteristics, this section focused on how the participants viewed behaviours of individuals they deemed to be leaders. The list of desired leader behaviours was derived by the researcher. By examining the participants' responses to the interview questions, a description of an effective leader was developed. These descriptions were framed as both a characteristic, such as he is intelligent, and as a behaviour, such as he listens to his subordinates. When asked to describe the characteristics of an effective leader, the result was generally a list; however, when asked to relate an example of an effective leader, the descriptions were almost always presented as behaviour, or something someone did. The common aspect of all the behaviours was a linkage to enacting the leadership function (direction, alignment and commitment) which enables the group to solve the agreed to problem.

While specific terms used to describe leader behaviours varied across the participants, they clustered into two broad areas: behaviours that focused inwards towards the group; and behaviours that focused outwards from the group. The majority of the behaviours expected by the group members from a leader are focused inward on the group itself. In this respect the leader is seen as an enabler, and not as the sole decision maker or an individual giving direction in terms of issuing orders.

Framing the problem with and for the group by articulating a clear vision is seen as a critical leader behaviour; however, to move the group forward in a common direction it is necessary to ensure commitment to the goals. Commitment was described as achieving buy-in or agreement to achieve the vision and goals by the members of the group. In order to achieve commitment,

the leader must be able to communicate the vision and motivate the members of the group. Stewardship, or ensuring long-term sustainability of the group and the wider organisation, and supporting the group by enabling the group to achieve its goals were seen as necessary. The management of resources of the group was viewed to include the management of physical resources, to include personnel and infrastructure and individual expertise to ensure they are aligned to best achieve the desired goals. Management also meant managing the process, specifically removing bureaucratic or administrative obstacles for the group. Decision-making was seen to be the responsibility of the formal leader; however, prior to making the decision the leader is expected to seek input from the members of group in developing options and considering which option should be selected. Thus, decision-making was perceived by the participants of the inter-organisation group, as a collaborative effort. This perception may explain why decision-making was not perceived to be a critical leader behaviour within the inter-organisational context. The final behaviour necessary to enact the leadership functions was engaging with external organisations. It is through this behaviour that the leader is expected to leverage external resources and expertise, which can enable the group, while simultaneously protecting the group from disruptive or negative influences.

4.5 Leadership – Differing views

When asked to describe a leader and leadership without relating the description to a specific situation or organisation, there was a degree of consistency across the groups. As discussed in section 4.3 leadership was perceived to be present when the leadership functions direction, alignment and commitment were enacted. As shown in section 4.4, the participants agreed on the leader behaviours required to enact the three leadership functions. However, this

was not the case when the leader and the approach to leadership were placed within the context of a specific organisation. The contextualisation of the terms leader and leadership resulted in different descriptions, or perceptions being articulated, between the participants based on organisational affiliation. Using the three parent organisations as the contextual lens, the differences in how leaders and leadership were perceived is examined. Participants' perceptions of leaders and leadership within their own organisations are examined first, and are termed perceptions of self. Next, the participants' perceptions of leaders and leadership from the other two organisations are examined. By comparing and contrasting these views it is possible to identify areas of commonality and areas of differences between the groups.

4.5.1 Perceptions of self

The perception of one's own organisation and the leadership therein was examined to understand how the participants see their personal, as well as their organisation's approach to leadership; then how those approaches affects how they enact the various leadership functions. As expected in the research design how the perception of self was articulated varied from a listing of characteristics to a simple description of how an individual viewed leadership and leaders from their own department. What was not anticipated, was how the narrative was expressed differed between the military and non-military participants. The military participants had clear thoughts on leaders and leadership, consistently referring to Canadian Forces doctrine as a framework or to provide validation or context to their personal perceptions. CIDA and DFAIT participants' narratives tended to be less structured and less uniformed in their descriptions, with two general areas or thematic lines being developed. At first, when asked to describe their organisation's approach to leadership and leaders from their organisations, both

CIDA and DFAIT participants provided a narrative that described the role of their respective organisations and interests rather than describing leadership as a construct or function, suggesting that they did not have a schema that they could easily articulate. As the interviews progressed, the participants' narratives became richer in detail, specifically on describing how the leadership functions are enacted. This narrative was freer flowing than the military narrative and was not linked to or constrained by a formal organisational level framework. An interesting point was that both CIDA and DFAIT often compared their organisation's approach to leadership with that of the military, rather than each other when trying to provide an example of contrast and highlight differences. Lastly, notwithstanding the differences between the three organisations, many of the main elements were consistent across the three departments.

4.5.1.1 **Perceptions of self - military**

The military participants described military leaders as having a leadership approach that is consultative, open to input from subordinates and other members of the group; but that they also have an ability to make decisions quickly under pressure in high risk situations as well as in a more deliberate and considered manner when time is not an essential factor. Two key aspects to how the military participants perceived military leaders and leadership are explained by MILITARY1 as, first the legal authority, "we have a commission for god sake, we have a legal, not only a legal mandate, but we also have a legal obligation to command troops" and secondly, that leadership is tied to the sense of the potential for death and injury. MILITARY1 then adds that with this authority comes a unique responsibility for the military leader that:

There is an expectation that I am going to put you in harm's way, when I am in a command role, so that colours everything. We are telling our guys to go into harm's way, and in fact they are willing to do it...so I think that is...a principal difference [between military leaders and DFAIT or CIDA leaders]

The legal authority provides the military with a unique aspect of leadership, which is command. This dimension of leadership is specific to the military participants in the study. As noted above, command involves the legal authority to direct individuals who have voluntarily assumed the role of subordinate. It is understood, in fact as MILITARY1 explained, it is expected that the leader is going to place their subordinates into harm's way. All of the military participants viewed themselves as leaders, regardless if they were a field commander or a desk officer in a headquarters, and this perception of responsibility and authority influenced the tone of the narrative.

MILITARY1 reframes the general definition of leadership discussed above into the military context by stating, "the purpose of leadership in the military is to make sure people keep moving forward under fire instead of caving. You know, it is ah, all about imbuing people with sufficient esprit de corps that they are going to move forward when things are pretty adverse."

MILITARY2 is more explicit, stating that:

"from a straight military perspective is the ah, physical and mental capacity to actually achieve this under all the conditions that we would expect to have to achieve it ah under, so under duress, under stress, ah under threat of death or dismemberment you have to continue to be able to lead.

MILITARY1 stressed the fact that military leaders were not the same as what is often portrayed as the typical military stereotype; an individual who makes the decisions on the way ahead in isolation and then issuing orders to subordinates who have no recourse but to follow them. His description of military leadership is one of a participative approach to developing goals and objectives, and in doing so accepting input and feedback from members of the group:

In the Army there is a hell of a lot of consultation that goes on between the various levels of command, and frankly negotiation. It is not an accident that

people say with a bit of smirk on their face that when an order is issued that the starting point for negotiation. I don't think any people are as directive as they were at one time in the Army. But, when they get to a decision point, and they have made a decision they expect everybody to row on the same direction, and so building, you need a guy who can build consensus.

Building on the idea of input from the group, MILITARY4 provides a practical explanation for why achieving buy-in through discussion is of importance:

You get to a certain point, um, where simply the function of you being the boss doesn't work. It doesn't, it is a large organisation though people may sit around the table and bobble head and appear to agree, you know, they [members of the group] can apply an institutional lethargy that will just prevent whatever you want to get done,

Military participants view military leaders as supportive of subordinates, with the norm being to delegate authority and responsibility for how the goals are reached. Once the vision is articulated, goals are established and the direction of the group is determined through collaboration. How to accomplish the goal is then delegated to the members of the group, or subordinates, to determine and then execute, with the leader providing support as needed.

Termed as mission command, MILITARY1 explained:

We tell a guy what we want we want him to do, not how to do it, we give him the resources and he gets on with it, and if he needs more resources he is expected to come back to the commander and get them. But generally speaking, and this was certainly the case in Task Force Canada, Kandahar, the Task Force commanders are not at the mercy of their bosses some 10,000 km away and hence are not subject to the 10,000 km screw driver.

MILITARY2 agreed with this perception, emphasising that the military culture is based on “centralised authority and decentralised execution” in which “we place in the hands of a platoon commander ah or a company commander³⁶ a great deal of authority. We give them intent, as

³⁶ A platoon commander is generally a junior officer with 1-4 years of service responsible for 30 to 40 subordinates. If the platoon is operating on its own, it may be reinforced with other military and non-military capabilities increasing the number of individuals to 50. A company commander is a major, generally with 10-plus years in the service. A company consists of 120

you know and ah, ah a rule set that we have them grow up by and we expect them to deliver without an awful lot of micromanagement.” MILITARY2’s comment “a rule set that we have them grow up by” is an important aspect of military leadership. The military participants’ perceptions of leadership have been shaped by the professional development they have received throughout their careers. This development consists of a combination of formal educational opportunities with practical experiential learning, both of which framed within an organisationally developed leadership doctrine. The result is a clearly defined and common perspective on leadership that is instilled from entry into the military, then reinforced and refined throughout the participants’ career.

The military participants described military leaders as result-oriented and mission-focused. The desire develop and implement solutions to solve identified problems underpins the military approach to leadership and perhaps helps to explain the almost obsession with planning and focus on achieving the desired goals. When asked to define a military leader, MILITARY5 responded by saying they are “results-orientated [sic], get it done, out in front, lead by example, type A personality.” In comparing the military to civilian leaders, MILITARY3 highlights the near obsession with achieving the mission along with the physical presence of the leader in dealing with the group and inherent risks associated with the profession:

We are mission-orientated [sic], in that we will do anything, move heaven and earth, to achieve our mission, they [civilians] don’t see things the same way. Their activities are based on budget cycle, so instead of being driven by missions and campaign plans, they are driven by their budget. They are also, they also don’t have a culture of physical bravery, in that they are courageous in that they do some of the things that they do in deployed areas ah um, they will not take the same risks that the military will take.

soldiers. In the Afghanistan mission companies were deployed in forward operating bases. Other capabilities, e.g. engineers for infrastructure development and repair, additional weapon systems, maintenance and support elements to make the operating bases more self-sufficient could be added increasing the size to 200.

In recounting his experiences in a senior planning position, MILITARY4 noted that the focus on mission success, or achieving the objectives, does not translate into the leader dictating how the objectives are to be achieved. Rather MILITARY4 reinforced the notion of mission command, and delegation of authority and decision making to subordinates which was corroborated by the other military participants:

If what you have done may not be the way the boss really wanted, but it works, fine; they will let that pass and they would be supportive and encouraging and rewarding of guys that do that. So the organisation rewards that kind of outside-the-box kind of approaches, as long as the effect or the outcome has been achieved.

MILITARY4's remarked that the focus on planning and problem solving can be a weakness when it prevents the military from listening to the perceptions of others. He stated: that

I don't think we military are very good at that [listening]. [B]ecause again, we go through a, especially young officers who moved through and got staff training and that, we go through an analysis, course of action analysis, appreciation process in our minds, which, you know other organisations don't do that in the same way, so as, we have a tendency to, in parallel, to us listening, we rapidly are starting to go through a course of action analysis, which means as we start to do that, especially if what is spoken to seems familiar to us, um we listen less, and the recommend is to hear everything they [peers from other governmental and non-governmental organisations] have to say and employ kind of an active listening approach in terms of, you question them, don't question them to try and get them to think your way, question them to ensure you understand what they are trying to communicate.

MILITARY4's observation demonstrated a level of introspection and ability to identify weaknesses in self. This level of self-awareness is shared by MILITARY5 who stated that:

They [military officers] need to get a good sense of the fact they are going to be working with folks that are not military so and so it's more about understanding ourselves and our weaknesses and our preponderance to use acronyms and speak obtusely in a way that a civilian would not understand is really on our back

This introspection and acknowledgment of the differences in how the military operates demonstrates that the military participants recognise what should be done when dealing with non-military organisations as either a peer or leader. The question remains can they operationalise this understanding and knowledge?

The military participants perception of the military approach to leadership can be summarised as consultative, results oriented, where subordinates are delegated authority to accomplish tasks without interference from the leader. These characteristics are framed within what is viewed as a legal and moral authority where subordinates voluntarily accept being put into harm's way by the leader.

4.5.1.2 **Perceptions of self - CIDA**

CIDA participants' view of CIDA leaders and approach to leadership was described as a collaborative, a bottom-up organisation that is seen to focus more on management rather than leadership. The sense of management versus leadership is largely due to the perception that CIDA officers work independently, with individual ownership of a specific portfolio based on the expertise of the individual CIDA officer who "owns" that specific file. This sense of expertise, independence and professionalism are key to the view that a formal leader in CIDA is primarily an internal coordinator, generally at headquarters in Ottawa, who is expected to enact the three leadership functions with external agencies, and to support the individual CIDA officers in the field.

CIDA2 attempted to describe her own perceptions of leader within the context of CIDA and her own experiences in the organisation:

I didn't get a good sense or grasp at the time of what leadership meant, because in my experience a lot of that was management. So there was like this equation of

leadership with management. Its more about, it was more about, I guess you get this decision funnelled up to you, so you have to make these quick decisions, but it was always about, ok, making the decisions in-line with what kind of authorities you have been assigned for your level and what you had, in sticking with sort of parameters or framework you were given by Treasury Board so to me there just didn't seem to be a lot of room for creative thinking, or kind of going outside of the box.

She goes on to say that “in the CIDA context, but also it's the same for I guess the Public Service in general ... the leaders were the management. So there wasn't...it wasn't, it was hard to make a distinction between the two.”

CIDA2 and CIDA3 make the point that as an organisation CIDA is “more hierarchical than you would expect it to be” but suggest that this is due to a “difference in the understanding of leadership between...headquarters and the field.” In describing the headquarters approach, CIDA2's perspective is that it is not collaborative at all. In expressing a level of frustration about the differences between individual perceptions of what leadership should be with how leadership in CIDA is actually enacted, CIDA2 points out that:

CIDA they are always talking; they don't really walk their talk. Like they are always talking about participation and you know horizontal inclusion and all of this kind of stuff in the development world, and then when it comes back to the headquarters everything is very hierarchical and you basically need the Minister or the President's support behind something before [moving forward], and even then there are ways of, you know, others of shirking or what not, of not getting behind it.

However, this view does not seem to be contradictory to the perceptions of the other CIDA participants; rather, it seems to support the characterisation of CIDA as an hierarchical organisation, and the role of the formal leader as one of agreeing to the project objective, or goals, then leaving it to the individual with the expertise to develop the approach to resolving the

problem. Within this context, one of the main roles of the formal leader is assisting the individual CIDA officers in the field to conceive, design and implement developmental projects.

CIDA participants stressed the collaborative nature of decision making within CIDA, explaining that ideas, suggestions and recommendations are developed bottom-up rather than top-down. In describing how decisions are made within CIDA, CIDA5 explains that “the process for assessing a project and determining whether or not we want to go forward with it, and what kind of comments and concerns we might have is a hugely consultative process.” In developing goals, objectives and ideas, CIDA1 reiterated that “within CIDA, it’s a little bit different; the thinking and the recommendations typically comes from the teams and then moves up and then people make decisions.” In describing CIDA leadership, CIDA1 emphasized the individual responsibility and overall sole ownership of the problem:

It is different, for the CIDA team. We all had our own portfolio so nobody really had to work with anybody else on the team to get the job done. You were given something to do, you have total independence and that was the nice thing, it wasn’t like the military teams were you have to rely on other units to get the job done um leadership works differently because we all independently manage and lead our own areas, I don’t need the other CIDA officer to get my job done.

The sense of sole ownership based on individual CIDA officer’s expertise is supported by CIDA3 who differentiated leadership between the military and the non-military side of the provincial reconstruction team: “on the, you know the civilian side, in terms of our development director um she would always be open to adjusting.” CIDA3 agreed with CIDA1 that the leader will take advice from the group, or subordinates based on expertise, explaining that “if the director thinks one thing and you know, the person who is managing the health programs says well actually this is what we are going to have to do, and this is what we are going to adjust. The development director will accept that without hesitation.”

CIDA1 described what she desires from her leader in these terms. She does not seek direction on how to solve the issue, but rather she expects that the “leader is going to give me the space and the tools to get that done.” If there are problems than being able to “go, like to your director, your leader saying ’ok here is the summary report of where we are, here are the problems, these are the issues I am having do you have any recommendations or advice of where I can go?”

The CIDA participants described CIDA leadership as collaborative, supportive and goal orientated. Although characterised as hierarchical in nature, CIDA approaches leadership as bottom-up, with input and planning coming from CIDA field officers who are experts in their specific area. CIDA participants tended to described CIDA’s approach as management rather than leadership; with leadership being used to describe the formal leadership positions in Ottawa.

4.5.1.3 Perceptions of self – DFAIT

DFAIT participants viewed their approach to leadership as consultative and collaborative, primarily due to having to work across organisations, often as individuals, with little or no delegated authority to make decisions or to establish goals and objectives. They described the DFAIT leader as being “more responsive, more open to, ah how to put it? Using numerous levers to achieve an end, and more willing to compromise on core values in favour of ah, ah strategic outcome” than their CIDA or military counterparts. The DFAIT participants explained that this responsiveness and broad approach results in a lesser emphasis on specialised professional technical knowledge, but an ability to effectively communicate ideas and concepts in order to influence others without the formal authority their military and CIDA counter-parts are perceived to have.

When describing leadership and leaders, DFAIT participants tended to focus on the formal positions found within DFAIT, resulting in perceptions being described in the context of those senior leaders within DFAIT. These positions are generally found in Ottawa, and as such did not necessarily reflect a generic DFAIT leader or officer. These initial descriptions gave a sense of how the participants viewed the parent organisation and their superiors in that organisation. Of note, this suggested that with the exception of a formal position in Afghanistan (the Ambassador and the Representative of Canada in Kandahar (ROCK)) the participants did not perceive themselves as leaders. For example, participants explained that decision making within DFAIT is held at the higher level, with limited delegation of authority to subordinates and those DFAIT officers in the field (which composed the majority of the participants). In describing his perceptions of leaders within DFAIT, DFAIT2 compares it to what he sees as the military approach:

So within that box [within the mission mandate] they tend to have...more freedom of action of how to get there, more delegated authority. We lack that authority, um delegated authority, in our junior to middle ranks. But senior ranks, we have very expansive authority and we are less part of a cog, ah, we are less cogs in a machine, with a much more direct connection to ultimate political authority.

DFAIT2 emphasised the perception that DFAIT leaders have greater responsibility and authority (at the senior levels) when compared to military leaders, “so we tend to view our reach [responsibility] as very, very broad; whereas some, we often I would explain to my DFAIT colleagues that they may often have a difficulty in getting a military leader to see beyond the box within they operate.” He went on to suggest that DFAIT officers are able to deal with a wide range of challenges and problems, that it is an implied characteristic desired in DFAIT officers, and hence leaders: “We are often, in comparison, called upon to operate more out in areas which

we may have comparatively little experience.” Notwithstanding the lack of practical experience, DFAIT 2 believed that DFAIT leaders “will be more directly accountable to our own political leadership.” This was the mindset that DFAIT officers had while working in the provincial reconstruction team.. As part of the inter-organisational group senior DFAIT officers working with other organisations had a responsibility to report and recommend options back to the parent organisation, but not to develop their own, or group, goals or objectives. Thus the leadership process found in DFAIT removed the decision making process and where goals are defined for the group, from individuals who are intimately involved with the situation, to formal leaders who are relatively high in the hierarchy. DFAIT1’s narrative of the process used by DFAIT and the interaction between the lead DFAIT officer in Kandahar with the parent organisation in Ottawa supports this perspective:

You can have perfect understanding at the tactical level, but...the [the senior DFAIT officer in Kandahar] was constrained by his mandate, his mission which was very time limited, and [name removed] was constrained by what idiots like me back in Ottawa were telling him, and his perception of his role, which was reporting. The product of the diplomat, 90 times out of 100 is a report, and that report goes to someone who uses it to influence Canadian policy.

Using a similar frame of reference as CIDA participants in the previous section, DFAIT2 differentiated between non-military and military leaders and leadership. Although he did note a minor difference between CIDA and DFAIT, his focus was on perceived roles of the two organisations:

The only core difference, the important defining difference between DFAIT and CIDA leadership would be how DFAIT conceive their mission. A DFAIT leader will see their mission as delivering on Canadian interests, however broadly or narrowly that maybe defined. CIDA leadership will see their mission, um, as delivering against a set of humanitarian values to which Canada has associated itself, but it might not always, the achievement of which may not always, in ever circumstance, in every moment, be in the Canadian interest. And the tension we

will always have between DFAIT leaders, and CIDA leaders will be differentiating between the humanitarian imperative and the [Canadian national] interest imperative.

He goes on to note the similarities in leadership approach, that is how the leadership function (direction, alignment and commitment) are enacted, are explained by the fact that the leaders in CIDA and DFAIT are public servants:

I mean how they go about it, will be very similar, I mean how they go about you know ah leading their organisations will be very similar, use very similar tools , very similar backgrounds um often with a lot of cross-fertilisation between the two ministries.

DFAIT1 highlights the point that “your civilian actors will have no delegated authority whatsoever” and that “actually we now have a six week approval process we have to go through back in Ottawa with people who don’t have an understanding of the tactical situation [in Kandahar].” The perceived lack of delegated authority to have input into the inter-organisational group decision-making process was seen by the participants as a limitation on DFAIT officers, specifically those assigned in a lead civilian role in the provincial reconstruction team. This resulted in the DFAIT participants not perceiving themselves as a leader nor enacting leadership functions. This perception was reinforced by the fact that DFAIT did not assign DFAIT officers to a formal leadership role, or provide the DFAIT officers with the mandate or assign them subordinates.

As the participants’ narratives became more story-telling the descriptions and perceptions of leaders and leadership moved from the hierarchical aspects of leadership as a formal position within the organisation, to a description of how individuals enact the leadership functions, the themes of individual influence and consensus building became predominant in the DFAIT participants’ narratives. In comparing the DFAIT approach to leadership to the military

approach, DFAIT2, highlighted that DFAIT focuses on “finding consensus on the way to move forward, as opposed to a planning cycle and... production of orders.” She indicated that when discussing leadership, the focus is outwards from DFAIT. As she explained, “if you are working in this environment [deployed to the field and not working in Ottawa] you will be working more as an individual than as a member of a formed unit, that you should think about attitudes creativity, openness and dialogue.” DFAIT5 agreed; when describing DFAIT officers interacting with others, she contrasted DFAIT with the military saying, “whereas on the civilian side [DFAIT] I think it is more about their ability to network and, um, you know work with diverse people.” Thus, the desired behaviours to enact the leadership functions are built around gaining consensus and developing, then growing networks, rather than on developing tangible goals and then options to achieve those goals. DFAIT3, not only provided a contrast to the military, but also demonstrated that the focus, or aim, of leadership from a DFAIT perspective is not necessarily to accomplish an immediate or tangible goal:

At DFAIT we will have a tendency to be diplomatic and nice; sort of beat around the bush to make sure everybody is warm and fuzzy when they leave the room. Whereas in the military I think there is more of a tendency to just tell it like it is, um around the table irrelevant of who is sitting there and this is the problem and this is what we have to do and this is everybody’s role and please go ahead and do it. Not in a disrespectful way ah um I think it is just a different approach.

When asked about making decisions and setting goals DFAIT5 offered that DFAIT’s approach is based on “consultation, and that sort of thing and it’s not; there is somebody in charge but, they still sort of, you need to sort of reach some sort of consensus or decision point.”

DFAIT6 further refined the idea of leadership not being about making decisions but offered that:

The concept of leadership of the foreign service culture, not necessarily all of DFAIT, but within the foreign service culture is much more about judgement, about guidance, about um sound reasoning, and providing that to help guide your

people appropriately but it isn't always about decision making, and I think this is a, it sets it apart from many ways from the type of leadership that I understand the military values and focuses on.

But the concept of consensus does not translate into talking until everybody agrees.

Rather, it means working with the various groups to first gain an understanding of the different perspectives and objections of the various stakeholders, then ensuring that the members of the group see that their concerns have been considered, and then a decision on the way to achieve the goals is made by the senior leaders. DFAIT1 stated that she believed that "from a DFAIT point of view... leadership it is personality based. There was no particular model; it was... really force of personality." When asked to expand on what is meant by personality based, and then asked to describe the personality she responded:

Not all of them are positive. Ah um, [long pause]. Force of personality, and by that I mean someone who is, ah both persuasive and bull-headed ah um prepared to move ahead irrespective of the objections, because, especially in a civilian setting there are always 50 naysayers for every idea. Um articulate, both orally and in writing, someone who, to be a leader in a DFAIT context you have to be effective at promoting your ideas and putting them down on paper. Because it is a bureaucracy or an organisational culture, which is based on the persuasive ah illustration of ideas on paper.

A unique aspect of leadership that came from DFAIT, but which was not identified by the CIDA or military participants was that often the motivation to support leaders is strictly transactional in nature, that is to say the individual is rewarded for the support they give to the leader. As noted by DFAIT1, "the reward for being part of a particular leader's orbit was being on the inside of the decision making process, and so you garner resources by being perceived by being the person who is able to move something through the system."

DFAIT participants described DFAIT leadership in terms of consultation, consensus building and reserved to the senior positions within the organisation. DFAIT leaders where

described to be strong communicators, and able to develop personal networks which are used to influence and gain information. DFAIT leaders tend to work as individuals, with little or no delegated authority, unless in a key senior position.

4.5.2 Perceptions of others

4.5.2.1 Military leaders and military leadership

In describing how they viewed leaders and how leadership was enacted in other organisations, the CIDA and DFAIT participants perceived leadership in the military context as being different from their own. In response to the question “is leadership in the military different from CIDA,” CIDA1 responded, “command and leadership are expressed in very different ways in the military than they are in CIDA.” The general perception of the military leader and the military approach to leadership fell into three themes. First, the military was perceived as authoritative when developing the goals and establishing the vision, both of which are seen to be done by the formal military commander at the higher levels with little or no input from the subordinates or members of the group. Second, military leaders are viewed as being very direct and to the point when discussing approaches to achieve the goal with others, even when dealing with other organisations outside of the military. Third, the military leader is seen to be mission focused. That is to say, military leaders are perceived to have an almost single mindedness focus on the achievement of the goal, which is directed from the senior military commander. However, once the goals had been developed and given to subordinates to execute, those same subordinates had a larger degree of authority of how to achieve the goals than either CIDA or DFAIT.

When describing military leadership and the military leader, the majority of the discussion centred on the military deployed on operations and two specific aspects of the military in this context. The first aspect was an acknowledgment by DFAIT and CIDA participants regarding the unique role of the military in using violence and deadly force to achieve its goals and the likelihood of death and injury of the members of the military. When asked to describe how the military leader was different from a CIDA leader, CIDA4 described his views of both the role of the military as an organisation and the specific unique aspects of leadership in this context:

The readiness I suppose to use kinetic force to achieve a goal, and apply it in a manner that is judicious yet effective.... to understanding the costs associated with that type of things, and then things that need to be done to remediate the effects of the use of that kind of force, and being able to ah um, you know, ah clearly define and lead people into that harm's way, you know, potentially dying with a sense of saying, this is for a greater cause or greater good.

Some of the participants viewed this unique role of the military as constraining. DFAIT2 offered that “they [military leaders] exercise their leadership within a fairly narrow arc, within fairly narrow confines, um and that their leadership is specialised.” This level of specificity was seen as influencing how the military leader perceives problems and develops solutions to resolve those problems. DFAIT1 explained that “their [the military's] entire culture background and training is about achieving a practical effect” and as such the focus was “results over, no that's not entirely true. Short time results are paramount, so [they are] directed and... active in, single minded in pursuit of the mission as defined.” The other aspect that was perceived to influence the military approach to leadership was centred on the timeframe that most military leaders were believed, by the DFAIT and CIDA participants, to work under. From a DFAIT and CIDA perspective, the military timeframe was seen to be extremely short, and in the case of

Afghanistan restricted, to a single rotation of 6 to 9 months based on the Commander of the task force, while the DFAIT and CIDA participants typically spent a year, or more, in Afghanistan.

The participants from CIDA and DFAIT agreed with CIDA5 that

in terms of the military as a whole, there was a lack of a vision that was concrete over the course of our entire engagement in Kandahar, and that each individual rotation had its own vision that was determined by the CO [commanding officer], and um that was done well but it didn't ensure consistency over the, over the series of rotations that went into Kandahar.

This perception was mirrored by DFAIT1, who explained the differences between how the military leaders acted in comparison to their CIDA and DFAIT counterparts:

So herein lays the primary problem we have right at the beginning; the timeframe that CIDA and DFAIT were operating in was not the timeframe the military operated in. The PRT commander arrived on the ground; [he] has six months to have an effect. The political director, DFAIT and CIDA, arrive on the ground, [they] have one year, because that was their tour length to better understand what is going on in Kandahar so we can start to take moves to engage in activities a year hence.

The perception of the DFAIT and CIDA participants when describing the military was that the limited time, combined with the risk of death and injury combined to reinforced the notion of command and the associated aspects of being directive and lack of collaboration from subordinates.

Terminology used by CIDA and DFAIT participants to describe military leaders and leadership was different from that used to describe either a DFAIT or CIDA leader or leadership. None of the participants used the term manager or administrator when describing the military; even the term management was only used when describing the action of managing resources. What was used exclusively when describing the military was the term commander, which often replaced the term leadership when the DFAIT and CIDA participants described the military

approach to leadership in Kandahar. This was generally linked to the fact that the military leader had legal authority associated with their formal leadership position. When asked to describe a military leader, DFAIT2 associated the term military leader with the formal position of commander. In doing so, DFAIT2 perceived this as a restriction on their leadership, noting:

A military leader is somebody who has, hmmm, a very clear mandate and legal justification for the position in which they find themselves. They have a clear but often very narrow ah um arc within which they can exercise that authority. Um, and they do so as part of a cog in a very large machine.

The idea of a “mandated position” and the military leader being “a cog in a larger machine” is indicative of the perception that the military is very hierarchical. Although both CIDA and DFAIT participants acknowledge that their own organisations are hierarchical in nature, the view of the participants in both CIDA and DFAIT was that the military’s hierarchical structure was a hindrance to thinking and imagination in a collaborative setting. CIDA1 believed that “the critical thinking is done at more at the command level within the military.” This was seen to mean that the analysis and framing of problems or the development of the vision and goals, were done at higher levels. As such, the framing of the problem and hence the solution to that problem developed by the military, was seen to be narrow and not inclusive of the other parts of the inter-organisational group. Based on, his experience, DFAIT2 believed that his DFAIT colleagues “may often have a difficulty in getting a military leader to see beyond the [military] box within which they operate.” DFAIT1 added to this perspective, describing military leaders in general to be “in the box,” stating “to work effectively inter-departmentally, you have to be prepared to think out of your box. Thinking out of your box does not mean how do I get all of these resources to help my box, its understanding that the box is bigger. But it is, ah, typically, even very effective military officers... never quite got there.”

It was with respect to vision development and the interaction with others in identifying the goals and objectives that the DFAIT and CIDA participants noted the military as being different. One perspective was that military leaders are seen to be more direct than their CIDA or DFAIT counter-parts. This directness was perceived as both a positive and negative characteristic. DFAIT7's experience was positive, stating that military leaders "are a little bit more direct and clear, ah um, when you are getting information or instructions, or guidance or however you want to phrase it." Notwithstanding the fact that he found the direction to be clear, DFAIT7 did not seem comfortable with this approach, stating that he found "there is a little bit less discussion perhaps in a military leadership role on the way forward than what would be in a civilian situation." Others agreed that this directness verged on giving orders without the requisite formal authority to do so and was perceived to show a lack of willingness to compromise. DFAIT5 noted that when working with military leaders "it can feel that there is not as much ability to compromise or like listen and make common recommendations. There is a position and sometimes it is a little harder to get flexibility." This more directive approach by the military was perceived by DFAIT and CIDA participants to be associated with the concept of command and the associated legal and moral responsibilities of the military. When asked to compare the military to DFAIT or CIDA, DFAIT5 reiterated the unique aspects of military leadership, command:

I think a lot of the distinction comes back to the issue of command, and the ability to command. Ah, um, and make those decisions and to understand complexities of environments and still make those difficult decisions. I think that I just, I think that there is on the distinction for me is on the military side there is still all those um more the skills associated with commanding that are strictly military and those have a proportionally high value when you are actually picking somebody to go in and can they carry themselves well under these situations and are they able to make these decisions.

In comparing military and civilian leaders, CIDA4 not only provided her perception of the different approaches, but notably clustered DFAIT and CIDA together suggesting a common civilian approach:

Military leaders are more willing to ask hard questions about goals, means and ends, and get that defined really clearly, whereas civilians are, I suppose, coming from DFAIT or CIDA or others, are a little bit more tolerant of ambiguity, because arguably the costs associated with ah failure are less. I mean I have often said that one of the reasons that we don't do the kinds of in-depth, post-action assessments that the military does, after action reporting and all that stuff is that the bursts of action are far less intense and far longer in duration. Your level of intensity is very high over short period. You [the military] are sprinters, we are marathoners.

The directness of the military leader was perceived to be a positive feature, specifically when developing the way ahead, or how the goals should be achieved. In recounting his experiences in Kandahar, DFAIT7's example of a military leader providing direction to subordinates in which the military leader's direction was "this is the information, these are your orders, and does anyone have any questions?" What DFAIT7 thought was positive was that the military leader allowed the subordinates the discretion to decide how to accomplish the goals, and after receiving a briefing on how they planned to complete the tasks the military leader simply stated "good, go do it." DFAIT2's experience was similar, noting the direct approach of the military leader but noting that the "military leader will...often have far more delegated individual authority and responsibility [than DFAIT or CIDA]." This perception of authority was described as: "If the general wants that hill taken he doesn't tell the infantry captain how to take the hill, um, he says go get the hill and the captain figures out how to do it." He explained that the delegated authority is bounded by "commander's intent [what needs to be accomplished] which does not tell them [the subordinates] how to accomplish the task." He caveated his

statement by adding that “within that box [limitations imposed by the mandate or by the superior commander] they tend to have I what would [describe] as more freedom of action of how to get there, more delegated authority.” This freedom of action and delegation of authority was perceived to be a strength for the military leader in their ability to achieve the mission. DFAIT1 noted, “in the absence of direction, which is so often the case, the military officer will have delegated authority over his resources.” She went on to comment that “your civilian actors will have no delegated authority whatsoever,” underscoring a major perceived difference in approaches between the military, and the civilian organisations. Of note, the delegation of authority was not seen by all of the participants as positive. What the military participants viewed as a strength in its approach, defined as mission command, CIDA1 viewed as a lack of support, input and engagement from the military leader, “[the] commander would look at you and maybe say, that is your problem to solve, you just tell me how you are going to get the job done.”

Yet the perception that the military leader simply developed the vision and objectives then told the members of the group to go forward and achieve the goals was not consistent amongst the participants. In discussing her experience in Kandahar, CIDA3 was “pleasantly surprised to see a commander that would listen to his subordinates and sometimes adjust his intent.” Another interesting perception that came from the CIDA participants was that they viewed CIDA and the military as closer in approach than the two are to DFAIT. This view is related to organisational role and the perception of how members from each of the organisations see the problem and the type of goals that the organisations desire to achieve. In reflecting on his work in Kandahar, CIDA3 stated:

We realised that we had a lot more in common with DND than we do with DFAIT, because we are more about, you know, producing products, producing and then putting in place money and programming to get change and we are all about, you know, frameworks and results and indicators and we are about delivering something.

DFAIT participants agreed that the military focus is on practical results. DFAIT1 stated that “their [the military] entire culture background and training is about achieving a practical effect.”

CIDA3 compared CIDA to the military in describing that both organisations focus on achieving practical results:

On the CIDA side and on the DND side we are all about change (laugh) and so we have to be diplomats because you can't just go and be a bull in a china shop and change everything. So you have to be diplomatic about it, but you need to find ways in which you can at the end of your project or at the end of your program you can look back and say ok, if we hadn't come the following things would not have happened.

4.5.2.2 Perceptions of CIDA leaders and CIDA leadership

When asked to describe CIDA leaders and leadership from a CIDA approach, participants tended to group DFAIT and CIDA together as a single civilian, or public service group.

DFAIT5's perspective is that CIDA and DFAIT leaders display a similar, if not the same, set of characteristics or behaviours. He offered that for CIDA some of the important behaviours are:

Decision making by consensus, and a group approach, being able to work with other people ah um still about reducing tensions but as I said, on the civilian side I don't think we have as much, it's not as delineated for like, you need to, it's not a command relationship so it's not about taking your information and just making that decision, having said that ah when you get up to the leadership positions in so many organisations that is there, you have to be able to make the decisions.

DFAIT2 also saw leadership from a DFAIT and CIDA perspective as being very similar with the important defining difference between DFAIT and CIDA leadership how each organisation conceives their mission. DFAIT2 explained one possible reason for the similarities between

CIDA and DFAIT is the fact they are both civilian organisations, and that many of the senior personnel move from one department to another. However, he went on to say that the focus of the leader, or how that leader perceives the problem that the group is trying to solve, and hence the approach, often differs between the two.

I think what sets them apart is the value set, um and I think at the risk at betraying perhaps departmental bias, I think that the CIDA leaders would tend to be more dogmatic, closed minded and devoted to a narrow set of principles whereas I think a DFAIT leader tends to be, more responsive, more open to ah how to put it? Using numerous levers to achieve and end, and more willing to compromise on core values in favour of ah, ah strategic outcome.

The lack of delegation from the parent organisational level of CIDA and DFAIT was a consistent theme from the participants. DFAIT1 reiterated, “your civilian actors will have no delegated authority whatsoever.” She continued to explain that this lack of delegation has a negative effect on relationships and on how the civilian organisations are viewed, in particular by the military, because that ability to identify objectives is stymied:

Your military officer is then ok we have reached a decision so let’s go ahead and put something in place, and all of a sudden your CIDA and DFAIT people are saying ok, stop actually we now have a six week approval process we have to go through back in Ottawa with people who don’t have an understanding of the tactical situation.

The lack of delegation, and the need to refer back to Ottawa, was a point of frustration for the military. MILITARY1 grouped both CIDA and DFAIT together when expressing his frustration about the lack of delegated authority his civilian counterparts had, his view was that unlike the military leaders MILITARY1’s civilian counterparts were

very much the subject of a lot of scrutiny...right from Deputy Ministers and ah, and have to suffer 10,000 km screw driver and a lot of decisions are top down driven and require a constant check back with Ottawa.

He attributed this lack of delegation to “the culture of risk aversion that exists inside of most civil services.” MILITARY5 also viewed CIDA and DFAIT leadership approaches as similar, in that the ability to actually make decisions and move forward towards agreed upon goals is missing, “except for the fact that um their ability to get decisions on short-term. Um ah, issues is always going to be not there.” He saw this as a result of how DFAIT as an organisation viewed leadership, specifically how it approached decision making and delegation of authority noting that “in most cases they really are not going to be empowered to make moment-to-moment decisions when they come from an organisation that’s concerned with long-term issues.” The inability for CIDA, as well as DFAIT, to actually make decisions, or rather the perception that CIDA and DFAIT members of the inter-organisational group were restricted by the parent organisation to be able to make the decisions, was viewed as an absence of leadership by the military. In fact, when asked about CIDA and DFAIT approaches to leadership MILITARY1 was adamant that “they don’t, that is the principle point to make, they manage, they don’t lead.” These differences in terminology between manage and lead was persistent throughout the MILITARY participants. MILITARY4 had a similar perspective that CIDA as an organisation would not be appointed as the lead agency and by extension, his perception was that CIDA members did not lead, rather the various levels of CIDA officers managed. In fact, his view was that while

CIDA has a greater degree of consistency, their division is hierarchical, so once you get into the kind of Director, Director General level equivalents, they may not actually be real CIDA people. The worker types, you know, t, the odds of ever finding one of them being put in charge of anything is slim, because they don’t kind of like that.

Based on his experiences in Afghanistan, MILITARY4 was of the view that CIDA would deliberately not take a leadership role:

Because that would mean they couldn't chuck shit at everybody else, except they do. And that is CIDA, DFID, USAID are exactly the same, they would far rather let somebody else be in charge so that they can critique it, and that is again their organisation doesn't lend to them being in a leadership role, hence them being independent agents and executing programs, a lot of free will, a lot of independence, so in dealing with them, um, you are dealing with someone who potentially would be in a leadership role, who might be quite uncomfortable with that.

Similar perspectives regarding CIDA as a lead organisation, and hence in a leadership role, were echoed by some of the DFAIT participants who linked leadership to formal positions. DFAIT7's comment, "I am not sure I have ever been in a situation where CIDA was the lead. Definitely where they were an important contributor or co-chair, but not the lead," provides a contextual framework of how CIDA as an organisation was perceived and implies why he found it so difficult to describe the CIDA approach to leadership. The categorisation of CIDA as an agency and therefore CIDA officers as non-leaders was reinforced in Afghanistan by what DFAIT1 described as the perceived role of CIDA:

CIDA wasn't there to exercise leadership; their initial staff were on a needs assessment mission. There was no one or no area over which they were supposed to be providing leadership. They would, they were there to provide advice were appropriate to the military commander, which from a CIDA perspective meant to rein in the military from getting themselves in trouble and to provide information back to headquarters, so that CIDA headquarters could decide on the nature of their development assistance in the province.

DFAIT4 viewed CIDA leadership more as an administrative or management function, based on how he perceived CIDA's role during operations:

Well they have a different role, CIDA is a program delivery agency, so project management, and the work involved in generating results through financing projects and of course, maintaining government confidence through compliance

of the various policies and regulations involved is ah, you know, is fundamental to their way of working. I wouldn't say that, that lead to a different way of observing their reality in Kandahar, or was an impediment to collaboration.

MILITARY1 echoed that perception, making a distinction between leadership and management, placing CIDA in the role of a manager concerned about project progress and tangible metrics rather than as a leader:

They are more concerned about their, their..., results based management framework, RBMF. So the results based management framework is the Holy Grail, and more so in CIDA than in DFAIT because there are more measurables in CIDA. If you can deliver on your, results based management framework ...and show progress and ah, you know to them that is leadership.

4.5.2.3 Perceptions of DFAIT leaders and DFAIT leadership

The perceptions that CIDA and MILITARY participants had of DFAIT leaders and their approach to leadership centres on the notion that they are viewed as policy advisors and diplomats, not as leaders. This meant that DFAIT leaders were perceived as bureaucrats and administrators who, except for the senior echelon, did not demonstrate leadership. When asked to describe a DFAIT leader or the DFAIT approach to leadership, CIDA5 used the term DFAIT leadership to identify the senior positions within DFAIT. His view was that they are “worried about, they think about perception a lot. Everything is viewed by outsiders by their seniors, by other countries, by their stakeholders, ah um, they are, I mean they are thinkers; they are policy people, so they are not always doers.” MILITARY5 was harsher in his comments when he stated:

I would start by saying they don't have leaders at all levels; they have roles. There is no DFAIT corporate culture of leadership that I could see, as for the CF you know we have the doctrine we have lots of touchstones that we can all go and come back to.

CIDA1 viewed CIDA and the military as more closely aligned as they both attempt to achieve tangible outcomes. However, she stated that DFAIT goals are not tangible; they are more about ideas and dialogue. DFAIT are “not as operational [as the military or CIDA]. Their job is just more about policy and policy work, and dialogue and diplomatic relations.

The perception that DFAIT does not achieve tangible goals but is focused on developing relationships and leaving options open, often by not making a decision or committing to a particular course of action, CIDA3 described DFAIT leaders to be

much more indecisive and, um, they tend to be more interested in papering over issues and not resolving problems, and presenting things with 500 words to kind of, um, you know, weasel out of a difficult situation, ah um, and it is the function of what DFAIT are about. They are about diplomacy, and diplomacy is many, many shades of grey, um, they don't really, they are not as accountable for producing things, um, or making things change like CIDA is, or like DND is.

She goes on to explain that the approach a DFAIT leader will take will be based on consensus and conciliation as “they don't ever want to be seen to be saying anything that could ruffle anybody's feathers because it could play against them in the long run if they suddenly need that person to deal with a particular issue.”

CIDA3 described DFAIT as very hierarchal in nature and fixated on formal leadership positions within which “there is less room for others who have leadership abilities or potential to exercise that unless they have that position behind them.” In comparing DFAIT to CIDA, CIDA5's perception was that “DFAIT is more hierarchical than CIDA was, ah um, I would say they are also more conscious of hierarchy than we are.” MILITARY2 took a broader perspective and includes all civilian agencies in describing his perception of leadership outside of the military when he offered that:

Generally speaking, people other than military do not practise leadership the way we do in terms of what mission command provides. Centralised authority and centralised execution, versus centralised authority and decentralised execution; this is how we do it. Most of the time other government departments are not that way, they are, ah their front line leaders and managers are required to report accurately so that headquarters may make decisions to tell them then to execute upon, now they may know what to do, and can anticipate and they can propose but generally speaking decisions are reserved at the highest level and that is quite a different environment.

The sense of strict hierarchy is reinforced by the perceived lack of discretion the DFAIT officers had working alongside their counterparts in Kandahar. MILITARY1 suggested that the lack of authority and discretion “speaks to the culture of risk aversion that exists inside of most civil services.” However, CIDA and MILITARY participants also perceived it as a lack of trust within the organisation and an inability of the designated DFAIT leader, or at least the individual the participants viewed as the DFAIT leader, to enact the desired leadership functions.

Notwithstanding this perception, during many of the interviews there was discussion on how DFAIT leaders enact the various leadership functions. These two apparent differences in perception can be attributed to three possible reasons. The first is the difference in how the MILITARY, CIDA and DFAIT participants describe leadership. Intuitively this reason seems plausible; however, given that the leadership functions were developed by the researcher for this study, this reason is not defensible. The second reason for the difference could be temporal.

While the provincial reconstruction team in Kandahar provides a common experience, as noted in section 3.5 the sample population consists of members of the provincial reconstruction team over a the period of 2005 to 2011. Within this period changes were made to the leadership structure, specifically by formally appointing a civilian lead to the mission; therefore, perceptions of leaders and leadership could differ based on this change. Lastly, there is the

possibility that the DFAIT leaders enacted some but not all of the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment. As indicated in section 4.3 all three functions must be present to have leadership. MILITARY4 related leadership to the authority to be able to make a decision in how the group should solve the problem and as such saw DFAIT decision making held at the senior levels in Ottawa. In recounting his experiences deployed on operations with DFAIT officers, his description of DFAIT leadership was that it

is based on information gathering, but they are also the most [inaudible], they are reporting, it is all about accuracy and precision, not because he is going to make a decision, somebody in Ottawa will make the decision, so he is reporting it. From that case, you get those guys that acquire an awful lot of information are able to synthesise it very effectively but necessarily be able to make a decision.

MILITARY2 was more positive stating, “I would say DFAIT produces leaders who are just as good as ours in those enduring leadership qualities” but caveated his statement by contrasting the DFAIT approach against the military approach to enacting leadership. His view was that DFAIT practised “centralised authority and centralised execution.” This has a limiting effect on DFAIT leaders at lower levels; since, “their frontline leaders and managers are required to report accurately so that headquarters may make decisions and tell them to execute upon.”

MILITARY2 offered that “your counterpart across the table, that person is probably as fired up as you are about the you know the situation, knows it well and could be just as courageous and all the full leadership capabilities that you have but probably has a different, ah management framework within to work in.” It is this management framework that CIDA and MILITARY participants believed limits the DFAIT officers’ initiative and made DFAIT officers appear to be less responsive than expected, which is translated into a lack of leadership.

4.5.2.4 Summary

Using the three parent organisations as the contextual lens, participants were asked to describe their perceptions of leadership and leaders first in their own organisation, and then in the other two organisations. In all three groups the perception of one's own organisation was closely aligned with the non-contextual or superordinate schemas described in section 4.3 . What was interesting was that participants, regardless of organisational affiliation, viewed their own organisation's approach to leadership as collaborative, supportive, open to input from the group, and able to adjust as the situation changes, while perceiving the other two groups as hierarchical, non-consultative, with centralised decision making authority. A comparison of the perceptions of own and other organisations is shown below in Table 4.1. The actual narratives have been consolidated and condensed into short phrase to make the comparison easier. The contextualisation of the terms leader and leadership resulted in different descriptions, or perceptions, being articulated between the groups. This would seem to support Lord et al.'s (1984) argument that individual schemas are influenced by contextual constraints

Table 4.1 comparison of perceptions of self to others.

	CIDA	CF	DFAIT
CIDA	Collaborative Supportive Bottom-up Shared sense of purpose Independent Expertise within mandate Manager Hierarchical Consultative Practical Goal orientated Tolerant of ambiguity Long term focus	Command Delegation of authority and decision making Hierarchical Injury or death possible outcome Achieve practical results Goal orientated Duty of care for subordinates Direct Short term focus	Hierarchical Policy focus Directive Bureaucrat Indecisive Issues management Good at communicating Harmony
CF	Collaborative Manger, Programmers Consultative Focused expertise Poor communicators Hierarchical Independent agents Uncomfortable in leadership role Long term focus Not going to be empowered, Decisions are top down driven Risk adverse MANAGE, they don't lead. myself, the people around me, and last the mission.	Consultative Command, Consensus. Delegated authority Leader Results orientated, Physical bravery Analysis, Legal and moral authority Centralised authority and decentralised execution my mission, my men, myself,	Policy focus Communication Risk adverse Lack independence to make decision Lack of imagination Bound by policy no DFAIT corporate culture of leadership Managers Centralised authority and centralised execution, myself, the people around me, and last the mission.
DFAIT	no delegated authority wasn't there to exercise leadership the only core difference, the important defining difference between DFAIT and CIDA leadership would be, DFAIT would be how they conceive their mission. ore dogmatic, closed minded and devoted to a narrow set of principles consensus management long term focus	seek out and accept responsibility commanders resource rich Short term focused, Mission focused in the box thinking Achieving a practical effect. a very clear mandate and legal justification for the position delegate decision a fairly narrow arch risk their lives, not collaborative direct and clear cog in machine	no delegated authority the only difference between DFAIT and CIDA how they conceive mission. Reach is very, very broad, directly accountable to political leadership. consensus individual vs a member of team consultation ability to network diplomatic and nice sort of beat around the bush to make sure everybody is warm and fuzzy when about judgement about guidance strategic overview articulate, both orally and in writing, bureaucracy Knowledge, persuasiveness.

Of note, there are a number of behaviours and approaches that are consistent across all three organisations, which was expected given the agreement among participants when describing leadership (functions) and the leader schemas (behaviour) at the superordinate level. The differences, and hence the potential for tension when leadership is enacted within the inter-organisational context, are attributed to the differences in how the leadership functions are

enacted, that is to say the specific leader behaviour. Thus, the differences in how the leadership functions are enacted are important to understand. While the literature, and this study, suggest that to be categorised as a leader an individual must be seen to be enacting the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment; the individually-held schemas of the participants reflect that there are differing expectations of how those leadership functions are enacted based on organisational affiliation. Aside from the potential for tension within the inter-organisation group, the differences in expectations of how the functions should be enacted may explain the differences in terminology used to describe leadership and leader behaviours.

The use of the terms command/commander and management/manager emerged from the data aligned to specific organisations and defined by the participants as being different from leader/leadership. Command was a specific aspect of leadership attributed only to the military, and was done so all participants. The description of command mirrored that of leadership in terms of the leadership functions, and commander enacted the leadership functions with the behaviours described in section 4.4. What differed was that command, and hence commander, included the legal and societal authority to employ violence to achieve goals. Command also included a moral component that identified the obligations that a commander has towards subordinates. Participants acknowledged that the military had leaders, and differentiated between leader and commander based on the position the individual was given within the military organisation.

The term manager was used by all participants to describe an individual that enacted some of the leadership functions. The term manager was attributed to individuals from DFAIT and CIDA, and was not used to describe the military. The term management was used to

describe the functions and responsibilities categorised as administrative in nature, and align with the description of the leader behaviour “managing resources of the group.” An individual was described as a manager, rather than a leader, when they were perceived to enact some but not all of the leadership function (direction, alignment and commitment). The term manager was given to individuals from CIDA because they were perceived to enact alignment, with an emphasis on projects and resources. DFAIT officers were perceived to enact commitment and at times direction, but were not required to align resources of the group. Unlike the term manager, the term management was used for all three organisations and was described as a behaviour that could be demonstrated by either a leader or a manager. The use of the term manager highlights the fact that for an individual to be perceived as a leader they must be seen to be enacting all three of the leadership functions, and not simply demonstrating leader behaviours.

4.5.2.5 Perceptions of leaders and leadership in an inter-organisational group

When asked about leadership in the whole of government context, the participants agreed that it was different from leadership in their single agency environment. In attempting to articulate the difference, CIDA2 notes that the same type of person who succeeds in his/her own department may not be the same type desired as an inter-organisational leader:

I guess it was kind of funny. Not so much on the CIDA side but on the DFAIT and the DND side, there is a certain kind of personality that makes their way through the ranks to the top. So whether you have a type A [personality], a very driven, a very ambitious um and those people have gotten to where they are based on their ability to be able to make quick decisions, to be confident in their own decisions too, confident in their own analysis and so I don't always think that those people were the ones that were necessarily, I don't think they were at their ability to work as teams were necessarily the highest priority. Sometimes I think it was their individual achievements and accomplishments that stood out.

CIDA4 echoed this perception that leading within an inter-organisational team has different challenges due to the inherent make-up of the group stating:

You have senior people in all of those areas [parent organisation] who are already leaders then you are dealing with a very difficult situation because you already have three dominant a type personalities.

However, when the participants were asked to described the differences, their descriptions were similar to the descriptions given without organisational context, that is to say the description aligned with the description of leadership and leader schemas at the superordinate level. What differed were the focus of the leader's actions and the relative importance of the leader behaviours. Some behaviours: communication, achieving buy-in, and motivating the group; were perceived by the participants to be as important in the inter-organisational context as they are in the parent organisational context. Other behaviours that allowed for integration of the group were seen to be of greater importance by then participants when they described inter-organisational leaders than leaders within their own organisations. These behaviours included: ensuring the concerns and views of all group members are acknowledged; that differences in terminology and approaches are integrated; supporting the group primarily through interacting with and protecting the group from the parent organisations; and understanding the different capabilities and requirements of the different organisations. CIDA2's description of the behaviours he believed to be important emphasises the role of leader as integrator; someone who has the

ability to listen, but you know, so in addition to being able to communicate effectively um to different groups with different [goals and priorities], sort of like you are a translator in a way, you are building bridges between the two, because sometimes you can have these two groups that are talking about the same thing and they don't realise that they are talking about the same thing.

The leader behaviours of stewardship, managing the resources of the group and decision making, did not appear consistently across the participants and as such are interpreted to not be seen as important as the other behaviours for an inter-organisational leader. The level of importance attributed to the various leadership behaviours within the inter-organisational context reflects the participants' expectation that the leader of an inter-organisational group will enable the group by providing a vision and a common approach that overcomes organisationally based perceptions and bias.

In placing the leader and leadership in the inter-organisational context, and emphasising different leader behaviours, the participants reframed their perceptions of what made an effective leader, that is to say the individually-held leader schemas changed. One of the new behaviours described as needed for an inter-organisational leader was being able to think outside of their parent organisation's culture. When describing what he would look for in selecting a whole of government leader, CIDA1 replied that the leader in this context would need "an ability to think outside their own bureaucratic organisation, and I would want to see that they have the characteristic of not being confined by the culture of their own organisation." Agreeing with the need for a broader perspective, CIDA5 argued, "you need to be able to think strategically and take yourself out of the detail" and then "be able to convey your views and your vision in a language that others can understand, even if they are coming from a different [organisation]." DFAIT4 offered the suggestion to "look for people who do not define their identity by their own organisation necessarily, that have external goals that are consistent with the mission so you can expect their behaviour to be pro-mission." The need to have a leader that takes into consideration the needs and desires of all the contributing organisations without imposing their

own organisational bias is seen to be important as it then allows that individual to integrate the various individual and organisational goals when developing the vision and goals of the inter-organisation group.

When placed in the inter-organisational context, the definition of the leader behaviour “understanding” was also expanded. As described in section 4.4, being competent in your own domain was seen as essential; as was having an understanding of other organisations within your group and those outside of the group who could support the group in achieving its goals. However, in addition to this definition of understanding, the ability to understand the complexity of the environment the group would work in combined with the dynamics of working in and inter-organisational group was seen as important. When asked what he would look for in a whole of government leader, MILITARY4 stated it was important to be able to “adapt...to think outside the box, so don’t try and apply the military solution on cases or things, be innovative, and leverage other organisational methods or practices.” To deal with this CIDA1 believed that they needed to “have on the ground experience. If they have worked in the cube their whole life within one organisation, I am not sure that they would be able to necessarily understand um, the way operational or complex environments can make you go in directions are outside the way that you typically thought that the bureaucrat could.” MILITARY3, CIDA5 and DFAIT3 also agreed that practical, which translated to field, experience is very valuable. CIDA5 stated “when you are talking about something; it is good not to be able to talk about it in the abstract but to talk about it in the concrete.” MILITARY4 and CIDA4 believed that practical experience combined with being able to think outside of the leader’s own organisational paradigm. MILITARY4 added that it allows that leader to “synthesise a lot of information to deal with ambiguity,

understand trade-offs, communicate those trade-offs, and umm then take the responsibility for having made a decision and then communicating why that decision was made in terms that the others who need to work on implementing it will understand.” By understanding the various components of the group and then removing him/herself from their parent organisational culture allows the inter-organisational leader to understand, appreciate and consolidate the different organisationally influenced views. DFAIT7 stated that this type of leader is

someone who is good at um consolidating different views, so who is capable of um, receiving points of view probably using different terminology from different perspectives who is able to find commonalities between those different views. Um and identify them back to the group, um because we all have our own language if you will, and each department has a tendency to hold on to their own language and there is a need to identify the commonality in what everyone is saying.

Not all of the participants shared the belief that the inter-organisational leader needed to be outside of their parent organisation. MILITARY4 believed that there needs to be a boss, somebody with real authority that is supported by legislation: “I know I made the comment about the comprehensive approach; I understand the desire and interest to create, you know a holistic approach, um, the problem is that until we adjust some legislative mechanisms, and second we are willing to truly make someone the boss, um you won’t get any further.” CIDA2 agreed with that there was differences in a leader within an inter-organisational team, but did not support the concept of that leader being neutral. When asked what he would look for in a Whole of Government leader he responded

I think one of the things that I would look for is that someone who really understood development, just not development as a process not someone who was really skilled at implementing Treasury Board guidelines. So I think you really need to have that kind of background and understanding to be able to better understand the advice your officers are giving to you.

4.5.3 Summary

The participants perceived an effective leader in the inter-organisational context to possess the same characteristics and behaviours that they viewed a leader without the organisational context in place, which is the superordinate level. However, some of the behaviours were reframed, primarily moving the leader out of the organisational context and into the generic leader frame that takes on a role that identifies with the inter-organisational group and not linked to a particular parent organisation.

4.5.4 Co-Leadership within the collaborative group.

Within the context of the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Kandahar, the concept of a civilian and military leadership team, or co-leaders was envisaged from the beginning. According to DFAIT1, the DFAIT perspective was that “the initial construct of the PRT was you had a...Colonel commanding the PRT alongside an EX 1 from DFAIT³⁷ and a yes, a minus 1, not even an EX from CIDA who were supposed to be a triumvirate management team.” However, the realisation of this relationship was not consistent amongst the various groups, as DFAIT 1 explains,

The Col who was on the ground was great and he understood some of this [that it needed to be a shared leadership team], but he didn't really get, he knew he had to work with some of these civilians, but he didn't really get that we were supposed to be equal partners in the operation. If we personally may have got it but that was not the instruction he was getting from Ottawa.

There is reason for the confusion, the House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence frames the provincial reconstruction team as a military lead team with development and policy advisors

³⁷ EX 1 or executive level 1 is a management level in the Canadian public service, that is equivalent to the military rank of colonel, see <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/faq/qual-eng.asp> for more information on executive

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=3034719&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1&Language=E&File=9>, accessed 15 Dec 2014). It was not until the appoint of the representative of Canada in Kandahar (ROCK) in 2007, who was responsible to provide strategic guidance to Canada's team of diplomats, development officers, police and corrections officials, that a formal civilian lead was identified and the concept of a military-civilian leadership team was established. Notwithstanding the appoint of an individual as a formal leader, shared leadership and collaboration depended on the perceptions and attitudes of the military and civilian leaders and the acknowledgment of the importance of each group to achieve the overall goals. DFAIT5 recounts her experience during what she termed “the divorce.” Her description of a dysfunctional relationship in which the military commander and the civilian ROCK refused to work collaboratively resulted in a lack of a coordinated effort in Kandahar, and a level of tension throughout the entire organisation. What is interesting is that at another level within the organisation she notes that “[the PRT commander] and [the civilian director] had an amazing relationship, they worked together so well, so we had a lot of really good success.” MILITARY1 believed that he had an excellent relationship with the civilian lead. When asked how shared leadership worked with him, his response was

when you are talking the high level stuff, the provincial level stuff and you are not getting into the tactical weeds, it is very easy to separate the two and to give her 75% of the space, or 90% of the space on development, and only take up 10% of the oxygen, but for example the once weekly provincial security conference, held in the governor’s palace, where she is still present she is only taking up 10% of the oxygen, you are taking up the other 90. If you are having a brigade level, these are really brigade level operations, a brigade level ROC drill, which is a rehearsal of concept drill, in a large sort of tent with all of your unit commanding officers there may not even be a civilian presence, because everything is military and kinetic, so I think there is a logical way to carve it up.

For the idea of co-leaders to succeed, there needs to be a clear understanding of the other organisations involved³⁸ and an acceptance that collaboration between the organisations is not only useful but also essential. By understanding the other organisation and their roles, organisational cultures and capabilities the co-leaders can resolve issues that may arise due to perceptions of role identity and responsibility. In the example of the dysfunctional co-leader situation, the inability of the military leader to understand the role of the other organisation in the wider mission resulted in him perceiving the civilian leader as a follower and not a peer-leader.

This study suggests that it was not the different schemas that were the sole cause of tension between the three organisationally affiliated groups. Rather, it suggests that it included how individuals viewed their own role, through self-categorisation, against how they were categorised by other group members, specifically amongst formal leaders from the other organisations.

A theme that emerged from the data was the notion of if an individual viewed self and others within the group as actually being a leader. Lord et al. (1986; 1982; 2011), suggests that if an individual exhibits the behaviours that match the observer's leader schema, then the individual will be categorised as a leader. While this is supported by the study, a factor that emerged from the data was a connection between exhibiting the behaviours of a leader and the view of self as a leader. It appears that within the inter-organisational construct, those individuals who did not perceive themselves as leaders did not display the behaviours of a leader and, therefore, were not viewed as a leader by others in the group. The study suggests two possible reasons for this.

³⁸ Of note this is one of the leader behaviours that is identified for an inter-organisational leader.

For the most part, DFAIT participants did not view themselves as leaders but rather as implementers of policy, responsible to accurately feed information back to DFAIT leaders (primarily in Ottawa). This can be seen in the responses to the questions asking about leaders and leadership, in which the DFAIT participants described leaders and leadership as of senior DFAIT officers in Ottawa. This description suggests that DFAIT participants view leadership as a formal position and due to the structure and processes within DFAIT these formal leaders tended to be in Ottawa. Within this study the exceptions were found in the position of the Ambassador and, eventually, the senior civilian or ROCK (Representative of Canada in Kandahar) at the task force level in Kandahar, both of them formal leadership positions. The DFAIT perception that leaders within DFAIT are the senior officers in Ottawa tended to translate into the participants not seeing themselves as leaders in their own right, or, at least not as leaders who are supposed to enact the leadership functions. In fact, in describing their personal frustration at the lack of leadership in Kandahar among the civilians, none of the participants acknowledged that they, regardless of position, could have assumed such a role without being formally appointed. Since they did not view themselves as leaders, they did not display the necessary leadership behaviours required to enact direction, alignment and commitment within the group. The lack of the leadership functions being observed meant that others in the group did not see the individual as a leader. Because they failed to fit the leader schema, they would be categorised as non-leader or follower and treated as such.

CIDA participants had a similar perception of self, in that they did not see themselves as leaders, and as such failed to demonstrate the necessary leadership behaviours to fit the other participants' leader schemas. In describing CIDA and expanding it to the broader public service,

CIDA2 suggested that unless the individual is assigned a formal leadership position they, for the most part, will not act as a leader:

I would say in the CIDA context, but also it's the same for I guess the public service in general, but, yeah it was, to me they were kind of together, the leaders were the management. So there wasn't ah um it wasn't, it was hard to make a distinction between the two. Like you might have someone who might show some leadership in terms of, you know, initiative taking on I guess something, responsibilities that aren't necessarily applied to them or trying to kind of spearhead something. But that was more on the rare side, and usually they didn't get very far with it, unless you had it all through the appropriate channels and the proper chain of, ah um, the hierarchical chain through the system. So there's a few times where you would see, even with some of the so, you know, quote unquote leaders trying to push something forward if they didn't have the support of ah they management team above them or below them, things didn't get anywhere. And sometimes even if they did, they just still didn't get anywhere. Because there wasn't I guess just enough ground swell within the organisation to make those kinds of changes happen. So there is a lot of, I guess initiatives that might be considered but because they were not championed by all, they would kind of fizzle out.

CIDA1 supports this expressed desire for a formal leader describing the differences in Kandahar before and after a civilian was formally assigned a leadership position as the Representative of Canada in Kandahar (ROCK):

I had the opportunity to be in Kandahar pre- and post-ROCK, so pre- and post-having a real civilian leader on the ground who could bring that perspective, now because I am now *de facto* in charge of all the civilian departments that are here I can see how I can bring a number of different tools to bear but because everybody typically operates in silos, ummm I could see that we could discuss things within a CIDA team but we really didn't, we really needed a leader that was able to say no I am actually going to tell the civilian police that they need to support this project right now, no I am going over to tell the military that they need to do this so that leadership was definitely crucial and fundamental to ensuring that anybody that had anything to contribute was given the mandate to do it.

It should be noted that DFAIT and CIDA participants did exhibit leader behaviour, as there are examples in of such behaviour emerging from the interviews, such as CIDA2 who recounted:

Because I saw a problem and created a solution for it and I wasn't asked to do it, I did it on my own accord and I was able to generate support behind it to make it actually happen. It wasn't just here I passed out an idea then sat back and waited for it to happen; I made it happen.

However, even when they displayed leadership behaviours, they did not enact all three leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment. Of note, even those that did display the desired leadership behaviours found in the various schemas, the participants did not perceive these informal actions as leadership without prompting from the researcher.

As discussed, an individual was perceived as a leader if they demonstrated certain behaviours; however, these behaviours were viewed as leader behaviours only if they enabled or enacted the three leadership functions. Thus, there is a linkage between what the individual perceives as leadership with behaviours that led to those functions being enabled. Another observation that emerged from the study was the perception participants had of the other organisations' ability to produce leaders. This shaped the expectation if an individual from that organisation would or would not display the desired leader behaviours. When asked to describe a CIDA leader and the CIDA approach to leadership, the military participants as well as many of the DFAIT participants found it difficult to answer. This difficulty was not due to lack of interaction with CIDA, as the criteria for selecting participants ensured interaction, but rather the analysis suggests that it was because CIDA was not viewed as an organisation that produces leaders, and as such the CIDA officers were not perceived as leaders. In recounting his experiences in the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Kandahar, DFAIT1's perception of CIDA was as follows:

CIDA wasn't there to exercise leadership; their initial staff were on a needs assessment mission. There was no one or no area over which they were supposed to be providing leadership. They would, they were there to provide advice were

appropriate to the military commander, which from a CIDA perspective meant to rein in the military from getting themselves in trouble and to provide information back to headquarters, so that CIDA headquarters could decide on the nature of their development assistance in the province.

MILITARY5's perception that "there is no DFAIT corporate culture of leadership" that "they don't have leaders at all levels, they have roles;" which is supported by CIDA2's observation that "there is less room for others who have leadership abilities or potential to exercise that unless they have that position behind them," are reflective of the perceptions held by most of the participants

At the almost polar opposite end of the scale, the participants from DFAIT and CIDA all described the military personnel as leaders. This was first due to the legal and moral mandate military officers have, and was a major point of discussion by all participants, who often linked this mandate to command. However, the perception went beyond the legal authority. DFAIT1 described the proactive nature of the military in providing leadership saying, "your typical Army colonel who is going to seek out and accept responsibility... the visible leadership is very much going to be on the military side." CIDA2 summarised the perspective of many of the participants in her description the military and military leadership this way:

Basically they cultivate a kind of leader at every level, and so um and not just at every level, but I guess in every individual so you will find that no matter what the rank is people who are the CF members will be confident in themselves, their abilities but also to use that expression, forward leaning in that they would be um they, I guess, as part of this leadership they are trained to quickly identify problems and solutions and they and to get on with the task of dealing with them, and so their approach is that, and they also I guess delegate more authority and responsibility down at each level and so, I guess these leaders at all levels are more empowered to act on their leadership so you will have people who may not necessarily be at the top making decisions and um and taking action,

One observation that is drawn from the study is that one of the first lenses used to categorise an individual is if the individual holds a formal position, then secondly is the individual, based on parent organisation, viewed as a positional leader. It is through these two lenses that the schema appears to be applied to determine if they display the expected behaviours. As such, there is a linkage between leadership as the position, the perception of ability to lead based on organisation and then confirmation of that perception based on the observed behaviours necessary to enact the leadership functions. This is not to state that leadership within three major government departments can be generalised by the perceptions of the participants in this study. However, the focus of the study is on the perceptions of the selected individuals, and as such the observations and analysis are presented within these limitations. The study shows that there are two aspects of being perceived as a leader: how the individual view him/herself, and how others view them.

Without demonstrating the leader behaviours discussed earlier that allow the individual to be seen to be enacting direction, alignment and commitment, the relationship between the various individuals would not be seen as co-leaders. Instead, the individual would be categorised as follower and treated accordingly. The participants described that this happened even if one of the individuals was assigned a formal leadership position. The impact within the group can be negative if the expectation of an individual is to be a co-leader is not met. This situation is made worse if the individual displays leader behaviours that fit the organisational held schema, and as such view themselves as a leader, yet they are not perceived and treated as a leader by the other leader in the group because they do not display behaviours that fit the schema of the other co-leader. The implications from this observation are two-fold: first at the parent organisational

levels, is the need for a clear articulation of group composition and responsibilities; these must be agreed to between organisations and then clearly articulated to all members of the inter-organisational group. Secondly, the individuals appointed as co-leaders must understand not only their own organisational leadership schema but those of the other organisations involved, and exhibit those behaviours in the manner expected by the other organisations' members.

4.5.4.1 Temporal aspects of leadership

During the analysis an additional theme emerged that is worth highlighting as it helps to further clarify some of the differences in individually-held schemas; that is the temporal aspect to leadership and problem solving. There was a noticeable difference in how time was viewed by the different groups which influenced decision making, both in terms of how decisions are perceived to have been made, and in terms of the timeliness for making the decision. The other participants viewed the military as having a short time horizon perspective on issues, often simply the duration of the commander's tour (6-9 months). This short timeframe results in a quicker decision cycle, which appears to be commander-centric and narrowly focused on immediate and tangible outcomes. The impact that these different timeframes had within the provincial reconstruction team were described by DFAIT1:

The PRT commander [military] arrived on the ground, [arrived in Kandahar] saying 'I have six months to have an effect.' The political director, DFAIT and CIDA, arrive on the ground, saying, 'I have one year, [because that was their tour length] to better understand what is going on in Kandahar, so we can start to take moves to engage in activities a year hence.' So sitting around the table with the [members of the] PRT, the military commander says 'ok I have six months. The first two months of my mandate we need to identify what we are going to do, the next two months of my mandate is when we are going to do it, then we will evaluate if it was successful in the last two months of my mandate.' The CIDA and DFAIT persons would say, 'you are out to lunch, nothing you will do in the next three weeks or even put in place activities in the next two months is going to have any impact on the ground unless we understand what is going on

first.’ The PRT commander responded, ‘I don’t give a blank if we understand it or not I have money to spend, I have people to do the work.

While CIDA outcomes result in tangible objectives, as CIDA 2 explained the development projects tend to be seen by the CIDA participants as more complex and longer term. Given that a major aspect of CIDA is to meet the needs of the population, there is more time needed to assess and consult with the local population. These considerations can make it appear that CIDA cannot make plans or make decisions, whereas the reality is that the planning and decision cycles are focused on the longer term and as such there is no perceived need to make rapid decisions or see immediate outcomes. DFAIT has a similar approach to CIDA with regards to timelines, but the outcomes are political and as such are not perceived by the participants as tangible outcomes that are immediately apparent.

The result of these differences is a perception held by the military participants that CIDA and DFAIT do not enact all of the leadership functions; or if the leadership functions are enacted the leader behaviours are such that they do not fit the desired schema that the military participant would have. This difference was significant enough to cause frustration from the military perspective that the civilians would not move fast enough in order to achieve the goals.

However, as pointed out by CIDA2 this also caused frustration and concern on the civilian side:

The military need and desire to have action quickly and so they [CIDA officers in the provincial reconstruction team] would have to demonstrate, constantly being trying to demonstrate, to [the military] that they were taking action...there is this expression about the military, you know, abhors a vacuum and will go and fill it. Well I think that often times they [the military] create a vacuum because they push people out of the way, to go and do it themselves if they feel that they don’t see action or they are not seeing any movement. So I think what happens is, um maybe, the civilians side isn’t always good at, showing outwardly, that it [is] taking steps, because...maybe it’s having internal deliberations and discussion. But from the outside, cause it’s not open or transparent enough to be um, the CF colleagues, from their view, it looks like civilians are sitting doing nothing. But

that is not the cause, there is a lot more consideration, and for us, sometimes, and trying to communicate the message that, sometimes, no action is better than any action. And sometimes that no action, is an action...in that case it is better to wait things out.

4.5.5 Gender

The study was not able to examine the impact of gender on individually-held leader and leadership schemas in all three organisations due to the lack of female participants in the military group. In comparing leader and leadership schemas of male and female participants within the same organisation there was no discernible difference, in fact the leader and leadership schemas within organisational affiliated groups were consistent. This would seem to support the social role theory (Eagly et al., 2000) that argues that organisational roles provides the norms that regulate performance of many tasks, including those associated with leadership. The consistency between schemas based on organisational affiliation also suggests that participants in this study have been successfully acculturated into the parent organisation's culture, displaying and expecting leader behaviours deemed as suitable for that particular organisation. One consistent theme across all participants was to describe leaders and leadership functions as masculine. With the exception of describing a female leader, none of the participants used female or gender neutral terms in their narratives when describing leaders or leadership. This theme supports the findings in the literature review that leadership theories are not gender neutral but are masculine in nature. Thus, while the gender of the participants did not appear to provide differing schemas, the fact that leaders and leadership were described in masculine terms suggests that from an organisational perspective gender, specifically male, influences on how leadership is perceived and subsequently enacted. As discussed in section 2.2 the literature suggests that leadership schemas based on masculine traits and behaviours tend to be task orientated and autocratic in

nature, while a feminine schema would be more interpersonally oriented and democratic in nature. What this study suggests is that a masculine approach to leadership does not meet the desired leader behaviours or how the leadership functions are enacted. Instead, the participants' preferred leadership approaches for an inter-organisational group (discussed in section 4.5.2.5) suggests that a feminine approach for enacting leadership functions is better suited for working in a whole of government context.

5 Discussion

This chapter provides a summary of the study and provides an interpretation of the findings and results along with conclusions drawn from the analysis and thereby answers the research questions posed in Chapter 1.

5.1 Discussion of the Findings

The primary question that this study addresses is “how do differing leadership schemas impact on leadership within an inter-organizational group?” The study showed that participants from different organisations hold differing leadership schemas and that these differences could result in behaviours that do not align with the individual schemas of group members from other organisations. The study further showed that, if not addressed by the formal leader(s) the differences in expected behaviours caused confusion and tension within the group and made enacting the three leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment difficult. These findings are consistent with Lord and Shondrick’s (2010) assertion that schemas are cross-culturally consistent at the superordinate level, but at the basic level they differ. It supports the argument that organisational culture is an important factor in shaping individual schemas as group members tend to adopt a collective identity and develop a common leader and leadership schema that is shared by members of that organisation. It also suggests that the collective identity reduces the differences expected due to gender.

The study also showed that participants working as part of a whole of government group perceived the requirement for leader behaviours to enact the leadership functions that are different from their parent organisational leader schema and that a new schema in the form of a whole of government schema was developed. The development of a new schema suggests that if

none of the extant schemas fit the inter-organisational context, then individuals will develop a new schema. In the case of this study, the new schema appears to have been developed to account for the expectations that the participants had of a whole of government leader. What is not conclusive is, if the new schema was a result of the differences found in individual perceptions of the other organisations leaders and approach to leadership being lessened; thereby aligning organisational affiliated schemas. Or if the inter-organisational context of the Provincial Reconstruction Team established a micro culture (Schein, 2010) which then led to the development of a schema for that new organisation. The study showed that the schemas for the inter-organisational group had feminine characteristics which differed from the male characteristics of the organisational schemas.

The study verified that participants hold a number of schemas, specifically a schema for expected leader behaviour and a separate schema for how leadership should be enacted. The first is the individually-held schema of each member of the inter-organisational group, which defines the expectations that individual has of leader behaviour. This schema is used to categorise individuals as leaders or non-leaders. This schema also influences the leader's behaviour. Referred to in some of the literature (e.g. Schank & Abelson, 1977) as a script, this schema is how the leader believes a leader should act and how leadership should be enacted and as such drives how a leader enables the leadership functions. The second schema held by the participants was how leadership is expected to be enacted. While there was agreement across all of the participants that leadership consisted of the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment, how each of the functions should be enacted differed based on organisational affiliation.

A theme from the study is that there is an expectation by group members that the leader will adjust their behaviour in how they enact leadership (direction, alignment and commitment) to meet the expectations of the group members, rather than the individual group member adjusting their schema to align with that of the leader. Leaders of the inter-organisational group that understood this, then took into account the differences in individually-held schemas (expectations) of the members of the group and adjusted their leader behaviour accordingly, were perceived as effective leaders and were able to enact direction, alignment and commitment. Those that did not were viewed as ineffective and were unable to fully enact direction, alignment and commitment across the inter-organisational group. While the literature discusses these aspects of a schema (Lord et al., 2001; Lord et al., 1986; Shondrick & Lord, 2010), this study reinforces the need for leaders to understand the different individually-held schemas found within their inter-organisational group and ensure that the differences are taken into account.

5.2 Leadership – A Common Schema

The study shows the participants perceived that the purpose of leadership is to set the conditions that allows or enables the group to solve a given problem(s). At the superordinate level, the leadership schema was consistent across all participants. Participants described leadership as an enabler that helps set the conditions for the group to solve problems, and that leadership consists of a number of discrete yet interrelated functions which are consistent with Drath's (2008; 1994) framework of direction, alignment and commitment. Of note was that the establishment of goals is an important factor when examining leadership; however, it is the identification of goals in order to establish direction for the group that was viewed as important, not actually achieving them. While it may be possible to examine leadership without reference

to specific goals, the participants of this study viewed all activities of the group in relation to solving a particular problem and as such it was not possible to isolate leadership from the goal. Although this perspective may be a result of the nature of the inter-organisational group used for this study (the reason for the collaboration was to solve complex problems in Kandahar province), this perspective reflects what is found in extant leadership theories (Antonakis et al., 2004; Bass, 2008; Burns, 1978; Chrislip, 2002; Connelly, 2007; Drath et al., 2008; Lord & Shondrick, 2011; Northouse, 2013; Shondrick & Lord, 2010; Stogdill, 1981; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Yukl, 2006). While the participants' discussion of goals was in relation to establishing and moving towards achieving agreed to goals, successfully obtaining these goals, or actually resolving the problem was not discussed as a requirement for effective leadership. It is unclear why successful achievement of goals was not seen as a major requirement for identifying effective leadership. It was evident in the interviews that identification, articulation and agreement on the goals necessary to be achieved were considered important. There may be two reasons for not perceiving successful accomplishment of the goals as important. First is the possibility that the achievement of the goals was implied, and as such the participants did not consider it necessary to explicitly state this as a requirement. The second reason may be the complexity of the problem and the timeframe associated with actually achieving the goals. The specific goals for the Canadian mission in Afghanistan were government assigned projects and to establish security and governance conditions, all of which were expected to take several years to accomplish. Given that the average length of assignment to the provincial reconstruction team for the military participants was six to nine months and nine months to a year for CIDA and DFAIT participants, none of the participants had any expectation of actually seeing the goals

being realised. Regardless of the reason, the study suggests that a leader, and leadership, can be perceived as effective without the goal actually being accomplished.

The study provides additional insight into understanding leadership schemas by showing that leadership schemas can be described in two parts. The first part of the schema consists of the three leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment, which were universal among the participants. The second part of the schema consists of how participants perceive the leadership functions should be enacted. The participants' perceptions of how the leadership functions should be enacted were found to be common when examined within the same organisational affiliation; however, they differed when examined between participants from different organisational affiliations; suggesting that the different schemas may be based on the parent organisation. The fact that there was no discernible difference within organisationally affiliated groups based on gender further supports this view. This distinction supports Lord and Shondrick's (2011; 2010) assertion that there is a level of cross-cultural consistency at the superordinate level, but that to examine leadership schemas within inter-organisational groups it is important to capture perceptions at the basic level of categorisation. This determination is consistent with the findings of the GLOBE study, which identifies the universal characteristics of an "ideal leader" but notes that how these traits are expressed and enacted may differ from society to society (House et al., 2002). The findings of this study suggest that the GLOBE results should be viewed as the superordinate level of categorisation and not basic level, it also suggests that when examining the leadership schema the researcher needs to consider the two aspects of the schema and that to investigate similarities and differences within the inter-organisational group research needs to focus on the basic level schema.

The direction, alignment and commitment framework (Drath et al., 2008) was consistent with the individual leadership schemas of the participants and provided an effective framework for exploring a universal schema of leadership. Based on participant responses, the main element of the leadership schema was providing direction for the group. A key aspect of establishing direction is sense making, that is to say framing the problem in such a way that everybody has a common understanding of the current situation and an agreed to understanding of what the solution could look like (Drath et al., 2008). The development of a common understanding to the problem and solution is generally expressed through a vision, which provides a narrative of what the conditions should be when the problem is solved, a general strategy or approach to achieving those conditions and an articulation of where the group fits into the larger picture. The vision provides the “big picture” and is often expressed as a general approach; however, in order to further refine the approach to realise the vision, the group needs to develop and agree on common goals or objectives (Archer & Cameron, 2009a; Bass, 2008; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Daft, 1999; Drath et al., 2008; Gardner, 1995).

Once the group establishes a common goal(s) and an agreed to direction, the participants noted that it is important to ensure commitment from the members of the group. Commitment was expressed in terms of gaining consensus or buy-in to the group’s objectives. The agreed to common goals provide a focal point for the group, which can replace individual goals or those of the parent organisation. The participants noted that the group’s goals recognises the importance of the individual and parent organisational goals and shows how they are related to each other. By taking a collaborative approach to developing the goals, each member of the group is able to contribute to developing solutions to achieve the goals based on his/her expertise, while at the

same time being able to voice their concerns on suggested solutions or the goals themselves. Participants noted that such an approach allows group members to see how their individual, and their organisation's, needs are addressed. The sense of giving a voice and having each member of the group contribute was identified by the participants of being important and ensured individual buy-in through by making the objectives their own.

Alignment was described by the participants as the management aspect of leadership, as it focuses on ensuring the resources of the group are used in the most effective manner to achieve the agreed to goals (Drath et al., 2008). The resources include people and knowledge, in addition to other physical resources. Of note is that the participants agreed that, once the group's goals are established, the focus of the leader in enacting the leadership functions shifts to the more practical aspect of managing, through the alignment of resources, while the members of the group carryout the detailed work necessary to achieve the desired goals. Participants expected that the assignment of work to be based on a combination of individual expertise and assigned area of responsibility. Thus, the participants agreed that in order to align the resources within the group a leader needs to understand both the goals and the capabilities of the individual group members so that they can align individual skill sets with the needs of the group. To ensure alignment, it was noted that the formal leader may be required to make changes to the organisation of the group rather than trying to make the individual change to fit existing structures. This aspect of alignment expands Drath's definition (see Leithwood, 2004, for discussion of structure and process as an element of leadership).

The participants viewed enacting the leadership functions as the result of interaction where members of the group are active participants in developing direction, alignment and

commitment; it is not viewed to be the sole responsibility of the leader. Regardless of level of participation the leader, either formal or informal, remains a key element of the leadership process as both an enabler and as the instigator for direction, alignment and commitment. This perspective shows that leadership is more than just a set of skills or traits attributed to an individual, but can be viewed as a social process resulting from the interaction of individuals.

5.3 Management

Although not a planned outcome of the study, a theme that emerged from the analysis of the findings was that participants differentiated between the terms leader and manager. Leadership was perceived by the participants as being present when all three leadership functions (direction, alignment and commitment) were observed, and the individual enacting or enabling the three leadership functions was categorised as the leader. In analysing this theme, it became apparent that the term management was used as a replacement for leader or leadership by those participants from across all three organisations who perceived the actions of the individual in a formal leader role focusing on only one or two of the leadership functions of direction, alignment or commitment. This perspective supports Drath's et al. (2008; 1994) assertion that in order for leadership to be present, all three functions of direction, alignment and commitment need to be seen. This perspective also suggests that participants discriminated between the term manager and leader based on which functions of direction, alignment and commitment are enacted, with a leader enacting all three, and a manager enacting only one or two of the functions. This perspective suggests that leaders and managers are views as positions based on the behaviours of the individual, while leadership and management are processes that both positions enact.

5.4 Leader – As a Common Schema

The study is consistent with the existing leadership literature and provides another perspective of the leader behaviours, with a focus on the desired behaviours of a leader within a specific inter-organisational context. This study shows that a leader is viewed as an individual who demonstrates certain behaviours, and that the desired behaviours are those that specifically enable or enact the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment. Thus, an effective or good leader is described in terms of behaviours that enact, or enable the group to enact, direction, alignment and commitment, and is, from the participants' description of an effective leader, not necessarily related to actually achieving the goal.

The participants in this study demonstrated that they hold a number of leader schemas: first at the superordinate level, and then multiple basic level schemas, or a single basic schema that adapts to changing context, each based on the type of leader being described. The basic schemas found in this study are described in relation to the organisations of the participants: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the Canadian Forces (military). An additional schema for the inter-organisational leader was developed from the specific context of the Canadian mission in Afghanistan, based on the whole of government group. The framework consisting of direction, alignment and commitment is described as set of leadership functions which are a reflection of individual leadership schemas. When describing how the leadership functions are enacted participants generally described the actions as behaviour, with good or effective, leadership associated with something positive that someone did, and negative leadership relating to something not being done. In both cases, the descriptions are related to what is needed to enact

one of the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment. Throughout the interviews the leadership functions were associated with an individual displaying the expected behaviour to enact the leadership functions; this individual was categorised as the leader. Thus, a leader was perceived to be someone who demonstrates the behaviours that the participants believe to be important to enact the three leadership functions. This perspective is consistent with Drath's (2008) framework and uses Lord's implicit leadership theory to explore how individuals define the desired behaviours believed necessary to enact the leadership functions. The study indicates that the participants agree that an individual can be categorised as a leader even if not in a formal leader position. This was most evident when describing leaders without the organisational context; however, when specific examples of effective leaders were sought, or the discussion centred on leaders in Kandahar or within the participant's organisation, most of the descriptions defaulted to individuals in formal positions. This perspective is believed to be due to the context of the leadership environment that was the focus of the study, in which the participants' schema was based on leaders in formal positions and did not view informal leaders as "real leaders" without prompting from the researcher.

The leader schema identified in the study supports Drath's assertion that "people possess beliefs about how to produce direction, alignment and commitment, and that those beliefs are the basis for the social practices by which direction, alignment and commitment is produced" (2008, p. 5) and adds to Lord et al.'s (1984; 2011) work on superordinate leader and leadership schemas. While, the study suggests that the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment are achieved through a collective effort or social interaction, it indicates that the role of leader remains important to establish the environment and ensure the necessary

conditions are in place for the social interaction to occur. In this capacity the leader is seen to act in two directions: inwards towards the group, and outwards towards other organisations and in the case of an inter-organisational group, outwards towards the parent organisations. Thus, the leader is seen as an enabler and the catalyst to help the group establish the goals by providing an initial vision and agree on the direction necessary to take, then develop an environment that obtains and maintains commitment to the goals and finally ensures the group has the resources and is free from undue interference to accomplish the goals. This perspective of a leader aligns with the literature on collaborative leadership (Archer & Cameron, 2009a; Bryson et al., 2006; Connelly, 2007; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Gray, 1985; Huxham, 2003; Linden, 2002; Rawlings, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a).

Finally, in answering the subordinate question within the context of the study “are there universal schemas for leaders?” The answer is in the affirmative, but only at the superordinate level. A leader is viewed as an individual who enacts the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment through the specific behaviours of: providing a vision, motivating the group, ensuring buy-in from the group, effectively communicating, providing stewardship, understanding the environment and other actors and having a high level of professional knowledge, managing the resources of the group, supporting the members of the group, effective and timely decision making and enabling the group through interaction with external agencies and influences.

5.5 Does context shape or change the schemas?

When asked to describe a leader and leadership without providing a situation or organisational context, there was a consistent response from all participants, that could be

described as a universal schema. The leadership schema consists of direction; alignment and commitment. The leader schema consists of the leader behaviours providing a vision, motivating the group, ensuring buy-in from the group, effectively communicating, providing stewardship, understanding the environment and other actors and having a high level of professional knowledge, managing the resources of the group, supporting the members of the group, effective and timely decision making and enabling the group through interaction with external agencies and influences. This was not the case when the leader and the approach to leadership were placed within a specific context, which for this study was the Canadian Provincial Reconstruction Team in Kandahar during the period 2005 to 2011. Although inconclusive, the study adds to Lord's (2011) proposal that rather than individuals having a static schema or a large number of schemas, individual schemas are influenced by contextual constraints and can be "generated on-the-fly to correspond to the requirements of different contexts, tasks, subordinates, or maturational stages of a group or organization" (Lord et al., p. 314).

The study shows that when asked to describe the "ideal" leader, the participants' schema is based on a superordinate level schema which is amended to describe the behaviours perceived needed within a specific context, resulting in a basic level schema (Lord et al., 2001). When describing a leader within the context of an organisation(s), the basic schema is shaped by the organisational culture resulting in individuals from the same organisation adopting a common leader and leadership schema within the organisational context the gender of the participant had no discernible effect on the leader or leadership schema. The common organisationally based schemas were identified in the analysis of the participants' responses to the interview questions

and described in section 4.3. It was noted that the basic level schema developed for a specific organisation (in the case of this study, military, DFAIT and CIDA), may not align with the desired or preferred schema for a new situation. This was the case faced by the inter-organisational group in this study; individual schemas were not suitable when dealing with group members from other organisations. The differences in leader and leadership schemas resulted in a mismatch between leader behaviour and how the leadership functions were enacted by members of one organisational affiliated group and the expectations (schemas) of leader behaviour and how leadership should be enacted held by members of the other organisational affiliated groups. This mismatch may help to explain some of the frustration participants had when dealing with individuals from other organisations in the provincial reconstruction team. The frustration participants expressed when dealing with leaders from their own organisation, individuals who should share a common schema, implies that the situation faced by the participants in Kandahar influenced their schema.

Differences were noted between how the participants' viewed leaders and leadership within their own organisation's (perception of self) and how the participants perceived individuals from other organisations. In describing one's own organisation, participants described a basic level schema that is based on the preferred or expected approach to leadership within one's own organisation. The perceptions of leaders and leadership approaches of the other organisations in this study resulted in a second and third basic level schema each based on the organisation being discussed. The perceived differences in how self and others are viewed partially are consistent with the idea of context shaping basic level schemas, and therefore partially answers the second question "does context shape or change the schemas?" Further, the

observed differences offer insight into potential areas of tension when the leadership functions are enacted within an inter-organisational construct. The study demonstrates that individually-held schemas may result in leader-behaviours that, while they are perceived as desirable within the individual's own organisation, do not align with individually-held schemas of group members from other organisations, resulting in confusion and possibly tension within the group. In order to overcome this problem group members used two methods. The first required different behaviours by leaders to enact the leadership functions in order to match the schema of the group members, and the second entailed group member schemas changing based on the new context. Both options suggest that if none of the extant schemas fit the inter-organisational context then individuals will develop a new schema. In the case of this study, a new schema was developed to account for the unique expectations of a whole of government leader. In support of this observation, a number of participants stated that they believe their schemas did change. This change in schema was displayed by a change in how other organisations' leaders and leadership were perceived and analysis of the participants' interviews suggests that the change was caused by gaining an understanding of the other organisation and the approaches to leadership and leader behaviour by individuals from those organisations. The understanding helped break down stereotypes and provided context to the leader behaviours that were then interpreted differently than from before the interaction occurred. The change was evident in the transcripts where participants acknowledged that their perceptions about an organisation changed after there was interaction in Kandahar. The study showed that when describing leaders and leadership in one's own organisation, the descriptions were very similar across the three organisations; it was when leaders and leadership in other organisations were described that the differences arose. This

would suggest that perceptions of other organisations' leadership behaviours are filtered through the original perception of the individual and that experience interacting with the other organisations can modify these perceptions in either a positive (reducing the differences) or negative (increasing the differences) manner.

Lord's (2001; 1986; 2000; 1984; 1982; 2011) theory posits that the level of importance given to each desired leadership behaviour held within an individual's schema, or in some cases the inclusion of a new behaviour into the schema, is influenced by the contextual constraints of culture, the leader, the follower and the current task(s). An analysis of the findings shows that, as a result of the interaction among the three different groups as part of the inter-organisational team, a new schema was developed. When asked during the interview if the qualities desired of a leader in a whole of government context differed from their parent organisation, the response from each participant was that there was a difference, and described a set of leader behaviours, or leader schema, which differed from the other schemas the participants had described. This new schema describes the leader behaviours the participants believed necessary to enact the leadership functions within a whole of government group, which are specific to the new inter-organisational group or provincial reconstruction team used in this study. However, when asked to articulate the differences most participants initially had difficulty. After using follow-up questions and rephrasing the original question, a number of themes became apparent. First, was the whole of government leader schema resembled the superordinate schema (universal schema) discussed earlier; however, this schema had some specific differences. The whole of government leader was seen to need to be able to step back from the specifics of the parent organisations. They were seen as an individual who does not define their identity by their own

organisation and whose actions and perspectives were not confined by the culture of their own organisation. Instead the whole of government leader would take on goals that are consistent with the overall mission of the inter-organisational group. The leader is expected to show they understand the perspective of each of the organisations contributing to the group and show respect for each of the organisations and the role they play. Building on the requirement for a leader to be an effective communicator, the whole of government leader must be able to communicate effectively to individuals from different parent organisations, each of which have their own organisational culture and language used to define and enact leadership; in short, the whole of government leader must be a translator.

Within this new schema, the leader was seen as responsible for enabling and orchestrating the leadership functions, but not necessarily in actually executing them. Rather, participants noted that they expect the leader to set the conditions necessary for the group to interact, but that individual group members expected that their expertise would be used to solve the problem. Thus, the development of the Whole of Government schema answers the question “does the whole of government context force behaviour outside of the prototypical schema at the organisational level?” by leaders of the whole of government group being expected to act as described in the new schema, which was acknowledged by the participants to be different from their parent organisations’. The expectation of group members to have a role in enacting the leadership functions based on their own expertise and experience reinforces the utility of direction, alignment and commitment as a framework to examine leadership in place of the traditional leader-follower-goal triad. Since leaders were seen to enable the leadership functions and not execute them themselves, the use of Drath’s (1984) direction, alignment and

commitment framework provides an effective framework to examine what leader behaviours are believed to be required by the group to enable direction, alignment and commitment, and then to explore how the group executes the various elements of direction, alignment and commitment as two separate concepts.

5.6 Leadership within the inter-organisational group.

Participants believed that the formal leadership construct within the Canadian mission in Afghanistan should have been straightforward, that is to say there should have been a clearly articulated lead department with the other departments supporting. Such an arrangement agreed to at the parent organisation level should have established clear terms of reference and terms of engagement between the members of the whole of government group in Kandahar. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine how clear this direction was; however, as highlighted by the comments by participants, there remained a level of uncertainty in the minds of the participants as to what the agreement was. This uncertainty resulted in different perspectives between the members of the three groups. The differences included the priorities of the mission; the approach to the mission (viewed either as a military-led mission focused on counter-insurgency with the other departments in a supporting role or a state-building mission with the military providing a supporting role through security); and finally, the relationships between the various groups and parent organisation assigned leaders for each of the groups.

The difference in perspectives resulted in leader behaviours that had positive and negative influences on producing direction, alignment and commitment. The negative behaviours resulted in friction between the groups, which eventually led to a division between the civilian and military groups that on occasion stopped collaboration of any substance. The positive leadership

behaviours established direction, alignment and commitment through a common vision, a shared sense of purpose and ensured commitment across the groups.

Effective leadership did not emerge as a social construct within the group, but relied on the formal leader(s) to establish the conditions. Some participants described an environment in which the military and non-military groups worked in near isolation. This situation was dealt with by some military commanders taking action in order to establish a collaborative environment based on co-leadership between themselves and the civilian lead. Two of the military participants replaced military commanders whose perspective, and as a result, behaviours; had been counter-productive to establishing direction, alignment and commitment within the whole of government construct and had to take highly visible action to gain the trust and support of the entire group. In order to understand how leadership developed in Kandahar, it is necessary to understand the impediments to this occurring, which are described below.

The study has identified a number of factors that influenced if and how positive leadership emerged within the inter-organisational group. One aspect that is found in the collaborative leadership literature is the role of the parent organisation in shaping the environment of the group. The study showed that actions that the contributing parent organisations take in establishing the group had the most dramatic impact on the how leadership was enacted because these actions established the environment within which the group operates. While the equal contribution of resources by the parent organisation, both material and manpower, was cited by participants as an important factor in being viewed as an equal partner within the collaborative group, most participants acknowledged that the military will always overwhelm the other two organisations in personnel and physical resources regardless of the type

of operation. What did make a difference was the restrictions, real or perceived, imposed on group members by their parent organisation. The perception amongst participants that DFAIT and CIDA do not allow decision making at the lower levels, affected how the senior DFAIT and CIDA officers were viewed as leaders. The lack of the parent organisation allowing the individual to act and be seen as a leader negatively influences how the senior representative of that organisation is treated by the other members of the group if the leadership construct of the group is based on shared leadership involving co-leaders. The details have already been discussed, but it should be noted that this perception extended to others who may be seen as neither fulfilling, nor expecting to assume, a co-leader role. For example, if the senior CIDA member sees themselves as a leader, but only on specific files based on their expertise, and that individual is used to being operating in a collaborative manner based on that expertise, then tension can arise if they are not viewed in a manner that aligns with their own schema. The parent organisation was seen to have a significant role in the establishment of expectations of the individual group members as to what the relationship between the individual members of the group would be. Participants recount similar experiences stating that “there was this continual confusion between is it DND supporting the civilian mission or is it the civilian supporting the DND mission” (DFAIT 1). The lack of a common understanding amongst the three contributing organisations negatively impacted the individually-held schemas, resulting in unmet expectations and, at times, tension amongst the group and a dysfunctional co-leader team that could not enact direction, alignment and commitment. Regardless of the misalignment at the parent organisation level, a leadership schema emerged in the provincial reconstruction team when individuals realised that each organisation had a vital role to play to resolve the problem the group was

formed to deal with in the first place. The relationship was not balanced, as DFAIT 1 noted the military had control of the resources necessary for the group to accomplish the goals. Those military leaders who understood that it was essential to enact direction, alignment and commitment across the inter-organisational team, ensured that positive, and hence effective, leader behaviours were displayed. By working with the civilian lead, the military commander established a co-leader context as initially conceived in Ottawa and applied both Drath's (2008; 1994) and Pearce's (2008) constructs that shared leadership is not where the leader role passes from one individual to another, but rather is a social process in which leadership is a construct resulting from the interaction of individuals within the group. Such an approach by some of the military commanders supports Chrislip and Larson's (2002) contention that leadership in a collaborative context is different; that it needs leaders who can safeguard the process and facilitate interaction. What is interesting to note, in order to facilitate this, the commanders who were successful simply displayed the leader behaviours described by participants' superordinate level schemas, but focused the behaviours to enact the leadership functions that allows the members of the group to develop direction, alignment and commitment through collaboration.

5.7 Summary of Conclusions

The primary question that this study asked was "how do differing leadership schemas impact on how leadership is enacted within an inter-organizational group?" The study demonstrates that differing leadership schemas can disrupt and in some cases prevent leadership from being enacted if the leader(s) do not recognise the need to adopt behaviours consistent with schemas held by the members of the group. The study also indicates that tension resulting from different schemas can be reduced through a number of measures: first, promote early (ideally

before deployment) and continued interaction between group members, in particular the senior or formal leaders from each of the organisations. Second, ensure more deliberate considerations by the parent organisations in forming the group, framing the problem and establishing the terms of reference of the group in order to shape individual expectations of relationship. Third and finally, facilitate an understanding by formal leaders assigned to the group by the parent organisations that the roles of the other co-leaders may differ from their own schema and recognising and respecting the different culture of the other group members.

The study also showed that working as part of an inter-organisational group requires different behaviours in enacting the leadership functions and that over time a new schema may develop. This evolution suggests that under certain circumstances if none of the extant schemas fit the inter-organisational context, then individuals will develop a new schema. In the case of this study, the new schema was developed to account for the unique expectations of a whole of government leader. What was not conclusive was if the new schema was a result of individuals with differing leader and leadership schemas working together, and in order to collaborate were required to develop a common schema resulting from the establishment of a micro culture based on the Provincial Reconstruction Team (Schein, 2010); or if it was the inter-organisational context established in part by the parent organisations and in part by the situation in Kandahar that forced a change in individual schemas.

The study shows that leadership and leader were viewed by the participants as separate constructs, and suggests that participants hold individual schemas of leadership as a process or function which are distinct from leader schemas. At the superordinate level the leadership schema was consistent across all participants; that is what leadership does and why it is needed

was universal amongst the participants. The study shows that participants described leadership as an enabler that helps set the conditions for the group to solve problems, and that leadership consists of a number of discrete yet interrelated functions that are consistent with Drath's direction, alignment and commitment framework. Of note, was that the establishment of goals is an important factor when examining leadership; however, it is the establishment of goals in order to establish direction for the group and then aligning resources and gaining commitment that was viewed as important, not actually achieving the goals.

Participants used the term leader to describe an individual who enabled or enacted all three leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment, while the term manager was given to an individual who only enabled one or two of the functions. While the leader was seen to initiate all three of the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment, The actual enacting of direction, alignment and commitment was seen to be generated by the group, at which time the leader moves to a supporting or enabling role. For the leader to enact the leadership functions, certain behaviours are expected: providing a vision, motivating the group, ensuring buy-in from the group, effectively communicating, providing stewardship, understanding the environment and other actors and having a high level of professional knowledge, managing the resources of the group, supporting the members of the group, effective and timely decision making and enabling the group through interaction with external agencies and influences. These behaviours were universal at the basic level; however, the actual understanding of each behaviour and how each is enacted differed among the organisations.

5.8 Limitations

There are a number of limitations associated with this study that must be understood when examining the implications and application of the study.

5.8.1 General

This study was an idiographic study derived from the examination of individual experiences within a specific context and as such the specific conclusions are not generalizable without further study.

5.8.2 Case Specific

The study focuses on the main organisations that contributed to the Canadian mission to Kandahar – CF, DFAIT and CIDA. They do not represent the full contribution within the Whole of Government team, nor does the study consider non-Canadian members of the team. Additionally, the study focused on Canadian participation in Afghanistan between 2005 and 2011 as this was the timeframe during which the Provincial Reconstruction Team structure was relatively stable and was under Canadian control. It does not take into account similar efforts in different operational settings or similar efforts that may have occurred in Afghanistan outside of this timeframe.

The participants of the study all held senior positions within the Whole of Government team in Afghanistan; therefore, their perceptions may differ from their counterparts who have not deployed to Afghanistan or have not worked within the Whole of Government context. The perceptions may not be reflective of more senior or junior members of the organisation.

The information gained was unclassified in nature and relied on the narratives of the participants. For many of the participants, Afghanistan presented a series of challenges not faced

by any of the participants before. The challenges ranged from the complexity of the problem set to the danger and harshness of the operating environment and the fact that the inter-agency group was found at several levels within the hierarchies and participants were expected to work closely with a range of other organisations.

In order to conclusively answer if the schema evolved and to what extent, it would be necessary to record the schema before and then compare it to the schema after the interaction or event. This study relied on recall after the fact, therefore, it is difficult to separate out pre- and post-perceptions with total certainty, however, using episodic examples based on storytelling related to specific events this concern is lessened. Additionally, the study examined the interaction of schemas, but did not consider how the individual schemas are formed.

5.9 Implications

The study partially addresses the gap in understanding leadership schemas in shared and complex leadership situations as identified by Lord et al. (2011). At the same time, it adds to the developing body of literature concerning collaborative leadership specifically dealing with how leadership in the collaborative inter-organizational group is perceived and in doing so addresses Connelly's (2007) concern that "leadership in regards to inter-organizational systems is often mentioned but rarely studied" (p. 7).

The study shows that participants perceive leadership and leader as separate constructs, and that participants hold individual schemas of leadership as a process described by functions which are distinct from individually-held leader schemas, described as the behaviours needed to enact the leadership functions. This conclusion enhances Lord et al.'s (2011) work on implicit leadership theory by combining individual leader schemas with a framework based on Drath's

(2008) framework of direction, alignment and commitment providing an integrated perspective in which perceptions of leadership and leader behaviours can be understood as separate but related constructs within an inter-organisational group.

The results of this study are consistent with several aspects of the existing literature on leadership, specifically implicit leadership theory, collaborative leadership and the social context of leadership. However, the study also adds new insights into these existing concepts. These are outlined in this section.

5.9.1 Implicit Leadership Theory

The study adds to the literature on implicit leadership theory by demonstrating that participants hold schemas for both leadership as a process, or functions, and for a leader, based on behaviours. The study enhances how the leadership schema is viewed and how it could be studied by showing that participants described leadership as a process that helps set the conditions for the group to solve problems. It supports Lord's (2011) assertion of universal schemas at the superordinate level, and adds that the universal schema for leadership is based on the purpose of leadership in the group. It offers that leadership consists of a number of discrete yet interrelated activities or functions which are consistent with Drath's direction, alignment and commitment framework.

The study supports Lord et al.'s (2011) theory that schemas are sensitive to contexts and in doing so offers insight into potential areas of tension when the leadership functions are enacted within an inter-organisational group. Related to this finding, the data suggests that individual schemas can evolve within the real-time constraints of social interactions. The study demonstrates that if none of the extant schemas fit the context then individuals will develop a

new schema which in the context of this study is the schema of a whole of government leader. Therefore, the study adds to Lord et al.'s (2011) proposal that, rather than a static schema or a large series of schemas, individual schemas are influenced by contextual constraints and can be “generated on-the-fly to correspond to the requirements of different contexts, tasks, subordinates, or maturational stages of a group or organization” (p. 314).

The study also suggests that when describing the “ideal” leader for a specific situation, the basic level leader schema is based on the superordinate level schema and is amended to meet the idealised behaviours within the specific situation. Such an approach does not guarantee that the basic level schema developed for a specific organisation will align with the individually-held schema. This would help explain the frustration some participants had with leaders within their own organisation.

The study supports Drath's assertion that “people possess beliefs about how to produce DAC [direction, alignment and commitment], and that those beliefs are the basis for the social practices by which DAC is produced” (2008, p. 5), a perspective closely linked to Lord's work on basic leader schemas (Lord et al., 2001; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord & Shondrick, 2011). While the study supports Drath et al. (2008) assertion that the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment are achieved through a collective effort or social interaction, it shows that the role of leader remains important and cannot be disregarded when examining leadership. The study demonstrates that within the inter-organisational group, the role of leader is perceived by the members of the group to be to establish a collaborative team environment and ensuring the necessary conditions are in place for group interaction to occur. In this capacity, the leader is expected to act in two directions: inwards towards the group and outwards towards other

organisations (in the case of an inter-organisational group, outwards includes towards the parent organisations). In this regard the leader is not perceived to be the first amongst equals, even if in a formal position, but rather as an enabler and the catalyst to help the group establish the goals generally by providing an initial vision and agree on the direction necessary to take, then develops an environment within the group that obtains and maintains commitment to the goals and finally ensures the group has the resources and is free from undue interference to accomplish the goals. This perspective of a leader aligns with the literature on collaborative leadership, specifically with that put forward by Chrislip and Larson (2002).

The study adds to the body of research on implicit leadership theory, specifically on how individuals categorise leaders. One observation that is drawn from the study is that there are a number of steps that an individual uses in categorising someone as a leader or non-leader. One of the first steps is to determine if the individual is in a formal leader position; secondly, is the individual, based on parent organisation, perceived as a leader. It is within this initial framework that the individually-held leader schema is applied to determine if the individual being categorised displays the expected leader behaviours. As such, there is a linkage between the leader as the position, the perception of ability to lead based on organisation and then confirmation of that perception based on the observed behaviours necessary to enact the leadership functions.

5.9.2 Manager or Leader

The study adds to the discussion differentiating the terms leader and manager. The idea that in order to have leadership, all three leadership functions (direction, alignment and commitment) need to be present, is supported by the labelling of formal leaders whose primary

set of behaviours are perceived to enact only some of but not all three leadership functions are described as managers and not leaders. This observation suggests that leaders and managers are seen as separate positions based on the behaviours of the individual. This can be further developed to use the terms leadership and management as functions that both positions are able to enact. This suggests that in examining these constructs delineation needs to be made between the position (the person exhibiting the behaviours) and the function.

5.9.3 Leadership Research

The study shows the utility of using Drath et al.'s (2008) framework for examining leadership and while it is not a model to test leadership as a process, it provides a lens to examine how the functions of leadership are enacted within the group and what behaviours are needed from a leader. The study suggests that the leadership function of alignment also includes establishing the structures and processes of the group that best utilise the strengths and expertise of the group members. The study shows that while goals were seen to be key to framing why direction, alignment and commitment are needed, achieving the goal was not related with being described as an effective leader.

The study also expands on the use of framework of direction, alignment and commitment to study leadership within an inter-organisational group. The relationship between the actions of the leader, expressed through behaviours, that enable or initiate direction, alignment and commitment, and the actions of the group members in achieving them, are key to how a group achieves leadership. This study offers that it is necessary to investigate and study both aspects to fully understand how leadership develops within the inter-organisational group reinforcing the notion that leader and leadership should be viewed as two separate but related concepts.

5.9.4 Leader Behaviour

The study adds to the existing leadership literature by addressing the question of what behaviours a leader within an inter-organisational context needs to display in order to enact the leadership functions. The study shows that a leader is viewed as an individual who demonstrates certain behaviours and that the desired behaviours are those that enable or enact the leadership functions of direction, alignment and commitment. It therefore suggests that leader behaviour vice characteristics or traits is a more effective measure when conducting qualitative analysis as it can be explained through descriptive examples and does not need to be inferred. The study concludes that there are ten behaviours for a leader of an inter-organisational group they are: providing a vision, motivating the group, ensuring buy-in from the group, effectively communicating, providing stewardship, understanding the environment and other actors and having a high level of professional knowledge, managing the resources of the group, supporting the members of the group, effective and timely decision making and enabling the group through interaction with external agencies and influences. Within this study these behaviours were shown to be universal across all participants.

5.10 Application

In addition to the implications discussed above and the associated application to further study there are a number of practical applications that arise from the study. The study offers a different perspective on the role of the formal leader within an inter-organisational group. Aside from the leadership responsibilities assigned to a formal leader by their own organisation, leading an inter-organisational group suggests that there may be a different role; one, that is responsible for enabling and orchestrating the leadership functions, but not necessarily in

actually executing them. From a practical perspective, this advancement in knowledge may be used to help train and educate leaders so they understand the differing leadership schemas held by the members of an inter-organisational group and that the role of the leader of such a group may differ from that the parent organisation. It suggests that a leader for this type of group may need to step back from actually “doing” to orchestrating and enabling the group.

The results from this study increase the understanding of different schemas within the Whole of Government team. By capturing and documenting an initial list of leader behaviours this list could be used in professional development across the three departments. The list can be used to refine both doctrine and training approaches and manuals dealing with the Whole of Government approach. This is of specific import to the CF, and potentially other militaries as they review their doctrine, procedures and education of senior leaders in the Whole of Government context.

The behaviours described in the study could be used to establish the criteria used to aide in the selection of individuals for work in the Whole of Government context, specifically leaders from the contributing organisations who will be designated as co-leaders within the inter-organisational group.

The study highlights the key role that the parent organisations have in establishing the group, setting the conditions for interaction and supporting the group members as they work to solve the assigned problem(s).

Whilst the study focuses on inter-organizational collaboration involving governmental departments, the impact of differences in how leaders and leadership is perceived could make the

results applicable as a starting point or framework in examining other inter-organizational groups, whether from the private, public or non-profit sectors.

Lastly, the study captures part of a unique aspect of the historical record of Canadian involvement in Afghanistan. With its focus on leadership and collaboration based on personal reflections and perceptions, rather than the tactics and doctrine of counter-insurgency the study allows insight to the human dimension of the inter-organisational group.

5.11 Areas for Future Research

Four suggestions for future research emerged from this study. The first is to design and conduct a longitudinal study of pre-and post-interaction schemas. The second suggests conducting a similar study with the same organisations but in a non-hazardous environment to determine the impact, if any, of the threat to the group. The third would explore the impact not having a formal, real or perceived, leader and the last recommendation is to conduct this study with private organisations.

This study was conducted using questions related to describing past event therefore relied on episodic memory. While this approach is supported in the qualitative research literature, a longitudinal study which would capture individual pre- and post-interaction schemas would strengthen the findings from this study and support the proposition of dynamic schemas.

The study considered interaction at a specific level within a complex and hazardous environment. These could have influenced how the group interacted and leadership emerged. Given the importance of the parent organisation in shaping the environment a similar study focusing on participants in the Ottawa setting is recommended.

The selection of the provincial reconstruction team to align the experiences had a real or at least perceived hierarchy; therefore; a study based on a “tiger team” or “ad hoc team” without a designed lead where all the contributing organisations have equal resources would explore the impact of not having a formal leader. Such a study would allow for the examination of emergent leaders.

The final recommendation is to look at non-government organisations. This study focused on a specific context with participants belonging to Government of Canada organisations; a study conducted with private organisations working in a collaborative manner would confirm if the theories discussed are transferable across all inter-organisational contexts.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-158.
- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2001). Big questions in public network management research. *Journal of public administration research and theory, 11*(3), 295.
- Alexander, J., Comfort, M., Weiner, B., & Bogue, R. (2001). Leadership in collaborative community health partnerships. *Nonprofit management and leadership, 12*(2), 159-175.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 295.
- Andersen, J. A. (2010). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. *Public Administration Review, 70*(1), 131-141.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory, 18*(4), 543-571.
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A., & Sternberg, R. (2004). *The nature of leadership*: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Audet, L., & Miller, J. C. (2003). Gender and leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(1), 43-51.
- Archer, D., & Cameron, A. (2009a). Collaborative Leaders. *Leadership Excellence, 26*(4), 7-7.
- Archer, D., & Cameron, A. (2009b). Tough times call for collaborative leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 41*(5), 232-237.
- Armistead, C., Pettigrew, P., & Aves, S. (2007). Exploring Leadership in Multi-sectoral Partnerships. *Leadership, 3*(2), 211-230. doi: 10.1177/1742715007076214
- Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.
- Axelrod, R. (1973). Schema theory: An information processing model of perception and cognition. *The American Political Science Review, 124*8-1266.
- Axworthy, L. (1996). Canada and human security: the need for leadership. *International Journal, 52*, 183.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 157.
- Babbie, E. R. (2007). *The practice of social research*: Wadsworth Pub Co.
- Bakvis, H. (2002). Pulling against gravity? Horizontal management in the Canadian Federal Government. *Knowledge, Networks and Joined-Up Government, 57-75*.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological bulletin, 112*(3), 461.
- Bartol, K. M., & Martin, D. C. (1986). Women and men in task groups. *The social psychology of female-male relations, 259-310*.
- Bass, B. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(4), 463-478.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*: Free Press New York.

- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership : theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership : theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: New York : Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17(3), 541-554.
- Bem, D. J., & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. *Psychological Review*, 81(6), 506-520.
- Bennis, W. G. (1989). *On Becoming a Leader*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub Co.
- Bennis, W. G. (2007). The Challenges of Leadership in the Modern World: Introduction to the Special Issue. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 2-5.
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (Vol. 5): Pearson Boston.
- Bickman, L., & Rog, D. J. (1998). *Handbook of applied social research methods*: Sage.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1975). An overview of the grid. *Training and Development Journal*, 29(5), 29-37.
- Blanchard, K. H., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. B. (1993). Situational Leadership® after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 1(1), 21-36.
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and quantity*, 36(4), 391-409.
- Boland, B., & Bilimoria, D. (2011). *Seeing leadership in context: implicit leadership theory formation of academic chairs*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, San Antonio Texas.
- Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: time to change the tune? *Leadership*, 2(2), 147.
- Bono, J. E., Shen, W., & Snyder, M. (2010). Fostering integrative community leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 324-335. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.010
- Book, E. W. (2009). *Why the best man for the job is a woman*: HarperCollins.
- Bowring, M. A. (2004). Resistance Is Not Futile: Liberating Captain Janeway from the Masculine-Feminine Dualism of Leadership. [Article]. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(4), 381-405. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00239.x
- Bradford, D., & Cohen, A. (1998). *Power up: Transforming organizations through shared leadership*: Wiley.
- Bradford Jr, Z., & Brown, F. (2007). Teams of Leaders: The Next Multiplier. *Landpower Essay*, 27.
- Bradford, Z., & Brown, F. (2008). *America's Army: a model for interagency effectiveness*: Praeger Security Intl.
- Brown, A. L., Adams, B. D., Authority, D. T. S., & Febbraro, A. (2010). EXPLORING THE JIMP CONCEPT: LITERATURE.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 44-55.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12(1-2), 30-48.

- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York Harper & Row.
- Campbell, D. P. (1991). The challenge of assessing leadership characteristics. *Leadership in Action, 11*(2), 1-8.
- Campbell, D. P. (2005). Globalization: The basic principles of leadership are universal and timeless. *Advances in global leadership, 4*, 143-158.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1977). Traits as prototypes: Effects on recognition memory. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 35*(1), 38.
- Capstick, C. M. D. (2006). Strengthening the Weak: The Canadian Forces in Afghanistan. *Canadian Institute of International Affairs Occasional Papers, 3*, 1-9.
- Chief of Review Services. (2007). Evaluation of CF/DND participation in the Kandahar provincial reconstruction team. Retrieved from <http://www.crs-csex.forces.gc.ca/reports-rapports/2007/P0775-eng.aspx> website: <http://www.crs-csex.forces.gc.ca/reports-rapports/2007/P0775-eng.aspx>
- Chrislip, D. D. (2002). *The collaborative leadership fieldbook : a guide for citizens and civic leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership : how citizens and civic leaders can make a difference* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Christensen, T., & Læg Reid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review, 67*(6), 1059-1066.
- Cleveland, H. (1972). *The Future Executive : a Guide for Tomorrow's Managers*. New York Harper & Row.
- Cleveland, H. (2002). *Nobody in charge : essays on the future of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. R. (2005). *Influence without authority*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, C. E., & Ebbesen, E. B. (1979). Observational goals and schema activation: A theoretical framework for behavior perception. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 15*(4), 305-329.
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 145.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings. [Article]. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 637-647.
- Connelly, D. R. (2007). Leadership in the Collaborative Interorganizational Domain. *International Journal of Public Administration, 30*(11), 1231-1262.
- Cox, J. F., Pearce, C. L., & Perry, M. L. (2003). Towards a model of shared leadership and distributed influence in the innovation process: How shared leadership can enhance new product development team dynamics and effectiveness. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 48-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*: Sage Publications.
- Crosby, B., & Kiedrowski, J. (2008). Integrative leadership: Observations from a University of Minnesota seminar series. *Integral Leadership Review, 8*(3).
- Crosby, B., & Bryson, J. (2005). A leadership framework for cross-sector collaboration. *Public Management Review, 7*(2), 177-201.

- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaborations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 211-230. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.003
- Daft, R. L. (1999). *Leadership: Theory and Practise*. Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt,Brace College Publishers.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Den Hartog, D., House, R., Hanges, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S., & Dorfman, P. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories:: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? 1. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-256.
- Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. (2005). *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World - Overview*. Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.
- Department of National Defence. (2005). *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World - Defence*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence.
- Derue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647.
- Dickson, M. W., Castaño, N., Magomaeva, A., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2012). Conceptualizing leadership across cultures. *Journal of world business*, 47(4), 483-492.
- Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 729-768.
- Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: how real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 118-127.
- Drath, W., McCauley, C., Palus, C., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P., & McGuire, J. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(6), 635-653.
- Drath, W., & Palus, C. (1994). *Making common sense: Leadership as meaning-making in a community of practice*: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Duffey, T. (2000). Cultural issues in contemporary peacekeeping. In T. Woodhouse & O. Ramsbotham (Eds.), *Peacekeeping and conflict resolution*. Portland, Oregon: Routledge.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of social issues*, 57(4), 781-797.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 233.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60(5), 685.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(1), 125-145.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. *The developmental social psychology of gender*, 123-174.

- Engen, M. L., Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 74(5), 581-598.
- Engle, E. M., & Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 988-1010.
- English, A. D. (2004). *Understanding military culture: A Canadian perspective*: McGill Queens Univ Pr.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit Leadership Theories in Applied Settings: Factor Structure, Generalizability, and Stability Over Time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2), 293.
- Feldman, M. S., Khademian, A. M., Ingram, H., & Schneider, A. S. (2006). Ways of Knowing and Inclusive Management Practices. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 89-99.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1965). Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager. *Harvard business review*, 43(5), 115-122.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological bulletin*, 76(2), 128-148.
- Fielding, K. S., & Hogg, M. A. (1997). Social identity, self-categorization, and leadership: A field study of small interactive groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1(1), 39.
- Finch, F. E. (1977). Collaborative Leadership in Work Settings. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 13(3), 292-302. doi: 10.1177/002188637701300305
- Fitz-Gerald, A. M. (2005). Addressing the security-development nexus: implications for joined-up government. *Policy Matters*, 5, 1-24.
- Foti, R. J., & Luch, C. H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(1), 55-66.
- Friedrich, T. L., Vessey, W. B., Schuelke, M. J., Ruark, G. A., & Mumford, M. D. (2009). A framework for understanding collective leadership: The selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6), 933-958.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. [Article]. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001
- Gammer, N. (2013). Integrating civilian-military operations: the comprehensive approach and the ATF experience, 2008–2009. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, 19(2), 211-222.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading Minds*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 121-134.
- Giessner, S. R., van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2009). License to fail? How leader group prototypicality moderates the effects of leader performance on perceptions of leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 434-451.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*: Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1970). Theoretical sampling. *Sociological methods. A sourcebook*, 105-114.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*: Transaction Publishers.

- Goktepe, J. R., & Schneier, C. E. (1988). Sex and gender effects in evaluating emergent leaders in small groups. *Sex Roles, 19*(1-2), 29-36.
- Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W. D. (2004). *Governing by network: The new shape of the public sector*: Brookings Institution Press.
- Gordon, S. (2006). The changing role of the military in assistance strategies. *Resetting the Rules of Engagement: Trends and Issues in Military-Humanitarian Relations, 39-52*.
- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration. *Human Relations, 38*(10), 911-936. doi: 10.1177/001872678503801001
- Gray, B. (2004). Strong opposition: Frame-based resistance to collaboration. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology. Special Issue: Multi-party collaboration as learning for interdependence in natural resource management, 14*(3), 166-176.
- Greene, C. N. (1975). The reciprocal nature of influence between leader and subordinate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 187-193.
- Grint, K. (2010). *Leadership: A very short introduction*: Oxford University Press.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field methods, 18*(1), 59-82.
- Guston, D. H. (2001). Boundary Organizations in Environmental Policy and Science: An Introduction. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 26*(4), 399-408. doi: 10.1177/016224390102600401
- Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2005). A theory of team coaching. *The Academy of Management Review, 30*(2), 269-287.
- Hamilton, D. L. (1979). A Cognitive-Attributional Analysis of Stereotyping¹. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 12*, 53-84.
- Hampson, F. O., & Maule, C. J. (1993). *Canada among Nations*: Carleton University Press.
- Hancock, T. (2011a). Health promotion in Canada: 25 years of unfulfilled promise. *Health promotion international, 26*(suppl 2), ii263-ii267.
- Hancock, T. (2011b). The Ottawa Charter at 25. *Canadian Journal of Public Health/Revue Canadienne de Sante'e Publique, 404-406*.
- Hannah, S. T., Uhl-Bien, M., Avolio, B. J., & Cavarretta, F. L. (2009). A framework for examining leadership in extreme contexts. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 897-919.
- Hansen, M. T. (2009). *Collaboration : how leaders avoid the traps, create unity, and reap big results*. Boston, Mass.: Boston, Mass. : Harvard Business Press.
- Heenan, D. A. (1999). *Co-leaders : the power of great partnerships*. New York: John Wiley.
- Helgesen, S. (2011). *The female advantage*: Random House LLC.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organization Management, 4*(4), 418-428.
- Higgins, E. T., & King, G. (1981). Accessibility of social constructs: Information processing consequences of individual and contextual variability. *Personality, cognition, and social interaction, 69*, 121.
- Higgs, M. (2003). How can we make sense of leadership in the 21st century? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(5), 273-284.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 15-41*.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *The Executive, 7*(1), 81-94.

- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184.
- Hogue, M., & Lord, R. G. (2007). A multilevel, complexity theory approach to understanding gender bias in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 370-390.
- Horn, C. B. (2006). Outside the wire—some leadership challenges in Afghanistan.
- Hosking, D. M. (1988). ORGANIZING, LEADERSHIP AND SKILFUL PROCESS. [Article]. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(2), 147-166.
- House, R. J. (1971). A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321-339.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*: Sage publications.
- House, R. J., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: an introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of world business*, 37(1), 3-10.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the Death of Dispositinal Reasearch are Vastly Exaggerated. [Article]. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 203-224.
- Howard, J. A., & Renfrow, D. G. (2006). Social cognition *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 259-281): Springer.
- Hunter, S. T., Bedell-Avers, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(5), 435-446.
- Huxham, C. (1993). Pursuing Collaborative Advantage. *Journal of Operational Research Society*, 44(6), 599-611.
- Huxham, C. (2003). Theorizing collaboration practice. *Public Management Review*, 5(3), 401-423.
- Huxham, C. (2005). *Managing to collaborate : the theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. London ; New York: London ; New York : Routledge.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: how Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-Up World. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1159-1175.
- Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., & Hodge, C. N. (1993). Stereotype effects of attributions, predictions, and evaluations: No two social judgments are quite alike. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65(1), 69.
- Jassawalla, A. R., & Sashittal, H. C. (1999). Building collaborative cross-functional new product teams. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(3), 50-63.
- Jogulu, U. D., & Wood, G. J. (2006). The role of leadership theory in raising the profile of women in management. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(4), 236-250.
- Johansen, B. C. P. (1990). Situational leadership: A review of the research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 1(1), 73-85.

- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation* (Vol. 5049): Basic books.
- Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative Advantage: The Art of Alliances. *Harvard business review*, 72(4), 96.
- Kellerman, B., & Webster, S. W. (2002). The recent literature on public leadership: Reviewed and considered. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 485-514.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. A., Murphy, C. J., & Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 12(1), 62-82.
- King, C. S. (1997). Review: Leadership for the Public Interest. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 20(3), 336-345.
- King, G., & Murray, C. J. L. (2001). Rethinking human security. *Political Science Quarterly*, 585-610.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). *The study of culture*.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological bulletin*, 137(4), 616.
- Kolb, J. A. (1999). The effect of gender role, attitude toward leadership, and self-confidence on leader emergence: Implications for leadership development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10(4), 305-320.
- Korabik, K. (1990). Androgyny and leadership style. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(4-5), 283-292.
- Korman, A. K. (1966). "Consideration," "Initiating Structure," and Organizational Criteria--a Review. *Personnel Psychology*, 19(4), 349-361.
- Kossler, M. E. (2004). *Leading dispersed teams*. Greensboro, N.C.: Greensboro, N.C. : Center for Creative Leadership.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change : how leadership differs from management*. New York : London: New York : Free Press ; London : Collier Macmillan.
- Kuzel, A. J. (1992). Sampling in qualitative inquiry.
- Lasker, R., Weiss, E., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: a practical framework for studying and strengthening the collaborative advantage. *Milbank quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1998). Mapping the Conceptual Terrain of Leadership: A Critical Point of Departure for Cross-Cultural Studies. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2, Leading Schools in a Global Era: A Cultural Perspective), 31-50.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.
- Leslie, A., Gizewski, P., & Rostek, M. (2008). Developing a comprehensive approach to Canadian forces operations. *Canadian Military Journal*, 9(1), 11-20.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75): Sage.
- Linden, R. M. (2002). *Working across boundaries : making collaboration work in government and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Litwak, E., & Hylton, L. F. (1962). Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Co-ordinating Agencies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 6(4), 395-420.

- Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or, how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*: Times Books New York.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338.
- Longoria, R. A. (2005). Is Inter-Organizational Collaborational Always a Good Thing? *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 32(3), 123-138.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions* 1. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(3), 311-338.
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 402-410.
- Lord, R. G., & Emrich, C. G. (2000). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 551-579.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 34(3), 343-378.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & Phillips, J. S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. *Leadership: Beyond establishment views*, 104, 121.
- Lord, R. G., & Shondrick, S. J. (2011). Leadership and knowledge: Symbolic, connectionist, and embodied perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 207-222.
- Manz, C. C., Shipper, F., & Stewart, G. L. (2009). Everyone a Team Leader:: Shared Influence at W. L. Gore & Associates. *The Ins and Outs of Leading Teams*, 38(3), 239-244.
- Marten, K. (2010). From Kabul to Kandahar: The Canadian Forces and Change. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 40(2), 214-236.
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410.
- Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1992). *Collaboration: What Makes It Work. A Review of Research Literature on Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration*.
- Mau, T. A. (2008). Public sector leadership development: The Canadian model considered. *CSL Leadership Review*, 1(4).
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*: Irvington New York.
- McClelland, D. C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long-term success in management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(6), 737-743.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from " Case Study Research in Education."*: ERIC.
- Merron, K., Fisher, D., & Torbert, W. (1987). Meaning making and management action. *Group & Organization Management*, 12(3), 274.
- Mervis, C. B., & Rosch, E. (1981). Categorization of natural objects. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32(1), 89-115.
- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80(4), 252-283.

- Mittman, B. (2004). Creating the evidence base for quality improvement collaboratives. *Annals of internal medicine*, 140(11), 897.
- Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research.
- Morse, R. S. (2010). Integrative public leadership: Catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 231-245. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.004
- Naidoo, L. J., Kohari, N. E., Lord, R. G., & DuBois, D. A. (2010). "Seeing" is retrieving: Recovering emotional content in leadership ratings through visualization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(5), 886-900.
- Natsios, A. S. (2005). The nine principles of reconstruction and development. Retrieved from Nielsen, J. S. (2004). *The myth of leadership : creating leaderless organizations*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Palo Alto, Calif. : Davies-Black.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership : theory and practice* (Sixth ed.). Thousand Oaks: Thousand Oaks : SAGE Publications.
- Offermann, L. R., Kennedy Jr, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43-58.
- Olson, L., & Gregorian, H. (2007). Interagency and civil-military coordination: Lessons from a survey of Afghanistan and Liberia. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 10(1).
- Orazi, D. C., Turrini, A., & Valotti, G. (2013). Public sector leadership: new perspectives for research and practice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 79(3), 486-504.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operations and Development. (2006). *Whole-of-Government Approaches to Fragile States*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-Operations and Development Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/24/37826256.pdf>.
- Orser, B. (1994). Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics:: An International Perspective. *Women in Management Review*, 9(4), 11-19.
- Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2010). Building bridges from the margins: The work of leadership in social change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 292-307. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.008
- Ostrom, T., Lingle, J., Pryor, J., & Geva, N. (1980). Cognitive organization of person perception. *Person memory: The cognitive basis of social perception*, Erlbaum, New York.
- Papworth, M. A., Milne, D., & Boak, G. (2009). An exploratory content analysis of situational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(7), 593-606.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*: SAGE Publications, inc.
- Pavitt, C., & Sackaroff, P. (1990). Implicit theories of leadership and judgments of leadership among group members. *Small Group Research*, 21(3), 374.
- Pearce, C. L., Conger, J. A., & Locke, E. A. (2008). Shared leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 622-628. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.005
- Peters, L. H., Hartke, D. D., & Pohlmann, J. T. (1985). Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership: An application of the meta-analysis procedures of Schmidt and Hunter. *Psychological bulletin*, 97(2), 274-285.
- Posner, M., & Keele, S. (1970). *Time and space as measures of mental operations*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 18(2), 229-252.

- Raffel, J. A., Leisink, P., & Middlebrooks, A. E. (2009). *Public sector leadership: International challenges and perspectives*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rawlings, D. (2000). Collaborative leadership teams: Oxymoron or new paradigm? *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 52(1), 36-48.
- Reed, S. K. (1972). Pattern recognition and categorization. *Cognitive psychology*, 3(3), 382-407.
- Rees, C. (1996). Qualitative & Quantitative approaches to research *British Journal of Midwifery Vol. 4* (No: 7), 374-377.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*: Sage.
- Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out qualitative analysis. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*, 219-262.
- Rod, N. (2007, 29 Jun). The great enabler, *Financial Times*.
- Rosch, E. (1999). Principles of categorization. *Concepts: core readings*, 189-206.
- Rosch, E., & Mervis, C. B. (1975). Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories* 1. *Cognitive psychology*, 7(4), 573-605.
- Rosch, E., Mervis, C. B., Gray, W. D., Johnson, D. M., & Boyes-Braem, P. (1976). Basic objects in natural categories* 1. *Cognitive psychology*, 8(3), 382-439.
- Rosch, E. E., & Lloyd, B. B. (1978). *Cognition and categorization*: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: New York : Praeger.
- Rubin, H. (2009). *Collaborative Leadership: Developing Effective Partnerships for Communities and Schools*: Corwin Press.
- Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 20(1), 93-110.
- Ryan, C. (2001). Leadership in collaborative policy-making: An analysis of agency roles in regulatory negotiations. *Policy sciences*, 34(3), 221-245.
- Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in nursing & health*, 18(2), 179-183.
- Sargent, A. G. (1981). *The androgynous manager*: Amacom New York.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). Scripts, plans, goals and understanding. *Erlbaum: Eksevier Science*.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2): John Wiley & Sons.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 95.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of social issues*, 57(4), 675-688.
- Schyns, B., Kiefer, T., Kerschreiter, R., & Tymon, A. (2011). Teaching implicit leadership theories to develop leaders and leadership: how and why it can make a difference. *Academy of Management learning & education*, 10(3).
- Scoppio, G., Idzenga, R., Miklas, S., & Tremblay, R. (2009). Learning together: Lessons on Canadian Forces skill sets for multinational, interagency operations. *Canadian Defence Academy, Directorate of Learning and Innovation*, 3705-3702.

- Scott, K. A., & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101(2), 230-242. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.06.002
- Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.
- Shondrick, S. J., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories: Dynamic Structures for Leadership Perceptions, Memory, and Leader-Follower Processes. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 25, 1-34.
- Silvia, C., & McGuire, M. (2010). Leading public sector networks: An empirical examination of integrative leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 264-277. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.006
- Sirman, R. (2008). Collaborative Leadership-A Sound Solution to Complex Problems. *Employment relations today*, 35(2), 31.
- Smircich, L. (1982). Leadership: The Management of Meaning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), NP-b-273. doi: 10.1177/002188638201800303
- Smith, J. A. (2007). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*: Sage.
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*: Sage.
- Smith, J. A., & Foti, R. J. (1998). A pattern approach to the study of leader emergence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 147-160.
- Sommer, R. (1961). Leadership and group geography. *Sociometry*, 24(1), 99-110.
- Sproule-Jones, M. (2000). Horizontal management: implementing programs across interdependent organizations. *Canadian Public Administration*, 43(1), 93-109.
- St-Louis, M.-H., & Michel-Henri. (2008). A Comprehensive Approach to Stability The strategic Advisory Team in Afghanistan. *Canadian Army Journal Volume*, 10, 48-57.
- Stewart, K., Wright, C., & Proud, A. (2004). Humanitarian organisations and the military—are they really chalk and cheese: QinetiQ Ltd. Research report.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(0), 35.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, Membership and Organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47(1), 1-14.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership : a survey of theory and research*. New York : London: New York : Free Press ; London : C.Macmillan Press.
- Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management a new narrative for networked governance? *The American review of public administration*, 36(1), 41-57.
- Taggar, S., Hackew, R., & Saha, S. (1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(4), 899-926.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*: Psychology Press.
- The Independant Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan. (2008). *The Independant Panel on Canada's Future Role in Afghanistan, Final Report*. Ottawa.
- Thompson, G., & Vecchio, R. P. (2009). Situational leadership theory: A test of three versions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 837-848.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654-676.

- van Quaquebeke, N., van Knippenberg, D., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2011). More than meets the eye: The role of subordinates' self-perceptions in leader categorization processes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 367-382.
- Van Seters, D., & Field, R. (1990). The evolution of leadership theory. *Journal of organizational change management*, 3(3), 29-45. doi: 10.1108/09534819010142139 (Permanent URL)
- Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-Sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 214-228.
- Van Wart, M. (2013). Administrative leadership theory: A reassessment after 10 years. *Public Administration*, 91(3), 521-543.
- Vandahl, E. (2007). No more leading from behind: Implementing a JIMP strategy to compliment the Canadian whole of government initiative: Canadian Forces College.
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2003a). Enacting Leadership for Collaborative Advantage: Dilemmas of Ideology and Pragmatism in the Activities of Partnership Managers. *British Journal of Management*, 14(s1), S61-S76.
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2003b). Nurturing Collaborative Relations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(1), 5-31. doi: 10.1177/0021886303039001001
- Vecchio, R. P. (1983). Assessing the validity of Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A closer look at Strube and Garcia. *Psychological bulletin*, 93(2), 404-408.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17-24. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.62.1.17
- Wendt, H., Euwema, M. C., & van Emmerik, I. J. H. (2009). Leadership and team cohesiveness across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 358-370.
- Wenek, K. (2003). Defining effective leadership in the Canadian Forces: Content and process frameworks (C. F. L. Institute, Trans.) (pp. 37): Department of National Defence.
- Winslow, D. (2002). Strange bedfellows: NGOs and the military in humanitarian crises. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 7(2), 35-56.
- Winter, D. G. (1991). A motivational model of leadership: Predicting long-term management success from TAT measures of power motivation and responsibility. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 67-80.
- Wolff, S., Pescosolido, A., & Druskat, V. (2002). Emotional intelligence as the basis of leadership emergence in self-managing teams* 1. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 505-522.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G. A. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. A. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 308-315.

Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483.

Appendix A. Relationship between Research and Interview Questions

Research Questions	Associated Interview Questions
What are the individually held leader schemas of the participants?	Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organization? What were the characteristics of the leader? What did they do?
	Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
	Can you describe for me an interaction in which you feel you were ineffectively led? What do you think the problem was?
	How would you describe how leadership within your own organization?
Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are universal.	Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organization? What were the characteristics of the leader? What did they do?
	Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
	Can you describe for me an interaction in which you feel you were ineffectively led? What do you think the problem was?
	How would you describe how leadership within your own organization?
	Can you give me examples where you saw the (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach leadership?
	How would you describe (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach to leadership? Did you see differences in how the military, DFAIT and CIDA approach leadership? How so?
	How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader?
Within these schemas which (if any) leader behaviours are organizational culturally contingent?	Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organization? What were the characteristics of the leader? What did they do?
	Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
	Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
	Can you give me examples where you saw the (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach leadership?
	How would you describe (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach to leadership? Did you see differences in how the military, DFAIT and CIDA approach leadership? How so?
	How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader?
Do differing schemas cause tension within a collaborative group?	How would you describe (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach to leadership? Did you see differences in how the military, DFAIT and CIDA approach leadership? How so?
	How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader?
Does the inter-organisational context require behaviour outside of the prototypical schema at the organisational level?	How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader?
	Are there particular personal or interpersonal characteristics or techniques that you think would be helpful to establishing/maintaining/restoring trust in WoG contexts?
How was leadership as a social construct enacted within the WoG team?	Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership during one of the major activities that occurred in the ... (PRT, Kandahar, and Kabul)?

Appendix B. Participant Information Letter



COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT & ECONOMICS Department of Business

Dear <Participant Name>:

Recognizing that contemporary missions and crises are often beyond the expertise and resources of one department, the Canadian government has adopted an integrated or whole of government approach (WoG) to domestic and overseas missions. Given your experience in this area, you are being invited to participate in a study that seeks to gain a better understanding of the leadership issues that may arise when various parties acting within these new operational environments must work together in order to accomplish their respective goals. Specifically, the study is designed to increase our understanding of about the nature, dynamics and perceptions of leadership in this context, by interviewing those who have recently worked or are likely to work within a WoG context. This study will also attempt to understand how leadership in this context is facilitated or frustrated, thereby potentially offering insights that may help to develop or improve effective leadership among the various organizations in contemporary operational settings.

In particular, your perceptions, experiences and insights will be used to begin to understand individual, organizational and social dynamics of leadership within WoG missions. Your candid experience operating in this capacity is vital for developing an inclusive and detailed picture of leadership in the context of collaboration among diverse actors. To assist in this study, you are being asked for approximately 2 hours of your time to participate in a one-on-one meeting. The idea is that you will describe your own perspective of leadership relevant experiences in which you have been involved, the factors that either facilitated or frustrated leadership in this context, and any strategies that you used to build, maintain or re-establish leadership.

In order to protect your identity and the identities of others, I ask that you do not mention specific individuals or groups by name or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this meeting. With your consent, the meeting will be audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis and will be kept in a secure location accessible only to the researcher involved with this or ensuing projects. The information will use a code number rather than a name to ensure anonymity. At no time will the content of our meeting be made available to anyone outside of the study without your consent. The same consideration will apply should you grant permission for the secondary use of data, and at no time will the content of our meeting be made available to anyone outside of the subsequent research team(s). Once our meeting has been transcribed, if you would like, you will be provided with a copy so that you may review the contents, point out any errors in the transcription and indicate any aspects you feel might be identifying characteristics. Any material used in the write up of the final report or subsequent publications or presentations will have any and all identifying characteristics removed. If you

wish, you can choose not to be audio-recorded but still participate in this research. In this event, the researcher will take detailed notes during your meeting.

The risks associated with your participation in this study are minimal and are anticipated to be no greater than what you would encounter in your daily life or occupation. If, however, a topic of discussion makes you feel uncomfortable, you may refuse to answer or skip any question, end the discussion, or withdraw from the study at any time. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please complete the attached Voluntary Consent Form, as well as the Biographical Data Form. I will collect these when we convene for our meeting with you.

The project has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions regarding the use and safety of human subjects in this research project may contact S. Auld, Director, Research Ethics, 519-824-4120, ext. 56606, reb@uoguelph.ca. If you have questions regarding the research you may also contact the academic supervisor, Dr. Michael Cox, at 519-824-4120, Ext. 56799.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Colin Magee

Appendix C. Participant Consent Form



COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT & ECONOMICS
Department of Business

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Whole of Government Leadership – An Examination of Perceptions of Leadership

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Colin Magee, from the Department of Business at the University of Guelph. The results will be contributed to a PhD dissertation.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Colin Magee at 416-482-6800 extension 6855; or his supervisor Dr. Michael Cox at 519-824-4120, Ext. 56799.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Recognizing that contemporary missions and crises are often beyond the expertise and resources of one department, the Canadian government has adopted an integrated or whole of government approach (WoG) to domestic and overseas missions. Given your experience in this area, you are being invited to participate in a study that seeks to gain a better understanding of the leadership issues that may arise when various parties acting within these new operational environments must work together in order to accomplish their respective goals. Specifically, the study is designed to increase our understanding of about the nature, dynamics and perceptions of leadership in this context, by interviewing those who have recently worked or are likely to work within a WoG context. This study will also attempt to understand how leadership in this context is facilitated or frustrated, thereby potentially offering insights that may help to develop or improve effective leadership among the various organizations in contemporary operational settings.

In particular, your perceptions, experiences and insights will be used to begin to understand individual, organizational and social dynamics of leadership within WoG missions. Your candid experience operating in this capacity is vital for developing an inclusive and detailed picture of leadership in the context of collaboration among diverse actors.

PROCEDURES

To assist in this study, you are being asked for approximately 2 hours of your time to participate in a one-on-one meeting. The idea is that you will describe your own perspective of leadership relevant experiences in which you have been involved, the factors that either facilitated or frustrated leadership in this context, and any strategies that you used to build, maintain or re-establish leadership.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks associated with your participation in this study are minimal and are anticipated to be no greater than what you would encounter in your daily life or occupation. If, however, a topic of discussion makes you feel uncomfortable, you may refuse to answer or skip any question, end the discussion, or withdraw from the study at any time. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The research contributes to both the academic and practitioner. Academically, the research contributes to the ongoing debate within the literature on whether leadership schemas are static or context based. The practitioner will gain a greater understanding of inter-organizational leadership within the public sector in complex environments. Whilst focused on a specific inter-organizational group, the results are expected to be applicable across a range of ad hoc collaborative groups, working to solve complex problems.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There is no remuneration for participation.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study. In order to protect your identity and the identities of others, I ask that you do not mention specific individuals or groups by name or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this meeting. With your consent, the meeting will be audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis and will be kept in a secure location accessible only to the researcher involved with this or ensuing projects. The information will use a code number rather than a name to ensure anonymity. At no time will the content of our meeting be made available to anyone outside of the study without your consent. The same consideration will apply should you grant permission for the secondary use of data, and at no time will the content of our meeting be made available to anyone outside of the subsequent research team(s). Once our meeting has been transcribed, if you would like, you will be provided with a copy so that you may review the contents, point out any errors in the transcription and indicate any aspects you feel might be identifying characteristics. Any material used in the write up of the final report or subsequent publications or presentations will have any and all identifying characteristics removed. If you wish, you can choose not to be audio-recorded but still participate in this research. In this event, the researcher will take detailed notes during your meeting

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca
Fax: (519) 821-5236

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I have read the information provided for the study “[insert title]” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant (please print)

Signature of Participant

Date

[The name and signature of the legal representative is ONLY necessary if the participant is not competent to consent. If the participant is competent, please do not include these options.]

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

Name of Witness (please print)

Signature of Witness

Date

[The witness is ideally NOT the investigator, but if there is no readily available alternative, the investigator can act as witness.]

Appendix D. Interview Protocol

(Semi-Structured Format for Participants)

I. Introduction:

Thank you for participating in this meeting. I appreciate that you have taken the time to meet with me today to share some of your insights into leadership within whole of government or comprehensive context.

As mentioned in my initial contact with you, this meeting is meant to help gain a better understanding of leadership within the context of working with other government partners in complex situations. In particular, I am interested in understanding how you view leadership and how you perceive leadership in other departments. This will help broaden our understanding of the nature of whole of government (WoG) leadership. I am hoping to develop from you and others like you, a more complete understanding of the dynamics of leadership within the WoG context and how it impacts on efforts to work together in an operational environment, in complex missions. To do this, I will be asking that you describe your perspective of leadership and leadership situations that you faced as part of your job. As the discussion moves along and we identify potential themes for further elaboration, I may ask you to expand a little on that particular topic if that is okay with you.

Over the course of our meeting, I ask that you speak freely and as openly so that we can capture the themes associated with WoG leadership in this particular kind of context, and to include as much detail as possible so that we can capture the full context of your experiences.

However, your participation is voluntary. Please recount only the experiences and details that you are comfortable sharing, and feel free to skip any question that you would prefer not to answer. I want to stress that your identity will be protected. In order to ensure that I ask that you do not use any identifying information that may compromise your identity or the identity of those you have worked with in the past. I will review the transcripts as well to ensure that no identifying information is included. If you wish, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript so that you may review it for content and for any points that you would like to delete. May we proceed on that basis?

Before we get started, I would like to ask if we could audio-record our meeting, so that we can ensure the accuracy of your comments. This will also help me when I analyze all of the interviews. If you choose not to be audio-taped we will take detailed notes of the discussion.

II. Career Background:

I'd like to begin by asking you to talk a little bit about your career history. Please include how long have you worked as/with... (e.g., OGD, OGA, etc.), how you came to work with... (e.g., CIDA, etc.), why were you interested in a career working with..., what kinds of roles have you had while a member of..., etc. Are there any other organizations (e.g., CF, NGOs, IOs, etc.) that you have belonged to prior to joining...?

Are there any other aspects of your career history that you would like to share before we move on?

III. Leadership Experiences:

3. Can you tell me about your role in...? (CF, DFAIT, CIDA)?
4. Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership in your organization? What were the characteristics of the leader? What did they do?

5. Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization? What characteristics did you demonstrate in this situation?
6. Can you describe for me an interaction in which you feel you were ineffectively led? What do you think the problem was?
7. How would you describe the purpose of leadership within your own organization?
8. What do you expect from leaders?
9. Can you tell me about working in ... (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul)?
10. What were some of the big things that happened in ... PRT, Kandahar, Kabul)?
11. Can you give me an example of where you saw people exercise leadership during one of the major activities that occurred in the ... (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul)?
 - a. How did leadership work in (PRT, Kandahar, Kabul)?
 - b. Did it change over time? How?
 - c. How do you define leadership?
 - d. How do you view the purpose of leadership in a group?
12. Can you give me examples where you saw the (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach leadership?
13. How would you describe (military, DFAIT, CIDA) approach to leadership? Did you see differences in how the military, DFAIT and CIDA approach leadership? How so?
14. How would you describe a military leader? A DFAIT leader? A CIDA leader? Are there particular personal or interpersonal characteristics or techniques that you think would be helpful to establishing/maintaining/restoring trust in WoG contexts?
15. What is the purpose of leadership in a group?
16. If you were responsible to select a leader for a whole of government team what would be important to consider?
17. You are in charge of a whole of government team what do you do to solve a problem?
18. Are qualities of a leader in the whole of government context different that your own environment? How so?
19. How would you define a good follower?

IV. Conclusion:

That concludes our meeting. Are there any other comments you would like to make about your leadership in your organization or about leadership in general?

I am leaving you with my contact information. Please feel free to contact them if you have any additional questions or comments.

Thank you for your time.

Appendix E. Sample Transcript

Question - Can you give me an example of people exercising leadership within DFAIT, within an Ottawa setting and a field setting.

In an Ottawa setting it is hard to divorce leadership from personality and control over process. So I worked for most of the period from oh whatever, 2xxx lets say, 2xxx to 2xxx through to 2xxx I worked for a particular ADM who was the acknowledged leader of the departmental effort for all international crisis operations, he was the leader because of force of personality, he had also knowledge of system of the substance, the subject matter. He really forced his will on the process through which we had to follow to government decisions taken and it was, it wasn't a particularly, what's the word I am looking for ah um not dynamic leadership, it wasn't ah it was the leadership, you followed him or you risked being sidelined, as opposed to leadership you followed him because you really had a sense of he was a charismatic and empowering leader, if you see what I mean. It was leadership in a bureaucratic is about at the end of the day who is able to have their way. And in this particular instance ah this boss of mine was always the one of having his way. It was very interesting that when he transitioned to a different job um the systems that had been set up to force like a whole of government forcing function at the bureaucratic level in Ottawa disintegrated because there was no longer his force of personality to bring them along. In fact, his departure allowed a number of different power centres to reassert their role in a very vindictive manner on occasion because they felt that they had been overshadowed and sidelined as a result of not being a part of his orbit. If that makes any sense?

In the PRT, or I will call it, in any operational setting because it was the same in the xxxx as well. Leadership often, in my view followed who had command over the resources. Who could affect change, who could make things happen and more often than not, in an environment in which you had a combined military and civilian effort the leadership was de facto military because the military had the physical resources to make things happen. Um the infrastructure, the transport arrangements, the communication links, um the physical setting to convene meetings, as well as in some respects the moral swaying by virtue of it being the conflict setting a uniform by sort of de facto was seen to be a leader in a whole of government, or in a multi-role operation. From a DFAIT point of view within, sort of the confines of DFAIT um I would say leadership it is personality based, there was no particular model, it was ah really force of personality. If you look at the behaviour of the embassy over time, the leadership that the leadership played in terms of espousing and representing a Canadian view point was very much dependent upon, who the individuals were in charge in any particular point in time.

Question - So if you think of a DFAIT leader, what would the characteristics of that leader be?

Not all of them are positive. Ah um, [long pause], I am thinking. Force of personality, and by that I mean someone who gives, ah both persuasive and bull-headed ah um prepared to move ahead irrespective of the objections, because, especially in a civilian setting there are always 50 naysayers for every idea. Um articulate, both orally and in writing, someone who, to be a leader

in a DFAIT context you have to be effective at promoting your ideas and putting them down on paper. Because it is a bureaucracy or an organisational culture which is based on the persuasive ah illustration of ideas on paper. I use to have bosses that would ah you know for them it was all about competition about whose telegrams, whose memos were read and your memos were read if they were clear and concise and persuasive and interesting. So leadership often you know you get noticed and you would get put into positions where you could wield influence as a result of, of, being able to articulate your ideas. Um for all the diplomats supposed to listen I wouldn't say that a lot of them are more effective short term effective leaders at DFAIT are people that didn't listen very well who are just prepared to make their will happen, and who had ah extremely high expectations of their staff, and the staff for no good reason were prepared to go all out for them. In part because the reward for being part of a particular leader's orbit was being on the inside of the decision making process, and so you garner resources by being perceived by being the person who is able to move something through the system not because you were very nice, or collaborative um especially when you are dealing with international crisis or crisis operations, collaboration was often the horizontal coordination piece was often seen to be an impediment and not something which was of benefit to the overall goal.

Question - Can you describe for me a situation where you had to demonstrate leadership in your organization?

Hmmm I tend to have a very negative view over some past situations, um in hindsight, sometimes at the time where we thought we were being fairly effective in hindsight perhaps we weren't.

Follow-up Question - Where do you think you demonstrated leadership, one of your jobs was the desk officer for xxxx, so within that framing or a job similar to that, did you have an opportunity to demonstrate leadership? Or enact leadership?

Yeah I would say properly more applicable example is in the 2xxx to 2xxxx period, I was first a xxxxx then xxxxx of the same division, it morphed somewhat in organisational structure and our job was to move through decision making to cabinet about Canada's role in certain operations, Kandahar in particular, well first the move to Kabul in Op Athena then first then, yeah it was Op Athena in Kabul and whatever the operation became in Kandahar, forgetting now Apollo then something else. Um, in that particular area we had, especially in the 2xxxx time period, we had an extremely difficult political environment in which to take decisions, um I don't know to what extent you will have to wipe this from the record. But if you think about what was happening in 2xxxx [LARGE SECTION REMOVED AS IT PROVIDES NAMED COMMENTS ON OTHER INDIVIDUALS] so the job I had at the time, was trying to bring together the whole of government community to create the necessary documents to move through the decision making to get the decision to go to Kandahar. Um and it was problematic, particularly in the DFAIT/CIDA relationship because CIDA had philosophically, doctrinal and personal issues about engaging in a more comprehensive development effort in Afghanistan writ large, and in particular in Kandahar province which they saw in a conflict situation and therefore inimical with doing development work, and for all the reasons for their doctrine they were absolutely right, but it didn't change the fact that there was sort of the train had left the station and we were

going to be doing something in Kandahar province and CIDA needed to be part of that. And so a big part of what I had to do on behalf of this boss I was mentioning before was get all of the government departments onboard into the plan that saw the establishment of the PRT and ultimately made the link between what the PRT was going to be doing and the decision to send a battle group in the configuration ultimately that the battle group went in. And ah, I don't know if I would describe this as leadership or not....getting the ideas down on paper, in a way, and in a cabinet submission in such away that it would get through the system. Um and that, you know it's interesting if nothing else if you use it as sort of a leadership example at the time I would have said I was front and centre in leading the whole effort, in retrospect and having read a couple of the other accounts including at the political level that have come out since then; what we were doing at a bureaucratic level was you know at the end of the day important and produced the necessary process for the decision making but there was another whole process going on at the political level for which we really had no visibility and its humbling to say.

Probing Question - Lets go back on that one a little then, you have this group, we will keep it at the tripartite group of CIDA, DFAIT and CF, I know there are other players but then it becomes too cumbersome. You have people from these three organisations, you being one, two other organisations, and you are trying to move an agenda forward. What did you see your role in trying to move this thing forward? How did you try and do that?

I de facto, had the leadership of this process at my level, because I held the pen on the document that was going to cabinet, and it's wise to you know the organisational design sort of forces leadership on different parts of the process because we at DFAIT worked very hard to maintain our pen on this document, MC, memorandum to cabinet, um and it was very difficult because we were holding the pen on a decision that government was going to take with respect to our, to the deployment, to what, what the Canadian presence in Kandahar would look like, but actually the DFAIT piece of the resource was you know, going to be two people compared to the 2500 that were coming from DND and another 2 people from CIDA, but the intent, and we were aided to some degree by the military's understanding of grand strategy and leadership, you know, the military effort follows the Canadian government political intent, follows the Canadian strategy, it was sort of the de facto understanding that, that strategy, our objective would be, would be framed by the foreign policy intent, ah um, the without having had the pen on the decision making documentation we would have, we within DFAIT and CIDA would have been completely overwhelmed and to some degree we were, by the military approach.

Appendix F. Sample Transcript Description of Nodes and Sub-Nodes

NODE	Subordinate Nodes	Comment
Leader	Leader Behaviours	Participant describes actions and behaviours of formal and informal leaders. This was generally what the leader did, but also included what the leader failed to do.
	Leader Characteristics	Participant describes the characteristics of formal and informal leaders. The characteristics can be physical or non-physical. Characteristics can be from an actual leader or an idealised leader.
	Leader Defined at Basic Level	Using Lord's ILT framework, the participant describes a leader free from context. For this study free of context was related to the question
	Leader Defined at Superordinate Level	Using Lord's ILT framework, the participant describes a leader within a specific context. For this study context was related to: the organisations of the leader, whole of government leader, and leader in the Afghanistan mission context.
	Leader Development	Participants described extent of leader development within their own organisation. This NODE was not used for the findings or discussion.
Leadership	Leadership Defined as a Position	Participants describe leadership as a position or a person.
	Leadership Defined as a Process	Participants describe leadership as a process, or something someone does.
	Leadership Defined at Basic Level	Using Lord's ILT framework, the participant describes a leadership as a process free from context. For this study free of context was when the participant described leadership without referring to an organisation. This generally resulted from the question
	Leadership Defined at Superordinate Level	Using Lord's ILT framework, the participant describes leadership as a process within a specific context. For this study context was related to: the organisations of the leader, whole of government leader, and leader in the Afghanistan mission context.
Participant		Listed the participants
Question		Listed the interview questions as subordinate nodes
Strategic Direction		Participants discussed actions from outside of the group context. For this study this referred to the parent organisation in Ottawa, or to the Government of Canada.

Appendix G. Consolidation of Behaviour Descriptors

Consolidated behaviour	Participant's terminology used to describe leader behaviour
Providing a vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vision ; • provides good kind of visualisation of what his intent and desire; • provide good clear indication of intent; • broad guidance setting the objectives; • clear sense of objectives, setting the direction; • identifying a common aim; • clarity of mission; • common understanding; • clarity of purpose; • identify a goal.
motivating the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • motivate; • generate excitement and enthusiasm for things ; • inspiration; • establishing high standards to make you want to be part of the team; • aspirations; • create a team of capable people; • empower; • give us the flexibility to determine our own priorities; • giving everybody a sense of ownership and responsibility; • feel valuable; • they also feel they are recognised for their work.
ensuring buy-in from the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • get the buy in and support ; • reach consensus; • consensus building; • participation; • ensuring everybody had a role to play; • ensuring that everybody's work and views were reflected in the work; • feel like they are making a positive contribution; • get that feedback, seek feedback; • having something for themselves; • inclusive; • inculcates that sense of participation; • ask people for their ideas; • engaging with individuals; • take differing views.
providing stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stewardship; • produce the next generation of leaders; • professional development needs of the people ; • builds and allows the team and the team members to become better professionals.
understanding the environment and other actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build coalitions between yourself, your organisation and other organisations; • identifying where the natural partnerships; • make those strategic connections; • work collaboratively; • relationships.

managing the resources of the group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise the limitations of what everybody was able to do; • manage the process effectively; • managing resources; • marshalled the resources ; • instil confidence; • organise other people; • coordinate; • integrator; • understand fully and completely and intimately each of the subcomponents.
effectively communicating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communication; • communicating intent; • communicate; • dialogue; • effectively express ideas.
effective and timely decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make any decisions; • making a decision; • concise decision making; • respond quickly; • turn things around quickly.
enabling the group through interaction with external agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • find a way around problems; • translator; • rise above the various competing interests; • cut through the process able to work outside of his organisation; • champion the cause; • supporting their teams; • managing up; • convincing upwards and sideways; • protect and defend his or her group; • advocacy.

Appendix H. Comparison of attributes and behaviours from the literature

Lord, Foti and Vader 1984 and Lord, DeVader and Alliger 1986		Offerman, Kennedy, Wirtz 1994		Epitropaki and Martin 2004		Gerstner and Day 1994
Intelligent Dominance Extroversion Conservatism Masculine	Emphasizes goals Seeks information Coordinates groups Provides information Proposes solutions Specifies problems Seeks suggestions Makes suggestions Integrates information Emphasizes deadlines Admits mistakes Explains actions Clarifies attitudes Prevents conflicts Argues convincingly Allocates decisions Exercises influence Emphasizes feelings Talks frequently Makes jokes Requests approval Agrees readily Withholds rewards Criticizes harshly Neglects details	Sensitivity Dedication Charisma Intelligence Strength Attractiveness Tyranny Masculinity	sympathetic sensitive compassionate understanding sincere warm forgiving helpful dedicated motivated hard-working goal-oriented energetic charismatic inspiring enthusiastic dynamic intellectual educated intelligent wise knowledgeable clever strong bold well-groomed attractive well-dressed classy domineering pushy dominant manipulative power-hungry conceited loud selfish obnoxious demanding male masculine	Sensitivity Intelligence Dedication Dynamism Tyranny Masculinity	sincere helpful understanding intelligent knowledgeable educated clever motivated dedicated hard-working energetic strong dynamic domineering pushy manipulative loud conceited selfish masculine male	Used Lord et al 1984.
Based on Mann 1959	59 attributes but 25 behaviours used in study		41 attributes		21 attributes	59 attributes