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Abstract

The aim of this inquiry was to identify Leadership literacies for professional staff in universities (hereafter called the 'Leadership Literacies'). This was achieved firstly by constructing a Leadership Literacy framework drawn from four broad fields of literature concerning leadership and the contexts for leadership in the 21st century. A sense that the focus of leadership has shifted in the current century propels this inquiry. I argue that this change, in essence, can be explained in terms of a shift from 'the leader' as a noun to the work of leading as activity. This means that emergent interests in leadership look more deeply into relational aspects including, relations with the self (intra and inter personal responsibilities) as both leader and follower, and with others in relation to what Follett (1926) referred to as the ‘law of the situation’ (pp. 65-66). Theoretical congruence for these expanded notions of leadership can be traced back to humanist concerns raised by theorists early last century and to the resulting Human Relations Movement (Mayo, 1919; Follett, 1924, 1928; Barnard, 1938; Mayo, 1945). This moves the focus to ‘intangible’, ‘soft’, ‘humanist’ elements which was traced back to Follett in this thesis, although they go back much further, for example to Plato (Carnwath et al., 2008 p. 1).

In order to explore this topic and undertake the research components of the thesis, it was underpinned by the cognitive frames of American Pragmatist philosophy, Critical Management Studies theory and Pragmatist Feminist theoretical guiding principles. This is an interpretative act of inquiry, guided by action sensitive principles. The means to investigate it is named as a qualitative multi-method approach. As a qualitative researcher investigating the socially complex phenomenon of leadership in these times, I am situated within this text as actively and publicly engaged in this interpretive act of inquiry.

The Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies, framed after the synthesis of literature from chapters 3 and 4, were applied to Australian universities for signs of their theorisation. This was followed by the primary research for this thesis, that is the application of these Leadership Literacies to professional staff working in universities to ascertain whether they were observed as part of their ‘lived experience’ of work. My primary research is set within Australian universities but given the common characteristic of the mix of academic and professional staff in all universities, I argue that it is possible to extrapolate from this

1 Professional staff are defined for the purposes of this inquiry as the people who work in universities in ‘other than academic’ positions. They are classified officially as ‘non-academic’ staff in government reporting documents and are also referred to as general staff, allied staff, administrative staff in the workplace.

2 Follett’s contributions to relational acuity will be taken up in Chapter four to consider this ‘law of situation’ and her expanded use of ‘purpose’ for its rallying capacities,
site to universities more broadly. My decision to focus on professional staff as a specific cohort was made for two reasons. The first is because of my standpoint as a practice led researcher, having worked as a professional staff member for ten years prior to undertaking this research. The second is that professional staff are an under-represented group in leadership studies in universities, as leadership is generally associated with academics. This gap presents an opportunity to look at leadership in Australian universities as well as the opportunity to consider similarities and differences for this work from earlier periods in history. In particular I was interested in shifts, if any, of perceptions about understandings of terms such as ‘leader’, ‘follower’ and ‘leading’.

This thesis produced one significant finding for the question *What are Leadership literacies for professional staff in universities?* This finding was supported by a working framework constructed after a thorough review and synthesis of literature regarding three of the contexts for leadership in the 21st century, as well as key leadership theory that showed promise to work with these conditions. This framework named the result of this construction as Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies. A multi-method approach was then applied to explore to produce empirical data. For theoretical congruence more generally within the higher education sector, the site of professional staff work, two leadership research reports about Australian universities were thematically explored for signs of theoretical resonance with the Leadership Literacies. Once this was indicated, the Leadership Literacies were then explored more deeply using the Framework qualitative analysis method applied to data gathered in a survey. These themes were elicited from the accounts of lived experiences of work and leadership of a cohort of professional staff working in Australian universities. In the final chapter, analysis of data drawn from this multi-method approach led to a finding that the research question was answered in the affirmative in two parts. First, the ‘what are’ part of the question was explored by the naming of the Leadership Literacies Framework; second, the Leadership Literacies were found to be both theoretically congruent as well as indicated in the elicitation from the lived accounts of experiences of work and leadership given by a cohort of professional staff in universities.
Chapter One | Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The aim of this inquiry is to identify Leadership literacies for professional staff\(^3\) in universities (hereafter called the ‘Leadership Literacies’). This will be achieved firstly by identifying relevant Leadership Literacies from four broad fields of literature concerning leadership and the contexts for leadership in the 21\(^{st}\) century. These are then applied to Australian universities in order to locate signs of their theorisation. This is followed by the primary research for this thesis, that is the application of these Leadership Literacies to professional staff working in universities to ascertain whether they are observed by them as part of their ‘lived experience’ of work. My primary research is set within Australian universities but given the common characteristic of the mix of academic and professional staff in all universities, I argue that it is possible to extrapolate from this site to universities more broadly.

Universities act as both drivers and vehicles at this time of significant change. It is therefore important to consider their leadership capacities in the face of these challenges at this time. This reflects that knowledge—its creation, production and dissemination—is now a driver of economic growth. Given this each nation’s higher education sector, as source and driver of knowledge, is central. It follows that higher education institutions be cognisant of, practice and promote congruent leadership literacies for their times. The purpose of the higher education enterprise, as Salmi (2002) and Boulton & Lewis (2008) argue, is central to the production and utilisation of knowledge. The site for this inquiry is important, because universities are central to Australia’s nation building capacity in the 21\(^{st}\) century (Considine et al, 2001; Marginson, 2002; Wood, 2003; Marginson, 2006). In the absence of hindsight, and regardless of the complexities associated with trying to analyse current conditions as they unfold, two key issues emerge for the higher education sector in Australia out of even the briefest consideration of these changed and changing times:

i) the extent of Australia’s preparedness to adequately support and fully engage in a global knowledge-driven economy; and

ii) the positioning of the higher education sector as both the driver and vehicle of Australia’s capacity building endeavours so that Australia can prosper in these times.

---

\(^3\) Professional staff are defined for the purposes of this inquiry as the people who work in universities in ‘other than academic’ positions. They are classified officially as ‘non-academic’ staff in government reporting documents and are also referred to as general staff, allied staff, administrative staff in the workplace.
As a practice-led researcher, this inquiry and its research question emanated from my practice as a Research Manager in an Australian university. Deep reflection on the nature of work within the higher education sector in Australia, and my part in it, led me to this inquiry. This reflective period was most active just after completing a Masters degree in professional education and training. It is of no consequence to reveal exactly what it was that sparked my concern (other than to reveal it as a concern for quality outcomes when trying to do more with less) only that it resulted in a considerable sense of disquiet. There came a point when I realised that it was unrealistic of me to expect someone else to ‘fix’ a problem that I had identified in my practice and studies and that it was my responsibility to investigate it. I now regard that realisation as the kind of leadership moment—albeit a reluctant one to begin with—that fits with the very leadership literacies that I ultimately investigated in this inquiry. My practice-led researcher lens will be more thoroughly discussed in Chapter 5, where universities in Australia are introduced as the case for this inquiry. Smith (1999) identifies such a ‘powerful sense of disquiet’ as the well worn path to research and action for practitioners. For me, this took the form of a series of ever widening questions beginning with ‘is it just me?’ ‘is it my faculty?’ ‘my university’, and back again to ‘what part am I playing in this given that I am keeping quiet about the invisible work I am doing over a significant period of time?’ These reflections led me to the key value driver that propels this inquiry. That is, what are the consequences for people working under these challenging conditions in the sector in the short term; and what might the medium to long term implications be for nation building capacities of a country that seemingly underfunds its higher education sector (Wood, 2003; Davis, 2006; OECD, 2010 p. 205)? However, it was the opportunity to co-write a conference paper using my colleague’s values framework as a lens to reflect directly upon my experiences that best helped me articulate these concerns. Indeed, my colleague observed that this sense of disquiet may be a direct consequence of the very leadership dilemma I was grappling with. We articulated these concerns thus:

An increasing reliance on compliance and surveillance ... are attempts to control order in an increasingly complex global, networked and information rich world. The machine-age, scientific worldview of ‘if it can’t be measured it can’t be managed’ is still prevalent but it is no longer appropriate because this view does not acknowledge that the real key performance indicators required for success in the new millennium are likely to be intangible. We argue that the overuse of such control mechanisms ... are actually part of the problem, not a solution. This behaviour is an example of regression under pressure to outmoded foundation values, diverting energy from thinking about the true purpose of governments, learning institutions, corporations and individuals for the future. ‘Working with’ practices, based ostensibly on values, are an appropriate vehicle for moving this agenda forward (Nanschild & Davis, 2007 pp. 138-139).

This inquiry goes some way to make sense of these dilemmas and makes a valuable contribution to both the sector and my colleagues working within it. It is clear that these
are not issues I can ‘fix’ on my own, or indeed are ‘fixable’ at all. Nevertheless I resolved to capture an account of the lived experiences of people, like me, working in universities in Australia. My decision to focus on professional staff as a specific cohort was made on the basis that they are an underrepresented group in leadership studies, and particularly in universities, as leadership is generally associated with academics in universities. In the wider discourse of higher education, the views of professional staff about all matters, not just leadership, are virtually absent (Castleman & Allen, 1995; Conway, 2000; Szekeres, 2004; Davis, 2006; Graham, 2009. This gap presents an opportunity to look afresh at leadership in Australian universities today and consider similarities and differences for this work in relation to earlier periods in history. In particular, I am interested in shifts, if any, of perceptions about what terms such as ‘leader’, ‘follower’ and ‘leading’ might mean for leadership studies in universities today.

An underpinning assumption of inquiry in this thesis is that the phenomenon under investigation, and the research design interrogating it, are integrated as constructions of what Law (2010) terms “social theories in practice ... which are shaped by the social world in which they are located and in turn help shape that social world” (p. 6). This is underpinned by my understanding of leadership as a socially complex and context dependent phenomenon. These assumptions to be detailed in Chapter 2 are in keeping with calls to look afresh at research in light of the complexities and discontinuous change affecting leadership. In this thesis I have made a conscious effort to look afresh at leadership. This is advanced as looking past the leader, where considerable research has already been done, to focus on acts of leading and what this might mean for ‘leader’ and ‘follower’. This connects to lines of leadership inquiry interested in the activities of leadership in the 21st century, theorised as post-heroic leadership. This deep philosophical shift is in response to fast changing times that mark the 21st century. These calls include Fullan & Scott’s (2009) "to adopt a ready, fire approach" needed for turnaround leadership” (p. 85); Bolden et al (2011) calls to reroute leadership and be “explicit about the choices and agendas that we bring to our work [so] may it be possible to capture an honest account of what we find” (p. 176); and Uhl-Bien’s (2011) critique of scientific management where, she reasons:

... science came into the field of management to help legitimize the field. But what has happened is that the sciences in the field of management are actually outdated. While we think we are doing science we are very outdated relative to where the real state of science actually is (9 min: 35sec).

To be clear, these calls and my response to them, do not want to do away with ‘science’. Rather that the ‘science’ used to be less reliant on ‘scientism’, and more open to finding ways to make sense of, and work with, the speed and nature of the times, using research principles that address rigour, ethics and transparency.
In responding to this challenge, this thesis is framed as an interpretive act of inquiry based on established qualitative theoretical grounding from the social sciences. It is presented as an integrated thesis in which arguments and their supporting claims from the literature are brought together wherever they are made. Narrative explorations and expositions are also integral to this approach. The research question “What are leadership literacies for professional staff in universities?” was addressed by considering the following sub questions. These are presented in the thesis in three separate chapters:

Chapter 4: What are these emerging leadership literacies?
Chapter 5: To what extent are these being theorised within Australian universities?
Chapter 6: To what extent are these being experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities?

1.1.1 Defining Concepts

Two concepts require definition in this inquiry. The first term, leadership literacies, is central to this thesis as it connects many of the interrelated arguments within it. Leadership Literacies’ signify embodied and collective understandings of leadership set within the current turbulent and complex conditions and contexts. The use of this term intentionally draws upon Freire’s (1970) notion of ‘literacy as conscientization pointing to possibilities for empowerment, social transformation and emancipation for leadership practitioners and scholars. Such conscientization implies that the ‘leadership literate’ are “knowing subjects, reach[ing] deeper awareness both of the socio-cultural reality on which life is built and his (sic) ability to transform that reality” (p. 27).

My own experiences of work have brought me in to contact with ‘literacies’ in many guises since the mid 1990s. As a professional working in libraries and studying librarianship I saw firsthand how libraries became de facto access and training sites for a new technology called the World Wide Web. This led swiftly to the importance of “information literacy” (McClure, 1994 p. 118) for the profession and for the public. As my interests shifted to leadership, I readily took up the concept of ‘leadership literacies’. This concept and its provenance is discussed in Chapter 4.

The second term, or indeed group of terms, to be defined is neoliberal economics. These pertain to the ideological values, political assumptions and technical activities that have driven globalisation and economic growth for over 50 years. This phenomenon fuels current global hegemony as well as most Western economic models today. Neoliberalism is, on the one hand, simply an economic theory heavily influenced by Hayek (1960) and Friedman (1962) that rests on a commitment to free markets (Peters, 1999 p. 4). Yet it is also ideologically driven and its influence has permeated all aspects of societal life, where as Evans (2008) notes, “the existing
structure of global power is still best characterized as global neo-liberalism” (p. 276). This commitment to free markets is based on two sets of claims which are succinctly explained by Peters (1999). These are “claims for the efficiency of the market as a superior allocative mechanism for the distribution of scarce public resources, and: claims for the market as a morally superior form of political economy” (p. 4). From Evans’s summation it is clear that this concept also has ideological implications, that is, the extent to which it serves to promote interests and maintain relations of power and domination (see also, Edwards, 2002; Deem & Brehony, 2005), as much as economic management. McChesney (1999) explicates this ideology:

... for the past two decades neoliberalism has been the dominant global political economic trend ... Neoliberal initiatives are characterized as free market policies that encourage private enterprise and consumer choice ... Neoliberals cannot and do not offer an empirical defense for the world they are making. To the contrary, they ... demand a religious faith in the infallibility of the unregulated market, that draws upon nineteenth century theories that have little connection to the actual world (p. 7).

The technical activities in the service of these agendas are best known as New Managerialism and performativity. New Managerialism has “become a new organising philosophy of governance and has serviced to justify the restricting and modernising of a range of institutions’ (Deem & Brehony, 2005 p. 221) with performativity as its tool. The term performativity is, of course, neutral and as Spicer & Alvesson (2009) contend, “the problem is to carefully decide what kind of performativity we want” (p. 554). Neoliberal performativity is one of the technical activities pressed into service to drive particular rationalist agendas. In this thesis performativity (and critiques of it) are assumed as notions of compliance, surveillance and hyper risk management activities. This ideology, and its technical manifestations, is deeply intertwined and so pervasive that sometimes the activities directly represent ideology. It is not uncommon, for example, to see the term ‘managerialism’ stand for neoliberalism (see for example, Davies, 2003 91; Deem & Brehony, 2005 p. 217). The euphemism ‘free market policies’ is how the public generally engage with this concept (McChesney, 1999 p. 7).

In Australia neoliberalism is best known as economic rationalism (Edwards, 2002). As will be discussed in Chapter 5, I regard managerialism as pervasive in the Australian higher education section at this time. This standpoint is supported in the literature by Considine et al, 2001; Biggs & Davis, 2002; Davies, 2003; Richter & Buttery, 2004; Marginson, 2004; and Blackmore, 2005.

1.2. Research Rationale

A sense that the focus of leadership has shifted in the current century propels this inquiry. I will argue that this change, in essence, can be explained in terms of a change from ‘the leader’ as a noun to the work of leading as the activity. This means that emergent interest in leadership looks more deeply into relational aspects including,
relations with the self (intra and inter personal responsibilities) as both leader and follower, and with others in relation to what Follett (1926) referred to as the ‘law of the situation’⁴ (pp. 65-66). Theoretical congruence for these expanded notions of leadership can be traced back to humanist concerns raised by theorists early last century and to the resulting Human Relations Movement (Mayo, 1919; Follett, 1924, 1928; Barnard, 1938; Mayo, 1945). This moves the focus to ‘intangible’, ‘soft’, ‘humanist’ elements which can traced back to Plato (Carnwath et al, 2008 p. 1). For example today this is acknowledged more generally as people bringing their whole selves to work (HBR, 2008), and that ‘leaders being in the business of energy management’ (Kets de Vries, 2003 p. 111). These in turn require consideration of ways to humanely and economically capture and manage knowledge and energies of people for competitive advantage (Loehr & Schwartz, 2003b; Schwartz, 2007). Indeed Mary Parker Follett was one of the first to identify the need for an expanded notion of leadership. It has been in Follett’s work where my own sense of connecting with longstanding streams of consciousness, integral to the research process, really began. Given this, her work features in both the theoretical guiding principles outlined in Chapter 2 and the leadership literature discussion in Chapter 4.

As stated, the aim of this thesis is to identify leadership literacies for professional staff working in universities. The rationale for this inquiry, at its heart, is about individuals and their capacity to change and influence wider groupings, be they leaders or followers within knowledge-intensive enterprises. The overarching drivers of this thesis are the interrelationships between leadership, language, literacies and learning as the means to make these cognitive shifts. I argue that leaders in these conditions require a different set of leadership literacies to develop than those from the command and control ‘competency’ based management literacies of the past. As will be elaborated upon in Chapter 4, these Leadership Literacies focus on people-centred approaches. I use the term ‘leadership literacies’ to signify embodied understandings of self in relation to leadership. I maintain this is needed by knowledge-intensive enterprises in the current turbulent and complex conditions. Here leaders understand themselves as teachers, enablers and stewards who encourage commitment and responsibility in themselves and their staff by tapping into intangible qualities like trust, values and commitment. Future leadership considerations may well require an attention to learning within its remit given the likely speed and magnitude of change it is responding to. This has been explained by practitioners and scholars such as Peters (1994) and Senge (1990), as the need for profound change within working environments that requires all to be critically engaged and contribute to the purpose and competitive advantage of the

---

⁴ Follett’s contributions to relational acuity will be taken up in Chapter four to consider this ‘law of situation’ and her expanded use of ‘purpose’ for its rallying capacities,
enterprise. This emphasis on learning implies the need for professional engagement of all individuals and groups to change towards levels of engagement and understanding beyond compliance and competencies.

1.2.1 Cognitive Frames Underpinning this Inquiry

As will be explored more fully in Chapter 2, this inquiry is underpinned by a method assemblage designed to articulate how the inquiry is grounded, how it is enacted and the means to investigate the inquiry. I intentionally use the term ‘cognitive frames’ in the method assemblage to articulate certain underlying patterns of thought about the philosophical and theoretical frameworks grounding this inquiry. This brings together the concepts of framing (i.e. a means to explain what is in and out of a particular picture, thus organising information according to particular norms) and cognition (i.e. the mental action or process of acquiring this particular knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses). The research question is first grounded these cognitive frameworks that fit with an inquiry into leadership studies that acknowledges that such phenomena remain essentially contested concepts (Cilliers 2002; Grint 2005a). This provides the warrant for me to explain in detail in chapter 2 the congruent methodology, methods and analytical choices made in this inquiry.

These cognitive frames are named as an American Pragmatist philosophy, Critical Management Studies theory and Pragmatist Feminist theoretical guiding principles. Next, the means to enact the inquiry is named as an interpretative act of inquiry guided by action sensitive principles. Lastly, the means to investigate the inquiry is regarded as a qualitative multi-method approach, using thematic analysis of extant data and a qualitative survey using the Framework qualitative analytical frame.

As a qualitative researcher investigating the socially complex phenomenon of leadership in these times, I am actively and publicly engaged in this interpretive act of inquiry. Given the nature of this approach, it is necessary to name my own philosophical disposition upon which interpretations made in this thesis are based. Like all research, this inquiry is framed and influenced by metatheoretical elements, commonly described as the epistemology, ontology and axiology of philosophy (Bates, 2005; Miller, 2005). I name my philosophical disposition as relativist ontology an interpretivist epistemology and a values-laden axiology. The reason that I say I ‘name’ them and not ‘select’ them is because they are not something I can necessarily choose. Rather, they are a part of who I am as a person and as a researcher and they serve to describe my underlying worldview to my scholarly community. Throughout the research process I have gained a greater sense of understanding and means of expression regarding my philosophical disposition, and how it contributes to my identity.
and to this inquiry. My philosophical disposition ultimately influenced, indeed it framed, the method assemblage of the research design and the conduct of this inquiry.

My ontology, \textit{way of being in the world}, is relativist. This standpoint understands that “reality is only knowable through socially constructed meanings and that there is no single shared social reality, only a series of alternative social constructions” (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003 p. 16). It is framed by my awareness of how this inquiry might contribute to the discipline of management, in that it does not seek to declare one truth or possible answer as an outcome of this research. Instead, guided by the research design, this inquiry provides an account of research undertaken in pursuit of a set of research questions that, restated, emanate from my practice as a research manager in a university in Australia. I interrogated the research questions by making choices to use selected literature from four particular domains of knowledge production; to use a particular set of participants who have provided accounts of their lived experiences of leadership in universities in Australia; to be guided by particular philosophical and theoretical stances, and to draw on a particular methodological approach and certain research methods. I have been mindful to seek congruence between the research questions, my philosophical disposition and the research design for this inquiry. My relativist ontology interprets truth claims as contestable. From this standpoint I understand that one’s ontological disposition, particularly the way ‘truth’ is constituted and then tested, has much to do with contestations in the interrelated discourses of research, philosophy and disciplinary knowledge. By allowing other than the dominant methodological and leadership narratives to surface, a relativist ontology also serves to critique the hegemony of certainty, order and determinism, and open up ways to see the world as it is in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century—a volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) (Johansen, 2009) place to live, learn, lead and follow. This critique is a key driver for this thesis.

I understand epistemology as one’s \textit{way of knowing}. I claim an interpretivist way of knowing as foundational to the conduct of this thesis. This standpoint, to paraphrase Ritchie & Lewis (2003), assumes that the researcher knows that:

\begin{quote}
... the social world impact on each other; facts and values are not distinct; findings are inevitably influenced by the researcher’s perspectives and values, making it impossible to conduct objective, values free research (although the researcher should be transparent about these assumptions); and, that the methods of the natural sciences are not appropriate because the social world is mediated through meaning and human agency (p. 17).
\end{quote}

My interest and curiosity is in exploring and understanding a world full of social complexities using both the participants’ as well as my own understandings. My

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{5} Understood as the philosophical study of the nature of being, existence and reality; \textsuperscript{6} understood as a way to explain knowledge assumptions}
interpretivist epistemology is important for this thesis because this inquiry is driven by an interpretive methodology, the declared interpretation in this sense, “does not simply continue the process of making meaning; it begins it” (Brizuela et al, 2000 p. xix).

These philosophical dispositions accord with my axiological understanding, that is, how I value the concept of values. That I am a values-laden researcher is not just central to this thesis, it is part of my identity, and I consider the explication of values as an ethical imperative for qualitative research. Upon this values-laden standpoint rests my assumption that qualitative interpretive inquiry unfolds through me and that this methodology (as will be fully discussed in the next chapter) naturally includes me as the ‘researcher-as-research-instrument’. A values laden axiology is congruent with an interpretivist epistemology, relativist ontology and qualitative methodology which all reject the hegemony of scientism and positivism. This is due to incommensurate understandings of the part values play in the research endeavour. Positivist hegemony rests on an axiology understanding that research must be conducted free from values. The idea that research can ever be a values free endeavour is incomprehensible to me. This is due to my values-laden understanding that values can never be absent, but rather they are either declared or kept silent.

From this philosophical disposition comes my understanding that “all research is basically intersubjective” (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000 pp. 67-68) and that I value research that is appropriately subjective and objective. As a qualitative interpretive inquirer I take seriously the subjectivities I enact, as well as the objectivity which is necessary to explore whether this research inquiry is viable and appropriate as argued by Guba & Lincoln (1994); Tesch (1990 p. 70); Shindler & Case (1996); Piantanida & Garman (1999); Meloy (2002); Merriam (2002); and Patton (2002). The work of Piantanida and Garman (1999), in particular, provides a warrant7 to voice these intersubjectivities and acknowledge that defensible qualitative research relies upon them and that they are testable in relation to qualitative inquiry (Piantanida & Garman, 1999 147-153). In providing these epistemologically germane criteria, they are able to frame the notion of objectivity differently to those that spring from positivist epistemology equating objectivity with guarantees of certainty or ‘THE’ truth. The intersubjective and anti-foundational locations for qualitative inquiry does not abandon objectivity, rather it reframes it, as Phillips (2000) discusses:

The crucial point is that it does not follow from any developments in epistemology that the notion of objectivity has been undermined. This ‘unbelievable consequence’ would only follow if objectivity were equated with certainty. When we

---

7 I use the term ‘warrant’ in this thesis when drawing upon considerations of theory and method in support of the directions I take in this inquiry. This is based on John Dewey’s (1941) notion of warranted assertibility. After initial thought, reflection and initial investigations of the literature, a warranted assertion is made that a particular approach has some referential basis, and is worthy of investigation.
abandon foundationalism, we abandon the assurance that we can know when we have reached the truth, but we do not have to abandon the notion of the truth or the quest for it, and we do not abandon the view that some types of inquiries are better than others (pp. 121-122).

The statements I make concerning my philosophical disposition are included as necessary background for the positioning of myself in the inquiry as part of the methodology of qualitative interpretive inquiry. This methodology requires an explication of a “critical self-awareness of [my] own subjectivity, vested interests, predilections and assumptions and to be conscious of how these might impact on the research process and findings” (Finlay, 2008 p. 17). These insights and understandings of how I am with the world and how I know the world accord with American Pragmatist philosophy.

The methods to be introduced in Chapter 2 were selected after much thought and reflection for their congruence with the research questions and methodology. The risk of emergent methodologies is that they can only be confirmed by the act of ‘doing’ the research and I am prepared to carry this risk in pursuit of new knowledge. The opportunities afforded by this approach will lead to original contributions to methodology and method. The research methods for this inquiry are positioned within a multi-method frame, where data collection and analysis sit within one particular research methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003 p. 11; Spratt et al, 2004 p. 6). This methodology has been described throughout the thesis as an interpretive inquiry grounded in the particular cognitive frames to be fully outlined in Chapter 2. To be clear, my research methods sit within a multi-method frame, they are not mixed methods. This distinction is important because one of the methods developed is a qualitative survey, and surveys are generally underpinned by positivist epistemology and analysed quantitatively.

1.2.2 Research Questions

Two methods were employed as a ‘between-methods’ triangulation strategy to test for signs of theorisation and experience of the Leadership Literacies in Australian universities. The first approach considers higher education leadership discourse as a way to investigate knowledge assumptions about leadership concerning Australian universities. Engagement with the literature as well as thematic analyses were used to discern whether the Leadership Literacies had been more generally theorised in relation to Australian universities (Chapter 5). Three publications addressing policy, theory and practice, were thematically and descriptively analysed for congruence with the Leadership Literacies. The second method, a qualitative survey of professional staff in Australian universities, was designed to identify, from their accounts of lived experiences of work and leadership in Australian universities, whether these
Leadership Literacies were yet *experienced*. Such notions of qualitative triangulation are well documented (see for example Jick, 1979; Brinberg & McGrath, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mathison, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell & Miller, 2000). The rationale for the research questions will now be discussed with these cognitive frames in mind.

**What are Leadership Literacies for Professional Staff in Universities?**

Due to the emergent nature of both the research design and the phenomenon under investigation, the first research question was addressed in Chapter 4 as part of the chapter’s pivotal role as a literature discussion from which a theoretical framework was constructed. The particular leadership theories and practices investigated in Chapter 4, from the large body of leadership literature available, were framed by the three key contexts discussed in Chapter 3 concerning leadership in the 21st century. These contexts include social complexity (Snowden & Stanbridge 2004) and learning metabolism (Hames 2007) as sensemaking frames and enablers for leadership in the 21st century. Second, mindsets influencing work and leadership in the 21st century as well as shifts toward more holistic leadership approaches that take responsibility for issues such as sustainability are addressed. These mindsets are from what by Staron et al (2006) describe as Industrial, Information and Knowledge Eras. Third, language and power relations in knowledge-intensive enterprises were considered. This Leadership Literacy Framework and its theoretical provenance emanate directly from the literature. My reasoning is that this approach best captured the emergence of key leadership approaches and theories as these and the inquiry unfolded in parallel. It was therefore important to have my interpretations grounded in the literature. This approach enacts my methodology, as ‘shaping and being shaped by’ experiences, whilst at the same time pressing the literature into the service of this methodology. It was conceptualised this way to capture a sense of a phenomenon in flux, the times in which the inquiry was set, and the research design in pursuit of it. This allowed me to begin to interrogate perceived cognitive shifts while they were in motion, rather than adopting a ‘wait and see’ stance afforded by historical distance. While waiting for a degree of certainty that time can provide would be a ‘safer’ option, it could not capture the potential meaning that the fluidity of the situation was likely to produce in relation to the largely intangible nature of the Leadership Literacies. Chapter 4 produces an original synthesis from four separate, yet interrelated, bodies of literature. It is also claimed as a construction chapter because the process had methodological intent to take seriously calls to ‘look afresh at leadership research’. In enacting this interpretative methodology in this way, it was possible to closely engage with the literature throughout the inquiry and use my own critical reflections and action learning to determine the Leadership Literacies and develop them into testable forms. This work represents an original
contribution to leadership studies and provides the content for the next two sub questions.

**To what extent are these being theorised within Australian universities?**

This question addresses the sub question concerning theorisation of the Leadership Literacies by engaging with Australian higher education leadership discourse and then thematically analysing a major government review of the sector Bradley et al (2008) and two Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) project reports (Scott et al, 2008; Jones & Ryland, 2011).

The results were mixed, with no engagement about the idea of Australian university leadership at all discovered in the Bradley Review (2008) and meaningful theoretical congruence between the Leadership Literacies and the two ALTC reports.

**To what extent are these being experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities?**

The third sub question, investigating whether the Leadership Literacies had been experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities was addressed in a primary research study presented in Chapter 6. This study makes a significant contribution to knowledge for leadership studies and the discipline of management for two main reasons. Firstly, professional staff working in universities are underrepresented in the literature concerning higher education in Australia (in general or leadership in particular). It consists of accounts by 226 professional staff about their observations and experiences of work and leadership in the early part of the 21st century. The selection of this cohort brings to attention just one of the many ambiguities of work in Australian universities, in that knowledge workers (both professional and academic staff) encompass both leader and follower roles. As will be argued, professional staff are mainly conceptualised as followers and supporting the activities of their institutions. Although I did not ask them directly about their own leadership (as this would simply add to the very large body of research gathered over many decades that focuses on the ‘leader’ in leadership studies). I am not suggesting that they were not formal or informal leaders in their own right. Rather, they were not commenting specifically on their own leadership but on their lived experience of work and leadership in their workplace. My intention was to track the cognitive shifts towards post-heroic models of leadership that support the notion that the work of leadership is more than just about any one designated leader. These accounts, gathered in an online survey, provided the data with which to test for signs of the expanded notions of leadership defined as the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies.
Secondly, as already discussed, I focussed on the difficult to measure—but no less important—intangible areas of relational and humanistic approaches to leadership which have emerged in this inquiry as important for leadership in the 21st century. The difficulties of researching these forms of leadership do not lie in the soft skills themselves but rather in positivist epistemologies and methodologies pervading scientific management since the 1950s. Positivist research is unable and/or unwilling to identify these concerns as legitimate sites of inquiry. This could be due, in no small part, on their inability to ‘see’ these as sites of inquiry due to the confines of rationalist, disinterested and values ‘free’ understandings that underpin positivist accounts of research.

The study discovered positive signs of the Leadership Literacies being experienced, observed and enacted in the everyday work of this cohort. However, the data outlining their lived experiences of working conditions, suggests signs of leadership and management more akin to Industrial Era models.

1.3. How the inquiry was enacted

Doctoral research is an iterative process that necessarily proceeds through what are called cycles of deliberation (Piantanida & Garman, 1999 pp. 6-8) or learning leaps (Wisker et al, 2010 p. 5) that occur when researchers cross what has been described as “transformative, irreversible, integrative, bounded and troublesome” conceptual thresholds (Meyer & Land, 2003 pp. 3-4). In keeping with the interpretive methodology chosen for this inquiry, examples of these leaps, made public in my research blog (see for example, Davis, 2008a, 2010c), are discussed in terms of cognitive blocks experienced in writing and/or thinking (and indeed by dint of the writing-as-thinking process) as my identities were challenged as part of the inquiry. An example of this work relates to reflections about my own leadership responsibilities (Davis 2008c):

One of the benefits of undertaking a PhD is the constant opportunity to reflect on my assumptions and ladders of inference and to work through the sticking points to my own personal development...As I am researching the topic of leadership I can’t help but reflect on my own experiences of leadership—as both a leader and follower—and I have come to an understanding that:

1. I’m an ‘accidental’ leader
2. I have, for most of my life, been a ‘reluctant’ leader.

For all its observation, leadership is still a very slippery concept to grasp and our concepts of leadership are very much based on our own experiences of bumping up against it. There are lots of reasons why people may be reluctant to see themselves or others as leaders but most of them are rooted in defensive routines and patterns.

As I mentioned in pt 1 of this post, the opportunity to do a PhD about leadership triggered me to reflect on my own leadership and particularly why it has taken me so long to be comfortable with the tag of leader. I’ve always had a strong sense of duty, I’d always taken responsibility for my own actions and I know others have
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identified me as a leader so why, I ask myself, have I been so reluctant to name myself a leader?

I have realised that my own opportunities for deep impact learning have mostly occurred when I’ve been taken out of my comfort zone. The reason I have come to this PhD has certainly emanated from a deep sense of disquiet about the leadership and management of the higher education sector in Australia and its effects on the people trying valiantly to support the work of the sector—the teaching, learning and research—with ever increasing workloads and ever decreasing resources. I've had colleagues buckle under the pressure and have been close to buckling myself and probably would have except my energies were diverted into explicating the reasons why this was happening.

So this brings me to list several reasons why people may be reluctant to lead:

It's not my place / Someone else will step up and do it. For quite a while I kept expecting someone else to see what I was seeing and step in to fix it. Why, for example, was it that Australia being an underperforming knowledge nation wasn’t on the front page of the newspapers, why was it not a major election topic, etc?? Surely the correlation between this fact and the diminishing resources for the HE sector and the consequences of this on the wellbeing of staff and students was obvious to everyone??

The aha moment for me was the realisation that I was responsible for what I was seeing and it was a ridiculous notion (but common nevertheless) to expect someone else to ride in on a white horse and fix it (n.p).

Given the emergent nature of the thesis question, and my related emerging identity as a practice-led researcher, it was important to ‘make my thinking visible’ (Ritchhart & Perkins, 2008) and public as I worked through key conceptual thresholds. This was a deliberate strategy where I used opportunities such as a research blog and preparing for conference presentations and journal articles as my writing-as-thinking strategy (as encouraged by Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Hookway, 2008; Chenail, 2011) and by actively engaging with my scholarly networks. This approach was crucial in order to keep pace with the capricious phenomenon under review and was enacted through my central position as researcher-as-research-instrument as part of the interpretive inquiry methodology to be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

1.4. How the thesis is structured

This is an integrated thesis where the literature and argument are more closely bound than in more traditional forms of presentation (often referred to as the ‘science report’ where the literature stands alone in the second of five chapters). Indeed my thesis is not represented by the usual five-chapter thesis format for another reason. To do so would be in direct conflict with my commitment to address the criterion of integrity within the architecture of the thesis as part of my qualitative and interpretative research design. The integrity I am committed to is not just limited to a sense of congruence for the conceptual structure within the research methodology and design. Integrity of architecture is also inextricably linked to representation, given that my interpretivist disposition is at odds with the traditional science report layout underpinned by positivist epistemologies.
1.4.1 Chapter Outlines

Chapter 2: Research Design and Methodology discusses the cognitive frames that underpin the thesis as well as the means to enact and investigate the inquiry.

Chapter 3: Contexts for 21st Century Leadership includes discussion and synthesis of three separate, yet interrelated contexts generally of interest to leadership studies in the early part of the 21st century. These include mindsets that influence work and leadership as well as cognitive shifts toward more holistic leadership approaches that take responsibility for issues such as sustainability; language and power relations in knowledge-intensive enterprises; and the sensemaking frames of complexity and learning metabolism, as contexts and enablers of leadership in the 21st century.

Chapter 4: 21st Century Leadership Literacies takes the key premises distilled from Chapter 3 to focus on particular leadership literature that suits the contexts and conditions of the times. This chapter critically examines these contexts and explores particular leadership studies literature and its theoretical provenance to construct a working framework for this study. This Leadership Literacies Framework represents shifts identified in the literature as important for knowledge-intensive workplaces. They are the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies.

Chapter 5: Testing Times in Australian Higher Education Leadership introduces the research focus and site of inquiry for this thesis, that of professional staff working in Australian universities. This chapter it sets the scene for the site of the inquiry then tests the Leadership Literacies for signs of theorisation in two publications concerned with leadership in Australian universities. It is the first of the multi-method triangulation strategy.

Chapter 6: Leadership for professional staff in Australian universities tests for signs of experience and observation of the Leadership Literacies. It is second part of the multi-method triangulation strategy in which an empirical study of the accounts of lived experiences of work and leadership of 226 professional staff working in Australian universities is undertaken.

Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion includes the finding and discussion (these are underpinned by the three construction Chapters), claims for original contributions to knowledge; discussion about what was researched and how it was done; future research possibilities in light of limitations, discoveries and the finding of this inquiry; and concluding remarks.
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2.1 Introduction

An emergent research methodology and design for this thesis was necessary to match the social complexities of leadership for professional staff in universities within the fast moving, turbulent and complex times under investigation. This required me to not only make the plan for the research transparent but also to explicate the design process that underpins its emergent capacity. As Terzidis (2007 p. 11) argues the research design process is about “conceptualization, imagination, and interpretation [where] design is the vague, ambiguous, and indefinite process of genesis, emergence, or formation of something to be executed, but whose starting point, origin, or process often are uncertain” (p. 69). This chapter explains this research methodology and design. It contains the arguments for the philosophical grounding, theoretical framework, research methodology and research methods for the inquiry.

Research may be interpreted as a deliberate act of inquiry, what Brown & Dowling (1998) describe as “the continuous application of a particularly coherent and systematic and reflexive way of questioning, a mode of interrogation” (p. 8). In this thesis, an interpretive approach was adopted in order to match the fluidity of the phenomenon under investigation. The chapter signals the unifying argument that runs through the inquiry, namely that the phenomenon under investigation for leadership literacies for professional staff in universities, as well as the research design in pursuit of it, are constructions of what Law (2010) terms ‘social theories in practice’. These are “are shaped by the social world in which they are located and in turn help shape that social world” (p. 6). Grint’s (2005b) argument that “leadership involves the social construction of context [pointing to the] proactive role of leadership in the construction of context” (pp. 1470-1471) situates Law’s proposition within the leadership domain (Grint’s work will be returned to in Chapters 3 and 4). These standpoints foreground my active role as research instrument and my intention to enact a values-laden, subjective, declaratively interested methodology for this inquiry. This enables the inquiry to move past what Law & Urry (2004) warn as a “methodological inheritance of social science … reflecting 19th century preoccupations with fixing, demarcating and separating” (p. 403). It is also in keeping with Page’s (2000) contention that “qualitative research is no less a social construction than the cultures it studies, and the mediating influence of the researcher is therefore ineluctable” (p. 5).

The research question is first grounded in the philosophical foundation and theoretical frameworks that fit with an inquiry into leadership studies that acknowledges such phenomena remain essentially contested concepts (Cilliers 2002; Grint 2005a). This provides the warrant for me to explain the congruent methodology, methods and
analytical choices for the inquiry that I made. Together these elements constitute what I have termed the ‘method assemblage\(^8\) for the thesis, which in turn describes the necessary framing process for conceptualising and undertaking this research, as depicted in Figure 1. This emphasis is in keeping with Maxwell’s (2005) argument that this frame is:

…something that is *constructed*, not found. It incorporates pieces that are borrowed from elsewhere, but the structure, the overall coherence, is something that you build, not something that exists ready-made (p. 35).

The research question *What are leadership literacies for professional staff in universities?* was addressed by considering the following sub questions. These sub questions are represented as follows:

- Chapter 4: What are these emerging leadership literacies?
- Chapter 5: To what extent are these being *theorised* within Australian universities?
- Chapter 6: To what extent are these being *experienced* by professional staff working in Australian universities?

The next sections describe the interrelated components of the research design. There is, for explanatory purposes, a separation of philosophy, theory, methodology and methods, although there was always a flow from and between these elements that in turn sparked the emergence of the whole method assemblage (as depicted in *Figure 1*).

\(^8\) Method assemblage, coined by Law to “…develop a set of vocabularies for thinking about method, its operation, and its performativity … widen[ing] the notion of ‘method’ to include not only what is present in the form of texts and their production, but also their hinterlands and hidden supports” (Law 2004, p. 144).
2.2 Cognitive Frames for the Inquiry

The underpinning cognitive frames for this inquiry are an American Pragmatism philosophy, coupled with Critical Management Studies (CMS) theory underpinned by five Pragmatist Feminist guiding theoretical principles.

2.2.1 American Pragmatism

American Pragmatism provides the philosophical grounding for this thesis because it has the demonstrated capacity to locate, understand and work with uncertainties and events that are symbolic of our times. The American Pragmatist movement (founded by John Dewey, William James and Charles Sanders Peirce) first emerged in the latter part of the 19th century on the premise that it:

…does not insist upon antecedent phenomena but upon consequent phenomena; not upon the precedents but upon the possibilities of action … An empiricism which is content with repeating facts already past has no place for possibility and for liberty (Dewey, 1925 pp. 353-377).

This grounding provided a fresh philosophical perspective about the issues of their day, not the least of which was a growing disquiet with the hegemony of foundationalism and rationalism. However, at that time the movement had little success in dislodging these hegemonies, given that their tenets were incommensurate with a rising neoliberalism that was to globally dominate the 20th century. More recently, due a similar contemporary disquiet, the philosophy is enjoying resurgence, providing the opportunity to give voice to rising concerns about global economic conditions, the state
Chapter 2: Research Methodology and Design

of the environment and other conditions contributing to the complexities of the times. These conditions are described by Johansen (2009) as volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) and further encapsulated in Cox’s claim that we ‘live in a society, not an economy’ (2011 n.p.). American Pragmatism has been recognised by authors such as Jacobs (2004), Elkjaer & Simpson (2011) and Tsoukas & Chia (2011), as an appropriate lens for contemporary leadership studies given its amenability to working with uncertainty and complexity and its interest in social context, lived experience, reflective practice and the intersection of theory and practice. Klenke (2008) summarises this in her claim that it is also cogent, if underutilised, foundation for qualitative research in the study of leadership because it:

...presents a very practical and applied research philosophy that is orientated towards action...and acknowledges that researchers’ worldviews involve ethical and moral issues ... [and that they] go beyond the established trilogy of ontology, epistemology, and methodology and include axiology as a cornerstone in their paradigm (p. 27).

Accordingly, I chose the philosophy of American Pragmatism to ground this thesis for two significant reasons. First, it enabled me to open the investigation to proximal accounts of contemporary leadership in times of flux and uncertainty. Second, it works with the theoretical framework and methodology of Critical Management Studies that incorporate values laden and intersubjective standpoints to position reflexivity as methodology. In so doing I argue that an understanding of reflexivity referred to by Dewey as “active, persistent, and careful consideration” (1910 p. 3) provides a necessary link between the philosophical, theoretical and methodological frames for the thesis, ensuring congruence between all the elements of the method assemblage.

2.2.2 Critical Management Studies (CMS)

In acknowledging that critical theories have a long history and engagement in many disciplines, Critical Management Studies (CMS) was selected because of its roots in management research. Founded on what Burrell & Morgan (1979) define as a radical humanism⁹ (pp. 32-33), CMS connects to the humanist and relational sensibilities within contemporary leadership studies that form the nub of this inquiry. It is an example of what Kelemen & Rumens (2008) describe as “theoretical perspectives that have emerged in the wake of the post-modern turn within the social sciences" (p. x). Adler et al (2007) position CMS as a theory that connects with “older, humanistic critiques of bureaucracy and corporate capitalism ... [concerned that] the market is the dominant mechanism for allocating resources [and] our societies, community and government...are forced into a subordinate role” (pp. 150-151). While these humanistic

---

⁹ A Radical Humanist Paradigm, as defined by Burrell & Morgan (1979) aims to develop a “sociology of radical change from a subjective standpoint ... interpretive paradigm. [This approach] is committed to a view of society which emphasises the importance of overthrowing or transcending the limitations of existing social arrangements (p. 32).

….a community of management scholars who share a common critical sensibility...a ‘big tent’ that accommodates diverse forms of analysis—from the outrageously radical to the almost orthodox—in ways that enable both diverse internal debates and common external engagements (p. 184).

Given the need to challenge the ‘idea’ of leadership for contemporary times, CMS provides the warrant for this inquiry to look below the surface; to pay attention to language, hegemony and power relations; and, to interrogate oppressive and energy depleting practices. These assertions drive the method assemblage as well as the search for, and testing of, leadership literacies for professional staff in universities.

CMS, like most cognitive frames, can be observed through many lenses. Kelemen & Rumens (2008) identifying five of these—American Pragmatism, Postmodernism, Deconstruction, Poststructuralist Feminism, and Queer Theory (pp. 37-120). Adler et al (2007) confirm an interest in the two lenses I seek to combine—Feminism and American Pragmatism—as does Klenke (2008) who argues that “Pragmatism and Feminism are emergent, if underutilised, qualitative approaches for leadership scholarship” (p 27).

For the purpose of this thesis, these CMS lenses are combined to form a Pragmatist Feminist lens from which five guiding principles of the inquiry are distilled. While this combination is rare in management literature, a wider search identifies that philosopher Charlene Haddock Seigfried (1990, 1996) made this connection as have others such as Duran (1993); Morton and Lindquist (1997); and Whipps (2010). This has rarely been done due to the a dual separation, as Seigfried (1996) explains, in that “women’s theoretical contributions were not acknowledged by pragmatists, and by the time feminism was reborn yet again in the 1960s few women philosophy students had much acquaintance with pragmatism” (p. 30). Although separated by this historical distance their cogent affinities combine as a solid foundation for the guiding theoretical principles for this thesis. I have chosen this combination as it enables me to evoke the pluralist sensibility that characterises it to, as Adler et al (2007) note, “weave together different strands of theory to address the challenges of contemporary forms of capitalism and patriarchy” (p. 145). Indeed Whipps (2010) suggests that it is these
affinities that have seen contemporary feminists largely responsible for the resurgence of American Pragmatism in the 21st century, as:

...the commitment to working at the intersection of theory and practice; as understanding philosophising as an active process (both as a way to change social realities and to use experience to modify the philosophies themselves); that experience is foundational to emphasise the social context of all epistemological claims; and that pluralism is a central value that connects the work of pragmatists and feminists (p. 1).

More importantly, Pragmatist Feminism draws upon a rich historical legacy of interrogating longstanding patterns of thought. This legacy is particularly useful when addressing contemporary leadership concerns. Indeed, Addams’s (1907) experiences are a salient reminder that in changing times “old-fashioned ways which no longer apply to changed conditions are a snare in which the feet of women have always become readily entangled” (p. 186). Adoption of this lens also makes space for the work of Mary Parker Follett, seminal management and leadership theorist, who, like Addams, adopted Pragmatist and Feminist principles (Morton & Lindquist, 1997) at the turn of the 20th century, and whose thinking has been instrumental in my own sensemaking for this emergent and interpretive inquiry.

This Pragmatist Feminist lens provided a suitably loose but logical guiding framework to build my emergent theory of leadership literacies. This enabled me to achieve what Silverman (2000) argues as important, that “without theory, research is impossibly narrow ... [and] without research, theory is a mere armchair contemplation” (p. 86) . This particular CMS Pragmatist Feminist lens provides the internal logic for this inquiry, which are distilled as five theoretical guiding principles. These enabled me to draw together what otherwise might present as separate, incongruous or disconnected elements and ideas. These five guiding principles—a reality that is in the making; social models of knowledge, pluralist methodology; emancipatory ethics; and, embodied rationality—borrow from Kelemen & Rumens (2008, pp. 41-43) pragmatist lens, but they are equally valued by Feminist approaches and thus strengthen the theoretical cognitive frame used in this thesis.

**Pragmatist Feminist Guiding Principles**

These guiding theoretical principles are enacted in the methodology and ground the inquiry in order that the Leadership Literacies may be theorised and named. They are also the means to address the research question “What are leadership literacies for professional staff in universities?” This combination, although rare in leadership studies, accords with Klenke’s (2008) view, that in the study of leadership:

...pragmatism or more politically engaged ways of knowing such as feminism have appeared on the qualitative landscape that take into consideration the changing context of research as organizations, the workforce, and society are moving into different directions (p. 48) .
The first guiding principle, *a reality that is in the making*, builds on Dewey’s (1927) understanding that a pragmatist lens identifies "a universe which is not all closed and settled, which is still in some respects indeterminate and in the making ... an open universe in which uncertainty, choice, hypotheses, novelties and possibilities are naturalised" (p. 52). This guiding principle is also woven throughout this thesis in the deliberate search for alternatives to rationalist frames and their seeming fixation with certitude. Less privileged but nevertheless cogent frames, such as complexity theories, resonate with this guiding principle. These seek to trouble our seeming dependence on certitude and rationality to make room for alternative frames to be considered. In this sense, these frames are as much about how we think not just about what we think. American Pragmatism (Menand, 1997 pp. xxv-xxvi), Fletcher’s post-heroic leadership theory (Fletcher, 2002, 2004), as well as social complexity theories, are already recognised for taking this approach within leadership studies. Fletcher (2002) argues that being a post-heroic leader requires “a set of beliefs and principles, indeed a different mental model of how to exercise power and how to achieve workplace success” (p. 4). Cilliers (2005) argues that “complexity theory does not provide us with exact tools to solve our complex problems, but shows us (in a rigorous way) exactly why these problems are so difficult” (p. 257). Kuhn (2007) makes direct connections between Pragmatism and complexity theories, seeing the affordances of complexity “as not so much better describing ‘reality’ but as a useful vocabulary for helping people to better explain and understand social phenomena, a more pragmatist perspective is taken, in the tradition of Dewey and Rorty” (p. 163). These ways of understanding the world closely align with the critical sensibility for this inquiry, that situate truth claims within relativist and pragmatist understandings seeking accounts of ‘a’ truth to share, rather than expecting the one and only ‘absolute truth’ to emerge. Eisner (1981) connects this to an epistemology that rejects truth claims in favour of meaning that is:

... less concerned with the discovery of truth than with the creation of meaning ... [so people might] find meaning from which their fallible and tentative views of the world can be altered, rejected, or made more secure (p. 9).

This principle is an appropriate grounding for this research in an era where knowledge is the means of production and turbulence, complexity and uncertainty mark the terrain. Such conditions have an affinity with modes of thinking that Cooper and Law (1993) suggest are able to deal “in the continuous and ‘unfinished’; it’s what is forever approached but never attained, always approximated but never fully realized” (p. 239).

The second guiding principle is *a social model of knowledge*. This enables the inquirer to be firmly situated within the inquiry where “there is no outside, no Archimedean point from which a positionless account can be written” (Smith, 1999 p.
8). Seigfried (1996) drawing from Dewey’s argument that “in fighting the entrenched belief that it is derogatory to link a body of philosophic ideas to the social life and culture of their epoch, pragmatism is a helpful ally of feminist criticism” (p. 39). Pragmatist Feminists enact knowledge as a model of social expression and see this as the hallmark of social inquiry. It is enacted in research by how an inquiry is shared and disseminated and how attention is paid to inquiry. Festenstein (2001) understands this to be “communal in the sense that its findings must be subject to scrutiny and testing by other inquirers” (p. 733).

This principle is enacted in this thesis through the positioning of the researcher-as-research-instrument as a means to carry out the inquiry from the position of having a visible presence in the field. This was achieved by presenting, publishing and seeking feedback during the conduct of this inquiry.

The third, a pluralist methodology, links this principle with my actions in this inquiry, which is a commitment to adopt an account of the research endeavour rather than positing the outcome to be the one and only possible truth. Kelemen & Rumens (2008) describe this pragmatic and relativist standpoint as one that “looks for fuzzy things, multiple realities, paradox and ambiguity” (p. 43) in research endeavours which fits with the fluidity of the social phenomenon in times of flux that are under investigation. One of the main benefits that spring from the re-emergence of American Pragmatism is, as already stated, that in essence Pragmatism is about ‘how we think not what we think’ (Menand, 1997 pp. xxv-xxvi). What often sparks research inquiry is a deep ontological disconnect, beginning with what Smith (1999) contends as “a sense of problem, of something going on, some disquiet, and of something there that could be explicated” (p. 9). This disconnect emerges for practice-led researchers when our own practice, guided by our ways of understanding and being in the world, collides with ontology incommensurate with our own. In contemporary times, these collisions are often with the hegemonies of neoliberal technical activities, managerialism and performativity. It is this intersection, and the often powerful sense of disquiet resulting from these collisions, which provide fertile ground for contemporary leadership scholarship. Holler (1990), connects the notion of pluralist methodologies with feminist theory in her critique of the axiology of science arising from notions from the 17th century which, she argues, was a period mythologized by scientism. She uses feminist theory to explicate the taken for granted assumptions of scientism that tell “the one true story about the world by equating its own models and methods with absolute, literal and ‘transcendent’
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11 Outcomes of these are recorded in my research blog at [http://leadershipliteracies.wordpress.com/papers](http://leadershipliteracies.wordpress.com/papers).
truth” (p. 3). Holler goes on to challenge these assumptions by arguing that the claim “of value-neutrality of science is seen to act as a mask for a particular set of values” (p. 5).

Such discussions about axiology are necessary for CMS inquiries grounded in Pragmatist Feminism, indeed they are expected. This is because values claims, particularly claims of values neutrality, often mask underlying political dimensions, power relations and hegemony. Therefore locating and making these political dimensions visible is in the service of the emancipatory aims at the centre of all critical theories. They are certainly taken up in this inquiry by its focus, its methodology, and in influencing the means to address the research question. This is illuminated by the choice of an ‘account’ as the product of this inquiry, which seeks to make an original contribution to knowledge by adding to others, rather than positioning the results as the only possible version of the truth.

**Emancipatory ethics** is the fourth guiding principle because it is at the heart of all critical theory. Calls “towards generating knowledge that makes a positive difference and contributes to better practice” (Spicer et al., 2009 p. 555) are central to this theoretical framework. Kelemen and Rumens (2008) restate a pragmatist ethic (which also closely aligns with feminist ethics) as one that “counsels tolerance for ambiguity and calls for personal responsibility on the part of the researchers” (p. 43). Seigfried (1996) points to an affinity between Pragmatist and Feminist emancipatory ethics and makes the point that pragmatism was:

…criticized and eventually relegated to the margins for holding the very positions that feminists today would find to be its greatest strengths. These include early and persistent criticisms of positivist interpretations of scientific methodology; disclosure of the value dimension of factual claims; … linking of dominant discourses with domination; [and] subordinating logical analysis to social; cultural and political issues (p. 21).

While some critical theorists (particularly from a time in the 20th century when neo-Marxism heavily influenced this field) do not accept the anti-foundational and practice-orientated dimensions of pragmatism that accord with critical theory. Nevertheless others identify connections between Dewey’s work and critical theory. In an essay intent on reconstructing Dewey’s philosophy of critical pragmatism, Kadlec (2006) locates Dewey’s “democratic commitments to the transformatory potential of lived experience, to a reconstructed conception of individualism, and to the cultivation of reflective social intelligence…as the basis of critical theory worthy of greater attention” (p. 519). Furthermore, Festenstein (2001), in articulating Dewey’s (1938) emancipatory aims, raises the point that for Dewey, “social inquiry is practical, and indeed political in its focus [and that] the point of social inquiry is not merely to interpret the world, but to change it” (p. 737).
Chapter 2: Research Methodology and Design

The intent for an emancipatory ethic is present in this inquiry and indeed any social inquiry which aims to be responsive to what Dewey (1938) referred to as the "actual social situations" (p. 492).

Lastly, *embodied rationality* critiques artificial separations that are favoured by positivist and scientist versions of rationalism. In particular, this critique is focussed on the notion that legitimate researchers are disinterested and divorced from emotions, the body and the everyday conditions. Both Pragmatism and Feminism stand in epistemological opposition to this version of science and understand that rationality, as Kelemen & Rumens (2008) argue “must be embodied if it is to be able to cope effectively with the perennial indeterminacy and contingency with which humans have to struggle in their everyday existence” (p. 43). Smith (1999) argues feminist scholars enact a step before what is usually made explicit in modes of social scientific inquiry. In this regard the body is not made silent within such methods of inquiry, nor is it written out of the inquiry process as happened after “the Cartesian shift that forgets the body” (p. 4). Smith reasons that this articulation “locates the knower in her body, in a lived world in which both theory and practice go on, in which theory is itself a practice” (p. 7). Interestingly, Seigfried (1996) argues that American Pragmatism demonstrates feminine ontology, where “on a scale of traits, assumptions and positions that range from stereotypically masculine to stereotypically feminism, pragmatism…appears far more feminine than masculine” (p. 32). These include the ‘goal of philosophical discourse (that is, the shared understanding and communal problem solving rather than rationally forced conclusions) and the assumption that human knowledge always instantiates particular perspectives (including values, which ran counter to the rising tide of positivist ideology espousing the neutrality of science and the objectivity of pure observation)’ [drawn from pp. 31-32].

The guiding principle of embodied rationality promotes a more expansive and holistic view of research. It also provides alternatives for what science might offer in the 21st century when otherwise unshackled from the dominant view of a science that has been “mythologized by scientism” (Seigfried, 1996 p. 3). In this inquiry, I similarly seek alternative possibilities of what leadership might offer if unshackled from the dominance of scientific management, where similar myths perpetuate and result in leadership that, as Sinclair (2007c) argues, “has been constructed as a disembodied activity” (p. 111). Furthermore, this expansive, holistic and embodied rationality that seeks interrelatedness of mind, body and spirit; the subject to their lifeworlds; and the reflexive insights of the researcher-as-research-instrument, drives both the conduct of this inquiry and the search for literature that identifies leadership concerns for the 21st century.
In summary, CMS through this Pragmatist Feminist lens provides a supportive scaffold for the inquiry and the means to interrogate critical perspectives within an investigation of a phenomenon in real time and in a state of flux. In particular, this framework is the knot that ties the method assemblage and the research question together. It also articulates, what Holler (1990) describes, as a way of ‘thinking with the weight of the earth’ (p. 1), which is a welcome and broader warrant for how and what may be included as management research. This lens applies to both the methodology, to be discussed next, and the selection of the kinds of literatures in order to interrogate to develop the Leadership Literacies. This Pragmatist Feminist lens is particularly germane to this research given that the work of professional staff in universities is a highly gendered space (as evident in Chapter 6).

2.3 Means to Enact the inquiry

The methodology to enact this inquiry is interpretive as this works seamlessly with the cognitive frames that ground the inquiry due to their congruence with what Alvesson & Deetz (2000) argue is “a general intimacy in relation to the plan under study and depth of understanding at the expense of abstraction, generalizability and artificial separation of theory and data” (p. 60).

2.3.1 Interpretive Act of Inquiry

The interpretive inquiry methodology chosen for this thesis rests on a qualitative logic of justification. Qualitative management research can be conceptualised as a way of doing research (i.e. method) as well as driving the research inquiry, as logic of justification (i.e. methodology). It is my contention, supported by others such as Cassell et al (2006) and Klenke (2008), that positioning qualitative logic as a logic of justification is however, underrepresented in the discipline of management. Cassell et al (2006) contend that qualitative inquiry, as method or methodology, also runs the risk of being evaluated “using criteria from a different epistemological perspective” (p. 292).

A seminal policy paper by Tranfield and Starkey (1998) assisted my location of qualitative inquiry within the discipline of management. In seeking to encourage a common language for policy development and the positioning of management research they explored the field in terms of cognitive and social organisation dimensions which
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12 Holler (1990) sees this as an embodied rationality that defines the process of knowing as dialogue with particulars or the “things themselves...and to ground cognizance in the world by breaking the habit of looking at the world, as if from a distance, and by ceasing to think about the world as if it were composed of a collection of objects-in-general (p. 1)
were evident in the discipline of management, using Becher’s taxonomy\textsuperscript{13} and the work of Biglan\textsuperscript{14} to guide their understanding of the markers of academic tribes. By considering the discipline of management within these dimensions they concluded that, “management research can be viewed as a soft, applied, divergent and rural field of study” (p. 347). Drawing their conclusion together with understandings of qualitative management research (based on Cassell et al, 2006; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008; Bryman & Bell, 2011) qualitative management research is similarly “soft, applied, divergent and rural field of study” (p. 357). Cassell et al (2006) report that qualitative methods have a long history and tradition within business and management research (p. 290), yet:

...there is no general consensus about the nature of qualitative management research...and the way that individuals define qualitative research is important in that it influences their perceptions about who does it; what is should look like and, ultimately, how it is judged (p. 299).

To secure the depth of argument to support my decision to use interpretive inquiry I drew on other disciplines, notably the ‘helping’ professions of education and nursing. This is not unusual in management research, as noted by Tranfield & Starkey (1998), because it “is a heterogeneous and fragmented field utilizing knowledge and research methods often drawn from associated disciplines in the social sciences” (p. 345). In a similarly practice-led research discipline of education I found that qualitative inquiry as logic of justification has a long and well documented history and extensive corroborating support for this deeper ontological connection (see for example, Piantanida & Garman, 1999; Brizuela et al, 2000; Metz, 2000; Meloy, 2002; Janesick, 2003; Kamler & Thomson, 2006). Indeed, qualitative inquiry as an overarching methodology for the study of leadership in the discipline of management for many of the same reasons as explained succinctly by Metz (2000):

One cannot usefully discuss qualitative research without attending to the methodologies that underlie its methods...Qualitative methodologies in education—and they are plural—carry assumptions or propositions about the nature of knowledge, the self, social interaction, culture and society. Research is a multifaceted dialogue among meta-theories about existence and knowledge, substantive theory, and information about the empirical world. Understandings of methodology grow in tandem with empirical investigation and the development of social theory (p. 37).

It is within this methodological space that I situate qualitative inquiry as the logic of justification for this inquiry, and in its enactment aim to make significant contribution to the field.


Enacting an interpretive inquiry methodology combines an interpretive epistemology with a qualitative inquiry logic of justification. The reflexive capacities made available by this approach are foundational for this inquiry into the social phenomena of leadership in real time, by capturing accounts of the lived experiences of professional staff in universities. In this situation there is no historical distance or perspective available to otherwise guide this inquiry, although there are several traditions that are able to accommodate an interpretive qualitative standpoint which also promote emergent approaches to theory. These include the traditions of Hermeneutics (Heidegger, 1962; Gadamer, 1990; Rorty, 1991; Hellan & Schulkin, 1998), Phenomenology (Husserl, 1970; Spiegelberg, 1975; Finlay, 2008, 2009; van der Schyff, 2010), Heuristic Inquiry (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985), Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Parry et al, 1996; Piantanida et al, 2002; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and ethnographic approaches such as Institutional Ethnography (Smith, 2006). My approach to enact such a methodology is to make visible the standpoint of researcher-as-research-instrument, as guided by van Manen’s Action Sensitive Pedagogy principles (1997).

Piantanida & Garman (1999) argue that qualitative inquiry is both a method and a logic of justification for research. Drawing on this argument, the researcher-as-research-instrument is made visible. This centrally positions the researcher in the inquiry, through reflexive practice and interpretation, to provide the means to enact the inquiry. This standpoint is curatorial in nature, in that everything concerned with this inquiry goes through me. Given that the root meaning of curator springs from ‘one who cares’ (Funk & Wagnall, 1984 p. 156), it therefore captures and makes visible the responsibilities of this standpoint for the intersubjectivities that are implied and for taking due care in their enactment.

In making this standpoint explicit, I am moving deeper into qualitative epistemology and ontological perspectives than might otherwise be traversed within the scientific management paradigm, perhaps even within qualitative management research. However, this standpoint is well supported in the literature, adopted by researchers such as Guba & Lincoln (1994); Tesch (1990 p. 70); Shindler & Case (1996); Piantanida & Garman (1999); Meloy (2002 p. 61); Merriam (2002); Patton (2002); and, Janesick (2003 p. 47). A key reason for making it visible is that, as Piantanida & Garman (1999) argue:

…the researcher is as much a part of the inquiry as the intent of the study and the inquiry process. In fact, the researcher’s thinking lies at the heart of the inquiry…that is, [the] students’ own professional experiences, personal intellectual concerns, and assumptions about knowledge (p. 24).

This means of enacting the methodology connects hermeneutic traditions and rests on the premise, as noted by Hellan & Schulkin (1998), that “pragmatism and hermeneutic
philosophy both treat science (or in general, all scholarship) as a form of human culture which approaches the world in the spirit of active inquiry in which background, theory, and praxis work together in orderly succession” (p. 291). Furthermore, Shalin (2007) draws attention to hermeneutics as influenced by Pragmatism as drawing upon embodied rationality “by making the link between the use of body and emotion as a hermeneutical resource” (p. 194).

This standpoint accords with the aspirations I have for this inquiry, which have sprung from over a decade’s experience in the management and provision of research training. This has included working with mostly qualitative methodology and methods, for a PhD program in the discipline of education. That qualitative inquiry is considered methodology first and method second, is not so much a choice as a declaration of how I see the world and my part in it. As well as forming part of my identity, it is congruent with the theoretical guiding principles of Pragmatist Feminism. In addition, such statements are expected in a thesis drawing upon CMS theory. Indeed, Kelemen & Rumens (2008) connect them with a CMS ethic that “counsels tolerance for ambiguity and calls for personal responsibility on the part of the researchers” (p. 43). They also connect with the values laden axiology that underpins all qualitative inquiry, where the researcher is declaratively interested and also centrally located in the methodology which drives the interpretive endeavour.

When justifying research instruments for any inquiry it is necessary to articulate how they were prepared for use. I was mindful that, as a research instrument myself, it was my ‘interior’ work that needed to be strengthened and made more visible because this is what grounds the interpretations in this inquiry. It is necessary, because, as Garman (2007) argues “unlike researchers who claim specific relations of cause and effect or statistical correlations through analysis of data, interpretive researchers persuade by reason” (p. 7). My role as researcher-as-research-instrument was developed through the inherent reflexivity necessary in any interpretive inquiry and strengthened by action learning principles that had me seek a deliberate and active engagement with the scholarly community throughout the inquiry. In particular this reflexive standpoint was apparent in the selection of the five Leadership Literacies and their underpinning theoretical frameworks in Chapter 4 and the qualitative analysis of the empirical data in Chapters 5 and 6. I was guided in this endeavour by the principles of van Manen’s (1997) action sensitive pedagogy. Whilst van Manen’s theory is underpinned by the traditions of Hermeneutic Phenomenology, his work was chosen because it accords with lived experience, practice and reflection, which also closely align with the cognitive frames grounding this inquiry. It provided the means to make visible the action oriented interpretive methodology for this inquiry, and focus on:
1. turning to a phenomenon of interest to formulate our research questions;
2. investigating the experience as it is lived to guide data collection process;
3. reflecting on essential themes that characterise the phenomenon;
4. describing the phenomenon through writing and rewriting to pilot data analysis;
5. maintaining a strong orientated stance toward the question(s); and,
6. balancing the research context by considering parts and whole to help ensure research validity (van Manen, 1997 pp. 30-31).

Indeed, my engagement with the literature and arguments drawn from the literature throughout the inquiry were developed from this researcher-as-research instrument stance and by the ‘thinking as writing’ processes evident in preparing conference papers about my developing insights. This engagement was enacted through the use of social media, by taking opportunities to present, publish and network at conferences and to continually seek feedback and share with my communities of practice. This engagement was also central to the formulation of the Leadership Literacies drawn from the engagement with both the literature and scholarly networks during this inquiry.

Reflexivity and professional practice are strongly linked in many ‘helping’ professions, in particular the disciplines of education (Mockler & Sachs, 2011) and nursing (Lamb & Huttlinger, 1989). These disciplines, coincidently, have a long tradition in using qualitative inquiry as logic of justification. Cunliffe (2011) recommends the adoption of reflexivity for management research. Her notion of ‘radical reflexivity’ resonates with my approach for this thesis:

Radically reflexive researchers see themselves as part of the process of constructing meaning and creating research accounts...The radically reflexive researcher is, therefore, a mediator of meanings throughout the whole process of research—actively and spontaneously engaged in the process of imagining and trying to come to some sort of shared momentary understanding of participant ‘realities’. The researcher is also positioned within the research: culturally grounded with embedded views and presuppositions (p. 415).

Action learning is “part of a wider family of action based approaches to research and learning distinguished by the primacy it gives to those actually facing the problems in question” (Pedler, 2008 p. 15). Action Learning is widely discussed in management literature and practice-led research practice (see for example, Argyris & Schön, 1978; Pedler, 1997; Beckett & Hager, 2002; Darling et al, 2005; Pedler et al, 2005; Raelin, 2009).

These means to enact the inquiry are solid grounding for this research in an era where knowledge is the means of production in knowledge-intensive enterprises like universities and turbulence, complexity and uncertainty mark the terrain. Such
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15 For a list of these activities and publications please refer to http://leadershipliteracies.wordpress.com/papers/
accounts deal “in the continuous and ‘unfinished’; it’s what is forever approached but never attained, always approximated but never fully realized” (Cooper & Law, 1993 p. 239). In the ‘means to investigate the inquiry’ section to follow, two research methods, as well as its data analysis model (Framework Analysis) that accord with these principles are addressed.

2.4 Means to investigate the inquiry

In a keynote presentation at the 2010 Social Life as Method conference Law (2010) proposed that we think of methods as “having a double social life, in that methods are social because they are shaped by the social world in which they are located; and they are also social because they in turn help shape that social world” (p. 1). I have likewise positioned research methods as social theories in practice that are likely to match the requisite social complexities inherent in leadership research.

In searching for the best methods to address the research question, I followed a line of inquiry taken by scholars who have penetrated the rhetoric of methodologies and methods to elicit trends in the history, philosophy and mindsets underpinning the use of methods in contemporary research. Knox (2004), for example, highlights the perils of a surface view of methods where the “the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is inadvertently linked with philosophical perspectives…leading researchers to believe that research is neatly divided into mutually exclusive categories and never the twain shall meet” (p. 119). Law (2004) suggests that “the problem is not so much lack of variety in the practice of method, as the hegemonic and dominatory pretensions of certain versions or accounts of method” (p. 4). This can lead to methodolatry, which Janesick (1994) defines as “a combination of method and idolatry to describe a preoccupation with selecting and defending methods to the exclusion of the actual substance of the story being told” (p. 215).

In arguing that it is the level of analysis that determines the methodological framework, and not the methods themselves, it follows that methods are not paradigmatically bound. This standpoint is supported in the literature, where Jansen (2010) contends that “the qualitative-versus-quantitative nature of data is established in the analysis. It is not inherent ontology but analysis which determines whether a study is qualitative or quantitative” (para 11). Likewise, Midgley (2000) argues that:

... we can detach methods from their original methodological principles in order to use them in new ways...we just have to acknowledge that we are setting up a new position which encourages learning about ideas from other paradigms, but reinterpreted in our own terms (p. 248).

The methods to be discussed were selected after much thought and reflection on their congruence with the research question. The risk of emergent methodologies is that they can only be confirmed by the act of ‘doing’ the research and following the
arguments ‘where they lead’ (Kelly, 2011). With the cognitive frames of this inquiry to guide me, I was prepared to carry this risk, and ‘nudge’ methodological boundaries in pursuit of new knowledge and two of the theoretical guiding principles underpin this approach. Such a commitment to follow arguments where they lead enacts the critical sensibility of ‘a reality that is in the making’ and the commitment to seek an account of a truth, not the only possible truth. This approach also addresses the ‘social model of knowledge’ sought by Pragmatist Feminism, due to an understanding that social models of knowledge situate the inquirer firmly within the inquiry. Whilst acknowledging the occupied territory of methodological discourse, my intention was to move past such distractions in search of research methods for my particular research question. This meant going beyond where Crotty (1998) argues that “most texts … qualitative research methods and quantitative research methods are set against each other as polar opposites” (p. 19).

The research methods for this inquiry are positioned within a multi-method frame where data collection and analysis sit within one particular research methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003 11; Spratt et al, 2004 p. 6). The methodology has been described throughout the thesis as an interpretive inquiry grounded in the particular cognitive frames already discussed. To be clear, my research methods sit within a multi-method frame, they are not mixed methods. This distinction is important because one of the methods developed is a qualitative survey, and surveys are generally underpinned by positivist epistemology and normally analysed quantitatively. This is not the case in this thesis. There is also considerable slippage in the literature where the terms mixed methods and multi-methods are sometimes used interchangeably. The distinction I make in this thesis is that mixed methods are enacted at the methods level and have their own distinct methodological movement to include methods and analysis drawn from both positivist and interpretive paradigms resulting in both qualitative and quantitative analyses of the data (see for example, Cameron & Miller, 2007). The choice for multi-methods is made at the methodological level where more than one method for data collection and/or analysis is selected to be used with one particular methodology. In this thesis, all methods sit within the interpretive paradigm and all are qualitatively analysed.

The methods, and the data analysis framework to be discussed next, accord with the ethos of the qualitative interpretive inquiry design, as they fit within its multi-method frame. This approach forms part of a “between-methods” triangulation strategy (Denzin, 1977 p. 302) so that “the use of appropriate multiple methods will result in more valid research findings” (Webb et al, 1966). Chapter 4 posits a Leadership Literacy Framework after the Leadership Literacies are theorised and developed for later exploration. Two methods in subsequent chapters form the ‘between-methods’
triangulation strategy test for signs of either *theorisation* or *experience* of these Leadership Literacies in Australian universities. The first method, a thematic analysis, reviews extant data published on Australian higher education leadership between 2008 and 2011 to test for signs of *theorisation*. The second method is a qualitative survey of professional staff in Australian universities, and this tests for signs whether these Leadership Literacies have been *experienced*. Such notions of qualitative triangulation are well documented (see for example Jick, 1979; Brinberg & McGrath, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mathison, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell & Miller, 2000) and summed up well by Creswell and Miller (2000):

As a validity procedure, triangulation is a step taken by researchers employing only the researcher’s lens ... [and is] ... a popular practice for qualitative inquirers to provide corroborating evidence collected through multiple methods, such as observations, interviews and documents to locate major and minor themes (p. 127).

The two methods will now be discussed in the order that they appear in the thesis and then the rationale for the data analysis method concludes this chapter. Both methods gathered data for the inquiry within the period 2008-2011. This period applies a fixed frame for the capture of accounts from professional staff and their context, the Australian higher education sector, in times of significant flux. Time is the only fixed element within this emergent research design and was chosen, as an interpretive inquiry, to coincide with my full time scholarship period  

2.4.1 Extant Data

This method was chosen to address the sub question investigating whether or not the Leadership Literacies had been *theorised* in Australian universities. It was expected that a formal analysis of extant data, namely reports and reviews related to leadership and higher education in Australia published between 2008-2011 would occur. Due to a lack of published material that met these criteria it was not possible to compare different sources in order to explore this question at the analytic level I had planned. Had there been four or five reports published from different sources that met these criteria, a meta-ethnographic synthesis (Noblit & Hare, 1983, 1988), also known as a qualitative meta-synthesis (Sandelowski et al, 1997; Thorne et al, 2004; Zimmer, 2006) would have been undertaken. As will be discussed further in Chapter 5, research into leadership in Higher Education in other countries, particularly in the United Kingdom, is occurring despite this not being a major focus in Australia. The dearth of extant data sources meant that the analysis for this component of the investigation remained at the descriptive level using two major reports to test for signs of theoretical engagement with the Leadership Literacies (Thomson, 2011).

16 In the end it took a further 12 months to complete this inquiry but the data gathered remained within the 2008-2011 period.
Indeed the lack of emphasis on policy engagement for leadership in Australian higher education, as will be discussed in Chapter 5, became apparent and made visible due to the emergent research design of this inquiry. In using CMS as the theoretical framework for this inquiry it was possible to look at this situation in more depth and to acknowledge such silences. From these unexpected outcomes sprang deep reflection and inevitably even more questions. My plan to conduct what I regarded as a robust analysis was now doubtful due to the lack of comparative texts from different sources in order to conduct the sort of analysis I had envisaged. The more troubling question that emerged was, why was there such a lack of sources investigating, in part or whole, leadership in the Australian higher education sector over the specified time frame?

Despite this general lack of emphasis in the major reviews of this period there was one source from which research reports meeting the criteria for inclusion were located. This was the Australian Learning & Teaching Council’s (ALTC) *Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program* through which 61 research projects were funded between 2005-2010 to investigate learning and teaching related leadership in higher education in Australia (ALTC, 2011). This research was funded “to strengthen leadership and build the capacity to lead change for the future enhancement of learning and teaching in Australian higher education” (p. ii).

Thus, what was originally envisaged as a robust analysis of extant data became a discussion chapter in this thesis and an opportunity to explore these silences in the context of this inquiry. This occurs in Chapter 5 in which the Australian higher education sector and its professional staff are introduced in more detail. The chapter addresses the sub question concerning *theorisation* of the Leadership Literacies. It does so by looking more broadly at the sector to discern whether the Leadership Literacies had been theorised in research reports concerning universities. The chapter relies particularly upon one major governmental review of the sector Bradley et al (2008) and a government funded leadership capacity building program (Australian Learning and Teaching Council). In this way, Chapter 5 represents one of the ‘between-methods’ for the qualitative triangulation strategy outlined in the methodological discussion. It also serves as a bridge between the broader literatures investigated in Chapters 3 and 4 and the application of the leadership literacies identified from this literature to professional staff working in universities. This occurs in Chapter 6 with an analysis of data drawn from professional staff working in universities about their experiences of work and leadership and their congruence with the Leadership Literacies.
2.4.2 Qualitative Survey

Of the broad options for collecting qualitative data, systematic elicitation was selected over mixed, direct and indirect observation techniques (Bernard & Ryan, 2010 p. 18). This was to address the sub question investigating whether or not there were signs that the Leadership Literacies had been experienced in Australian universities. Using Ryan & Bernard (2000) to guide my understanding, this technique was chosen because it fits with the methodological intent of this inquiry which is “to elicit meaning from data…[and] to identify lists [themes] that belong in a cultural domain and to assess the relationships among these items” (p. 770). This elicitation draws upon sociological traditions that “treats text as a window into human experiences” (p. 769). This method activates the methodological aims to “cast light on a focused problem, question, or theme … [through] the search for the discovery of meaning and essence in significant human experience” (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985 p. 40) and thus links directly to this inquiry’s guiding principles, where Pragmatist Feminist research is expected to elicit such experiences and their meaning. Eisner (1981) connects this to an epistemology that rejects truth claims in favour of meaning. He sees these as differences between scientific (positivist) and artistic (interpretivist) theoretical and methodological approaches (rather than the usual quantitative-qualitative divide), to be:

... less concerned with the discovery of truth than with the creation of meaning ... [so people might] find meaning from which their fallible and tentative views of the world can be altered, rejected, or made more secure (p. 9).

In this thesis, the notion of the qualitative survey has been re-imagined as a research method, rather than a mere definition of a set of specific and ordered questions, by taking the notion more literally. This method was specifically developed for this sub question by reimagining it as a method that might qualitatively analyse data gathered in an online survey. My intention was similar to Fink’s (2003) to “collect information on the meanings that people attach to their experiences ... not aim for ... generalizable results, [or] provide information on the ‘typical’ or ‘average’ individual” (pp. 61, 68). I also followed the precedent of using a method more likely to be associated with quantitative instruments underpinned by positivist epistemology, in the service of a qualitative method underpinned by interpretivist epistemology (Crotty, 1998; Knox, 2004). Where this has occurred in the past it has generally been at times when disciplines themselves were maturing and seeking to expand their understandings through different methodologies, methods and repertoires that better suited prevailing conditions. Ethnography is an example of this shift, as Crotty (1998) notes:

...many methodologies known today as forms of qualitative research have in the past been carried out in an utterly empiricist positivist manner ... that is true of the early use and history of ethnography (p. 15).
In developing this research method I drew on literature that supports the liberation of methods from the occupied territory of methodological paradigms in order to consider methods first as servants of ontology, epistemology and axiology, then methodology (Crotty, 1998; Knox, 2004; Galasinski & Kozlowska, 2010; Jansen, 2010; Maxwell, 2010). Methods come to life only after they are co-opted by the—anything but neutral—philosophical dispositions of the researcher, and are also influenced by philosophical and theoretical understandings. Taken this way, the use of numbers in qualitative research offers other possibilities. This qualitative survey method rests on using descriptive statistics for the purposes of pattern matching and reduction of the considerable amount of data gathered from this online survey. By uncoupling numbers from positivist notions of statistical analyses and accepting that certain accounts of numbers are acceptable in qualitative methodologies, using descriptive statistics becomes a viable approach. The use of numbers in qualitative inquiry is a highly contested notion, with political and philosophical connotations drawn from years of having qualitative research marginalised or compared adversely with quantitative standpoints (Lather, 2004; Maxwell, 2004, 2010). One legitimate response to such treatment of qualitative inquiry is to reject numbers altogether from qualitative inquiry. Sandelowski (2001) however, encourages a more liberal approach in stating that “the desire to move ‘beyond numbers’ (Greenhalgh & Taylor, 1997) should not prevent qualitative researchers from using numbers to get there” (p. 239). In this vein I followed a line of inquiry based largely on the work of Sandelowski (2001; 2009), Jansen (2010) and Maxwell (2010), who regard the judicious use of numbers in the service of qualitative interpretive methodologies as a valid approach, as Maxwell (2010) argues:

> The use of numbers per se, in conjunction with qualitative methods and data, does not make a study mixed-method research. Specifically, numbers in the sense of simple counts of things (Becker's quasi statistics) are a legitimate and important sort of data for qualitative researchers (p. 25).

Likewise, indigenous understandings of numbers provide another lens with which to view “multiple domains and types of knowledges, with differing logics and epistemologies” (Agrawal, 1995 p. 433). Indeed, I take indigenous constructions of counting, understood as “one, two, a few or many” (Schumann 2010, p. 25) as the basis for interpretive analysis and pattern matching of the qualitative survey method used in Chapter 6. Schumann (2010) illustrates this approach:

> ‘1, 2, a few, many’ are the only words some Australian Aborigines had for number. I used to think that quaint and could not image how they could live without words for all the numbers. I now look at that set of words differently for they fit the science of complexity even better than words for all the numbers (p. 25).

The form of reportage for this method is that of an ‘account’. This is both a narrative (Czarniawska, 1998b) and artistic (Eisner, 1981) approach that rests on the lenses of ‘pluralist methodology’ and ‘reality in the making’ that the Pragmatist Feminist guiding
principles affords. As such, accounts allow “for fuzzy things, multiple realities, paradox and ambiguity” (Kelemen & Rumens 2008, p. 43) that match the fluidity of the social phenomenon under investigation, that of engagement with leadership literacies by professional staff in universities. The term ‘account’ signals its truth claims grounded in relativist ontology that positions itself as one of many possible truths. This is congruent with the proximal reality with which it is engaging, where conditions are far from settled, but rather ‘continuous and ever unfinished’ (Cooper & Law 1993 p. 239). An account does not aim for generalisable results, rather it portrays its own particular story, and this indicates, that in keeping with interpretive inquiries, the research is reproducible only to the extent that the instrument may be used again to gather additional data, longitudinally or from a different cohort, for comparative analyses. Such an account will be built from the synthesis of ideas and evidence to form ‘evidence based images’ (Ragin, 1994 p. 56) for this sub question.

This method was enacted as an online survey of professional staff in Australian universities between November 2009 and March 2010 with the data thereafter analysed qualitatively. Before the online survey was made available to participants ethical clearance was granted, and a reference group was assembled to test the themes that emerged from the literature and also to pilot the survey instrument to test for usability and relevance. This reference group comprised four experienced higher education management leaders with decades of experience, a professional staff member who had been employed in a university for many years; and a leadership development subject expert with experience working in the higher education sector as well as the Australian Public Service for over ten years. I chose these colleagues for their longstanding expertise and interest in leadership in the higher education sector. They were aligned with the intended cohort for the study but otherwise ineligible to participate given that participants for the study needed to be members of the Association of Tertiary Education Management (ATEM) and currently employed in an Australian university in an other than 100% academic position. At the time of the study, one reference group member was a Deputy Director, Organisational Development in a New Zealand university; two former managers were then employed in 100% academic roles; the professional staff member was a lapsed ATEM member; and two were not employed by Australian universities at the time of their involvement with the reference group.

Whereas much leadership research asks leaders directly about their leadership, I sought to complement this body of knowledge by not asking participants directly about their own leadership, rather they were asked about their lived experiences of work, the work of leadership in their institution and about their leader, so that a broad picture could be drawn. That is not to say that some of the participants were not leaders, rather
that they were not asked directly about their own formal leadership responsibilities. The data gathered was then used to explicate signs of engagement with the Leadership Literacies.

Formal leadership of universities in Australia is considered the domain of Vice Chancellors, with further theorisations of university leadership in Australia concerned with academic leadership and thus containing the voices of academic leaders (see for example, Meek et al, 2010; Vilkinas & West, 2011). Despite the growing number of professional staff in Australian universities [52,850 or 57% of the higher education workforce (DEEWR, 2010 Table 1.7)] they are under-represented in leadership discourse. This has led to much being assumed, yet little known, about this cohort of staff. In the wider discourse of higher education, the views of professional staff about all matters are virtually absent (Castleman & Allen, 1995; Conway, 2000; Szekeres, 2004; Davis, 2006; Graham, 2009). Therefore, I chose to situate my research within this obvious gap as being capable of making an important and original contribution.

Given this, professional staff have typically been viewed as followers in relation to formal academic leadership. This is exampled by the fact that the official nomenclature for this group is non-academic staff (Conway, 2000; DEEWR, 2010). Using a CMS perspective, people classified by what they are not generally do not have strong claims to power. Professional staff fare a little better in the literature emerging from the UK where there are some recent reports that include professional staff perspectives about leadership and management (see for example, Bolden et al, 2008b; Whitchurch, 2008). Once identified as under-represented the importance of adopting a critical Pragmatist Feminist lens for this inquiry becomes more evident as an example of theories that look to the margins (Hooks, 2000; Wilkerson & Paris, 2001). It also led me to choose an online survey data collection method as it made room for as many participants as wished to add their voice, and resulted in 226 participants taking the opportunity to do so. These 226 participants were drawn from invitations to the 800 people who met the criteria of being current ATEM members and employed by an Australian university in an administrative or managerial role that was not a 100% academic position.

The selection of professional staff from Australian universities as the focus of this inquiry illuminates ambiguities and the blurring of formal leadership boundaries that are indicative of change surrounding the work of leadership in knowledge-intensive enterprises. While underrepresented in the literature, professional staff are anecdotally connected with managing, and indeed sometimes driving, changes to more managerialist approaches in universities (see for example, Davies, 2003; Blackmore, 2005; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Marginson, 2008a). Adding to the ambiguities captured by the selection of this cohort is the discourse of knowledge work that further shifts the
boundaries of work and leadership responsibilities. As the literature to be discussed in
the following chapters elucidates, staff working in knowledge-intensive enterprises are
likely to have responsibilities as both leaders (at least of the self) and followers
(Drucker, 1999a; Raelin, 2003; Davenport, 2005; Chaleff, 2009; Holtshouse, 2010;
Ladkin, 2010). Within higher education discourse there is a blurring of the type of work
undertaken and this renders formal distinctions between academic and non-academic
work as unlikely to keep pace with these changes, or at the very least adequately
capture what Whitchurch (2009) defines as a possible third space inhabited by
‘blended professionals’. The decision to focus solely on professional staff working in
universities in this inquiry was made for three reasons. First, I am a practice-led
researcher and a former university Research Manager, which points to professional
staff being the focus of my study. Second, any group that is underrepresented in
research studies, as professional staff are, fit with critical theory interests that seek to
‘measure from the margins’. Third, by adding the voices of professional staff to
university leadership studies, there will be something new with which to compare and
contrast other accounts of universities leadership given by academics and students. By
acknowledging these complexities and capturing accounts of how professional staff
were experiencing work and leadership under these conditions provides an original
account, and a snapshot in time, to inform leadership theory and practice for
contemporary times in Australian universities. Together the research methods
proposed in this section formed the between-methods triangulation strategy for this
inquiry to investigate leadership concerns for professional staff in Australian
universities. These methods collected the data to be discussed and analysed in
Chapters 5 and 6.

2.4.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis chapters follow Thomson’s (2011) model of empirical analysis that
contains three distinct stages of analytic engagement. The first of these is the
descriptive stage, followed by a deeper analytic level and finally the theorised stage (p.
1). I have further nuanced these with Auerbach & Silverstein’s (2003 p. 33)
understandings of theorisation to acknowledge a level of ‘theorising’ required at the
analytic level that may not be immediately apparent in Thomson’s naming of these
stages. At the analytic stage this concerns the identification of what patterns are to be
found in the data, whereas stage three theorisations connect these to concerns about
why such patterns are occurring and how they might connect back to the ultimate ‘so
what’ imperative that clearly locates new knowledge generation. The data analysis
chapters and the findings discussion will also be framed by Thomson’s
recommendation to combine descriptive and analytic levels of data analysis and bring
them together “around key organising ideas…so that the text is structured around the argument, not the stages of analysis” (Thomson, 2011 p. 1). This separates stage three theorisations for the findings discussion to follow the data analysis chapters in this thesis.

In order to enact a robust data analysis it is important to triangulate the interpretations made in the role of researcher-as-research-instrument with other factors so that the analysis does not run the risk of becoming circular or self-referential. One way to do this is to draw on a ‘between method’ triangulation approach which considers the same research question in different ways. Opportunities for triangulation occurred as explained by bringing to life a “dialogue of ideas and evidence” (Ragin, 1994 p. 56) between the literature supporting the themes under investigation and the evidence discerned from the data analysis. This in turn is built upon the interplay between Ragin’s (1994) four ‘basic building blocks of social research’ which are ideas, analytic frames, evidence and images (pp. 56-57). The respondents are analytically treated as a ‘tertiary collectivity’, defined by Galtung (1967) as “a set of loose entities that are the units of data collection” (p. 39).

In Chapter 5, the case of Australian universities is introduced so that the Leadership Literacies framed in Chapter 4, could be explored and descriptively analysed for signs of theoretical congruence. This is followed in Chapter 6, where the data is explored for signs of experience and observation of the Leadership Literacies when treated to a deeper level of analysis using the Framework Analysis model (Ritchie and Spencer 1994). This is a matrix-based analytic method that encourages rigorous and transparent qualitative data management upon which qualitative interpretive analysis of data can be drawn. There are many interpretive data analysis models available, including Grounded Theory and Situational Analysis methodologies (Clarke, 2005; Corbin & Strauss, 2008), Template Analysis (King, 1998; Crabtree & Miller, 1999) and Structured Case Analysis (Carroll & Swatman, 1999, 2000). Framework Analysis was chosen because it has been used for many years in social science research projects (see for example, Simons et al, 2007; Lacey & Luff, 2009), including management (Srivastava & Thomson, 2009). It draws an important distinction between the two key stages of an interpretive inquiry to foreground that qualitative analysis is a continuous and iterative process. The first of these key stages “requires managing the data and the second involves making sense of the evidence through descriptive or explanatory accounts” (Ritchie et al, 2003 p. 219).

I was initially drawn to this data analysis model for its thematic emphasis as I had been developing emergent themes from the literature upon which to base my data collection strategy. Upon further investigation it proved to be a well-considered approach that
provided the rigorous framework for the qualitative interpretive inquiry I was seeking. It also offers its own Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS), (a term coined by Fielding & Lee, 2002) which has been developed to aid the model. I particularly welcomed the realisation that the method drove the development of the software, not the other way around and that the model could be supported just as well in smaller cases with pencil and paper matrixes or spreadsheets. For this study however, the software was a vital component due to the large number of participants for qualitative analyses. The data reduction strategies I employed included descriptive statistics for pattern matching and the summarising of verbatim text. This data analysis model also offers the necessary rigour for qualitative interpretive analyses because it provides an audit trail from the discoveries and finding of the interpretive analysis back to each level of abstraction within it. The accompanying FrameWork software hyperlinks back to these abstractions at the levels of raw data, indexing decisions, data reduction and summaries, and finally, charting abstractions of concepts and categories. Lacey and Luff (2009 p. 13) attest to the value of Framework Analysis as a robust analytical method in practice as described here by Spencer et al (2003):

> It is therefore important to have a strong analytic structure within which to carry out all the investigative and creative tasks that are required...essentially the 'building blocks' of qualitative explanations need to be made clear so that others can view the sources and logic of the construction, judging for themselves the 'validity' or 'credibility' of the findings (p. 216).

Once the data was collected it was analysed by qualitatively interpretive means in keeping with the multi-methods approach of this inquiry. The synthesis, analysis and reduction of this data occurred through the thematic analysis of open ended questions and by identifying patterns at the level of descriptive statistics for the closed questions in the online survey.

### 2.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented the reasons for the choice of the cognitive frames of American Pragmatism philosophy, CMS theoretical framework and Pragmatist Feminist guiding principles to ground this inquiry. These were chosen for their ability to enable critical exploration of complex issues affecting leadership in ambiguous and fluid times. Adopting these in turn sparked the means to enact and investigate this inquiry using an interpretive act of inquiry methodology, and a multi-method approach. In the process of constructing this method assemblage, I have developed a strong sense of where and why I am located within the occupied methodological and scholarly territories traversed in this thesis, as well as a sense of confidence to build upon this solid foundation to work with the emergent methodology for this inquiry. Together, this particular assemblage provides the means to make possible the identification and development
of Leadership Literacies, and then explores whether or not they have been theorised and experienced in Australian universities. The standpoint of positioning this method assemblage as social theories in practice is supported in the literature by calls for deeper levels of transparency in research endeavours. It also addresses concerns in leadership research to look deeper and differently at leadership studies and to reframe them for the contemporary times (for example, Smith & Heshusius, 1986; Wood, 2005; Sinclair, 2007b; Carroll et al, 2008; Hassard et al, 2008; Klenke, 2008; Bolden et al, 2011; Bryman, 2011). For example, Bolden et al (2011) sought to reroute leadership research:

Leadership research, like all social inquiry, comprises a substantial degree of social construction yet this is seldom explicitly acknowledged in published accounts. Only through recognizing the assumptions and inevitable biases (social, cultural, philosophical, methodological, etc.) that we bring as researchers to our enquiries can we hope to gain a more realistic appreciation of the relative strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of our approach. Indeed, only through being explicit about the choices and agendas that we bring to our work may it be possible to capture an honest account of what we find (p. 176).

An interpretive inquiry methodology was presented as well as the qualitative survey method as alternative and valid options for inquiry into Leadership literacies for professional staff in universities. Only by the ‘doing’ of this research however, is it possible to posit alternatives to the positivist and mixed method epistemologies still very much privileged in current leadership and management research. In particular, my research methodology and design is a response to the sometimes superficial treatment of qualitative inquiry in management research. The emergent nature of this inquiry positions engagement with the literature, positioned next, as part of the research methodology and design. This reinforces my claim that working with these literatures throughout the conduct of this inquiry was a necessary part of the methodology, not just the inquiry. In doing so, I have not only theorised particular method assemblage for this inquiry, (depicted in Figure 1), but have made an original contribution to methodological knowledge for leadership studies intent on investigating socially complex phenomena in real time, where the researcher is both curator and instrument in this endeavour.
Chapter Three | Contexts for 21st Century Leadership

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses key contexts that affect contemporary leadership and locates theoretical frames to bring them into conversation with the next chapter’s specific focus on leadership. This intentional placement of context ahead of leadership discussions draws upon Grint’s (2005b) argument that leadership involves:

the social construction of the context that both legitimates a particular form of action and constitutes the world in the process … [that] is not independent of human agency … [which points to a necessary] proactive role of leadership in the construction of context (pp. 1470-1471).

Grint expands this further to identify ‘context’ as influencing responses that address attendant power relations and appetite for uncertainty depending on whether the context and conditions are constituted as tame, wicked or critical (pp. 1472-79). My thesis argument about being ‘shaped by and shaping’ contexts of methodology and leadership studies closely mirror these assertions. My understandings of the ‘social construction of leadership’ are that the work of leadership occurs within socially complex and context dependant situations.

This chapter considers current sociocultural perspectives that underpin contemporary leadership which point to complex times, given that we are located in a ‘century of complexity’ (Hawking in Chui, 2000 29). Berman & Korsten (2010) found complexity to be the ‘greatest challenge’ facing leaders, as identified by 1541 global leaders and CEOs from 60 countries and 33 industries:

The world’s private and public sector leaders believe that a rapid escalation of ‘complexity’ is the biggest challenge confronting them. They expect it to continue, indeed, to accelerate in the coming years. They are equally clear that their enterprises today are not equipped to cope effectively with this complexity in the global environment (p. 3).

In order to explore links between complexities and leadership, I have focussed on three particular contextual factors that are relevant for contemporary leadership studies and to leadership for professional staff in universities. The first discussion makes intentional links between complexity and learning as possible sensemaking frames for leadership in the 21st century. The next two consider mindsets, then power relations and language. A central theme in all discussions is the notion of sustainability as zeitgeist17. These particular sites of inquiry delve below the surface to address intangible contexts that contribute to the social complexities of leadership in changed and changing times.

The location of literature discussions in this and the next chapter is intentional. They are presented after the research methodology and design to confirm their integral role

---

17 First theorised in my conference presentation (Davis 2010b).
within the research design, and the application of abductive reasoning (Peirce, 1903; Reichertz, 2009) to work with ideas stemming from a thorough engagement with literatures from four domains. This way of working with the literatures is encouraged by Kamler and Thomson (2006) who argue against ‘naturalized view of literature work’ (p. 29) where “the writing of a review occurs only once at the beginning of the doctoral research” (p. 35). In seeking to identify Leadership Literacies I take their lead in acknowledging the labour and processes of actively working with sources from different ‘fields of knowledge production’ in order to locate a place for this inquiry within multiple occupied territories. These inquiries are presented in narrative form in the thesis, drawing on Czarniawska’s (1998a) ‘science as conversation’ (p. 51) and Burke’s (1941) ‘unending conversation’ (pp. 110-111). This accords with what Kamler & Thomson (2006) term the ‘dinner party and its emphasis on conversations’ (p. 38). Such narrative approaches illustrate Oakeshott’s (1962) argument that “as civilized human beings, it is the conversations extended and made more articulate over centuries that we inherit, not [just] the accumulation of a body of scientific information” (pp. 196-198). The difference between this approach and more traditional analyses of the literature is that, rather than ‘clearing the field’ (which is a common term in literature reviews whereby the reviewer identifies the literature, marks it off and locates a space for their own work), I expect to work with these literatures throughout the inquiry, make salient connections between them and locate existing possibilities for consideration. If and when established frames are found to be ‘enough’ to ground the inquiry the literature will not be ‘cleared’, it will be ‘amplified’ and drawn together to consider afresh. Such synthesis represents an original contribution to new knowledge. The warrant for this approach is located within the Pragmatist Feminist guiding principle ‘social models of knowledge’, as discussed in Chapter 2, which seeks to enact knowledge as a model of social expression, which in turn is considered a hallmark of social inquiry.

There is a scene in the film “The History Boys” (Bennett & Hytner, 2006) that illustrates this active engagement with the literatures and my relationship with them. Hector (the English Literature teacher) speaks to his student about that moment when a thought of one’s own is discovered in someone else’s writing:

> The best moments in reading are when you come across something—a thought, a feeling, a way of looking at things—that you’d thought special and particular to you. And here it is, set down by someone else, a person you have never met, maybe

---

18 Kamler & Thomson argue that a field may be comprised of bodies of scholarship that have natural boundaries and affinities; but they are likely blurred and in process. Scholars bring together disparate areas to create different and new fields. Knowledge production emphasizes the construction capacity of this intellectual work. It is productive and ongoing; the agency and labour of the doctoral scholar as a producer within fields and disciplines is fore grounded (2006, p. 46)
even someone long dead. It’s as if a hand has come out [of the text] and taken yours (Hytner, 2006).

In my role as researcher-as-research instrument, finding Mary Parker Follett’s work from the 1920s was the first of many powerful connections between the literature and my own understandings, where trains of thought that felt particular to me were located. For example, I began to conceptualise leadership approaches as ‘working for’ and ‘working with’ only to find in my investigations that Follett had, decades earlier, described these same ideas as ‘power over’ and ‘power through’ (Follett, 1925d). I had a similar learning leap with the contemporary theoretical work of Amanda Sinclair in her use of the words ‘leadership’ together with ‘liberate’ in the subtitle of her book (2007c). At the time of locating this text I had been reflecting on (but had not yet been prepared to say out loud) the perplexities of finding ideas about what I had previously thought as incommensurate, namely ‘leadership’ and ‘emancipation’.

It is this active engagement with these fields, and the recognition of the contributions of others, that frames my relationship with the literatures for this inquiry. The literatures were identified in formal texts and also through the methodological standpoint of researcher–as-research-instrument (Piantanida & Garman, 1999). In order to strengthen myself as research instrument and to rehearse critical arguments for this thesis, I actively engaged with scholars and practitioners in fields relevant to this thesis throughout this inquiry (including the scholarly groups International Leadership Association and the British Academy of Management’s Leadership and Leadership Development Special Interest Group). This action learning strategy was applied by presenting parts of my work at international conferences and by writing journal articles, publishing a research blog and by engaging in social media. Where these rehearsals have been drawn upon to write particular arguments contained in this thesis they are indicated as footnotes.

This, and the following chapter, outline four particular fields of knowledge production that I consider crucial for contemporary leadership studies. The focus of Chapter 3 is on contexts which impact leadership in universities. Similar to the broader context, this is volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environment. This will surface conditions contributing to the turbulent and discontinuous change in which universities are located, and the impact of this for their leadership. This chapter addresses three factors that contribute to this context, with the following chapter presenting a review of the broad range of leadership discourse that has arisen in response to these contexts.

---

19 This is an example of how references to ideas rehearsed by publishing, presenting or reflecting upon in blog posts are documented in this thesis. For example, an early blog posting is noted. It refers to the cognitive leap just described when watching the History Boys film and how it framed my relationship to the literatures (Davis 2008b) that underpins this argument in the thesis.
3.2. Making Sense of Complexity

The key premise from this section is that it is necessary, in times marked by complexity, turbulence and uncertainty, to locate alternative sensemaking modes and language to encourage expansion of the responsibilities of leadership, to include, for example, rapprochement of economic and environmental imperatives. This cognitive reframing can be advanced by adopting theories that work with these conditions and sharpen learning metabolism and these have much to offer leadership studies. Social complexity theories as well as Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) (Holland, 1995), Johansen’s (2009) uptake of the VUCA environment and how to work with it, and sustainability development models like Dunphy et al (2007), are examples of such framing theories. As we move further into the second decade of the 21st century, there is a growing recognition that complexity theories are themselves useful to navigate the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous times that mark this time in history. Complexity theories will be discussed as a means to make sense of, and work with, emergent challenges of sustainability as well as intangible contexts for leadership studies and practice in the 21st century.

Complexity as context allows consideration of the turbulence that besets these times without looking for guaranteed certain or right answers. It is possible to work with these conditions, rather than succumb to threat rigidity, i.e. the “failure to alter responses in face of environmental change” (Staw et al, 1981 p. 501), pretend they do not exist or think they are someone else’s problem. To do so however, requires cognitive shifts to make sense of these conditions in order to locate more holistic and interrelated ways of thinking about the world to match the ‘requisite variety’ (Boisot & McKelvey, 2011) of the times, i.e. to be “efficaciously adaptive, the internal complexity of a system must match the external complexity” (p. 279).

Times have indeed changed since the Industrial Era and the Information Age, and calls for different and deeper ways of thinking about our world and our worldviews, have been made for some time. These mostly challenge the Newtonian determinist, reductive and mechanistic worldview that drove the industrial era by seeking alternatives based on quantum mechanics (see for example, Hames, 2007 53-56); evolutionary cybernetics (Heylighen, 2000) and other holistic understandings of the world, which include complexity theories. This reframing has implications for the study and practice of leadership just as much as wider political and societal changes.

---

20 The key arguments I mount for complexity contained in this section were first advanced in a panel discussion about leadership and complexity at the 2011 International Leadership Conference, in London (Davis, 2011)
Theobald, from the 1950s until his death in 1999, was one of many to herald this imperative:

In this same century, our understanding of how the world is, and should be structured, has changed. Scientific theorists no longer believe that Newtonian models of reality can be used to describe complex human and natural interactions. They are moving to explanations such as those contained in fractal, chaos and complexity theory (Theobald, 1999 p. 67).

The holistic lens that complexity affords, in turn connects with the notion of ecologies as metaphor to encompass deeper understandings about the relevance of learning, unlearning and relearning in times of rapid change, turbulence and wicked problems. The imperative to do so is illustrated in how we, as individuals and organisations, take up issues of environmental sustainability and the reasons why are encapsulated by Nobel Laureate, Peter Doherty:

... the myriad of challenges and problems thrown up by climate change has forced the human race to confront the future as never before. These are really acute crises humanity is facing and they require transitions of the likes never seen before. Humanity never before has been forced to face its long-term future. This is not factored in to how humans think. And it is not immediately clear to me that humanity is as yet up to the challenge. The fact that our very fate depends upon successfully managing a future that is already inconveniently impinging on our present lends a new urgency to the research that will harness the wisdom and unleash the insights necessary to make the future a time of hope rather than fear (Doherty in Cahill, 2010 p. 1).

Complexity theories are themselves complex and heterogeneous accounts of what Crumley (2005) defines as “the study of dynamic nonlinear systems, that is, systems that are not in equilibrium and do not act in a predictable manner” (p. 36). One of the earliest of these can be traced to Turing and the breaking of the German ‘enigma’ encryption machine in World War II. According to Rothe (2005) “Turing laid the foundations of recursive function and computability theory, the mother of complexity theory” (p. 2). Mathematics continues to play a significant role in complexity theories (see for example, Mandelbrot, 1982; Holland, 1995; Kauffman, 1995), for the reasons that Meyers (2011) outlines:

... complex systems are much more than a sum of their parts ... not readily predictable or even completely deterministic...[This] led to many new concepts and sophisticated mathematical and modeling tools for application to many scientific, engineering, and societal issues that can be adequately described only in terms of complexity and complex systems (p. v).

Holland’s work is closely associated with the Santa Fe Institute, founded in the 1980s as a multidisciplinary site to engage with notions of complexity and chaos. Indeed, through this multidisciplinary work, Santa Fe Institute has enabled one of the best known complexity theories. Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) emerged from their multidisciplinary and dialogic engagement, as much as their work in laboratories, with (often visiting) scholars from economics and the life and social sciences as well as
computing and mathematics (Waldrop, 1992a). For this reason, Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) (see for example, Waldrop, 1992b; Holland, 1995) theory now transcends the realms of mathematical complexity and has been applied to other domains, including social complexity. Leadership and social complexity are a very good fit for the socially derived phenomenon of leadership. Before outlining the reasons why social complexity theories deeply resonate with leadership studies and practice, Snowden & Stanbridge’s (2004) *Landscapes of Management* model is provided to define the conditions which lend themselves to socially complex situations. This model at Figure 2 below, also indicates how conditions of social complexity differ from the other domains named as mathematical complexity, systems thinking and process engineering.

**Figure 2: Conditions for Landscapes of Management**

![Figure 2: Conditions for Landscapes of Management](image)

Snowden and Stanbridge argue that contemporary landscapes of management generally encompass these four working domains, with each of them defined by where they intersect particular axes. The vertical axis is determined by ontological understandings of order (which are described as “the sense of a system in which the relationship between cause and effect can be discovered”) [p. 143], the horizontal axis is determined by epistemological means of understanding of ambiguity (where rules “are an exemplar of the low ambiguity end of the scale … and heuristics permit a degree of ambiguity of interpretation”) [p. 144].

I have used this model to point to the domain of social complexity as a suitable sensemaking frame for the study of leadership at the turn of the 21st century. This is to acknowledge the inherent uncertainties and ambiguities in human acts of knowing, which themselves are at the nub of leadership concerns. The work of leadership lends itself to complexity based thinking and in particular, social complexity theory, given that
this work traverses high tolerances for ambiguity and low reliance on certainty. To explicate this further I synthesised the four domains to highlight their conditions and underlying premises in *Table 1*.

**Table 1: Landscapes of Management Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding to</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Premise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Complexity</td>
<td>Unordered ontology, heuristic based epistemology.</td>
<td>Acknowledges that human systems are different from those which otherwise occur in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Complexity</td>
<td>Unordered ontology, rule based epistemology.</td>
<td>To design or discover rules under which human beings can make decisions which then result in complex phenomena which can be optimized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Thinking</td>
<td>Ordered ontology, heuristic based epistemology.</td>
<td>Interested in the human aspects of an organisation that cannot be reduced to a mechanical structure, but nevertheless expect some sense of order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Engineering</td>
<td>Ordered ontology, rule based epistemology.</td>
<td>Views the organisation as a machine which can be designed, structured and planned and which will produce consistent and repeatable performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Synthesised from Snowden & Stanbridge, 2004 144-145)

As well as calling attention to social complexity and its applicability for leadership concerns for the 21st century, the *Landscapes of Management* model clearly identifies the incommensurability of underpinning philosophical dispositions between social complexity and process engineering. Given that process engineering, widely adopted from the 20th century, and underpinned by Newtonian mechanistic and deterministic hegemony of the Industrial Era, this explication is an important one. Process engineering emerged from the same mindsets that gave us *Principles of Scientific Management* (Taylor, 1911). These, as seen in *Table 1*, expect order and create rules to mitigate against ambiguity. Indeed, Mintzberg et al (1998) commented that process engineering principles were tailor made for management consultants in the 20th century, because they could "arrive cold, with no particular knowledge of a business, analyze the data, juggle a set of generic strategies (basic building blocks) on a chart, write a report, drop an invoice, and leave" (p. 93). Scientific management and process engineering approaches are outmoded due to their inability to deal with the volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity of the times through their lenses reliant on certainty and order.
Social complexity theories afford the space to view all human systems, including leadership, as relational. They rest on philosophical dispositions that see and shape perceptions of the world that promote opportunities for co-evolvement, so that people may create new realities together. These stand in diametrical opposition to the philosophical dispositions that underpinned the scientism and rationalism in the 19th century. Through these lenses that themselves connect with proximal\textsuperscript{21} accounts of knowing our worlds (Cooper & Law, 1993), alternative ways to understand the conditions we are experiencing emerge. These are intent on the interconnections between agents within holistic systems. These more complex and proximal understandings rest on assumptions that social processes underpin our complex planet and its emerging worlds because, as Cooper & Law (1993) argue, they explicate the processes that lead to results, not just results in isolation:

\ldots taken-for-granted states of being, human or organizational, are products or effects of complex social processes. And if we want to understand them, we need a sociology of \textit{becoming}...Proximal thinking views organizations as mediating networks, as circuits of continuous contact and motion—more like assemblages of \textit{organizing} (pp. 238, 240).

Social complexity theories open up possibilities to recognise and give voice to the cognitive leaps required to attune mindsets to alternative ways of thinking about leadership for the 21st century. Understanding the distinctions between complex, complicated and simple conditions\textsuperscript{22} and how to deal with their ontological contestation, is also a crucial life skill and leadership attribute for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century as Miller and Page (2007) explain:

When a scientist faces a complicated world, traditional tools that rely on reducing the system to its atomic elements allow us to gain insight. Unfortunately, using these same tools to understand complex worlds fails, because it becomes impossible to reduce the system without killing it. The ability to collect and pin to a board all of the insects that live in the garden does little to lend insight into the ecosystem contained therein (p. 10).

In summary, complexity theories provide alternative frames with which to view 21st century leadership, although care is needed to ensure that they are not read as a panacea to fix, tame or otherwise apply certainty its volatile, complex and ambiguous conditions. Rather they provide a way to work with these conditions as “an alternative way of legitimizing the current interest in boundary critique, creativity, and pluralism” (Richardson et al, 2001 p. 17). Such lenses of complexity theory, as Cilliers points out, recognise our limits as well as the limits these claims can make about any model or

\textsuperscript{21} Cooper & Law (1993) understand proximal thinking in organisational contexts as viewing “organisations as mediating networks, as circuits of continuous contact and motion—more like assemblages of \textit{organizings}” (p. 239).

\textsuperscript{22} described eloquently within the Cynefin Framework (Snowden & Boone 2007) and for the Health Sector in the US (Glouberman & Zimmerman 2002).
theory\textsuperscript{23}. These can only ever be ‘modest claims’ because “knowledge of complex systems is always provisional. We have to be modest about the claims we make about such knowledge … [however] a modest position should not be a weak position, but a responsible one” (Cilliers, 2005 pp. 256, 259). Further, in turning away from the veneer of certainty that underpinned much of 20\textsuperscript{th} century thinking, Cilliers (2002) is instead making the point that such ‘modest’ claims are hard work and heavily values and ethics laden:

What we need, therefore, are ways of dealing with that which we cannot calculate, of coping with our ignorance. There is a name for this. It is called ‘ethics’ and no amount of complexity theory will allow us to escape it (p. 83).

The implications for leadership theory may be that difficult, yet crucial, shifts in thinking are necessary so to work with the complexities of current times, rather than try to tame or order them. The next chapter will return to the importance of such modest and ethically laden claims for leadership in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. Leadership approaches relating directly to the social complexity of leadership evolving from this rich interdisciplinary foundation will also be addressed in the next chapter. One way to work with the complexities of leadership in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, which include intangible factors such as mindsets, power relations and complex problems (such as issues of sustainability), is to privilege the notion of learning metabolism. This firmly positions the place of learning in the leadership domain of knowledge-intensive enterprises in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

\textit{Learning Metabolism}

Learning metabolism, coined by Hames (2007), is a matter of organisational survival where the imperative is to maintain a speed of learning that matches, or is greater than, the rate of change in the environment:

\begin{quote}
In essence, it is the rate of metabolism of the organisation to ingest new information, digest it and turn it into nutrition to help organisations remain healthy, strong and to grow. The speed of organisational learning also has to do with the cycle of time involved in making changes. This applies not only to the organisation as a whole, but also to groups and even individuals within the enterprise (p. 267)
\end{quote}

This places learning at the centre of the enterprise and whilst this is not a new idea, it is certainly not mainstream even in knowledge-intensive institutions like universities. However, the confluence of conditions to be discussed in this chapter make a place of learning as a central leadership concern. The elevation of learning into the leadership domain is supported by earlier work from the Human Relations Movement, particularly Barnard (1938, 1948); through Action Learning principles emanating from the work of Revans from the 1950s (Revans, 1967, 1978, 1982; Pedler & Burgoyne, 2008); as well

\textsuperscript{23} Cilliers also makes the point that not only can we not “escape the use of models, we can also not escape the responsibility involved in using them—a responsibility that can never be shifted to the models themselves” (Cilliers, 2001 p. 145).
as Systems Thinking (Checkland & Scholes, 1999; Ackoff, 2004; Checkland & Poulter, 2006; Reed, 2006) and Learning Organization (Senge, 1990, 1996) theories that all elucidate these holistic perspectives. Such perspectives encourage explicit acknowledgement of the dynamics inherent in the relational nature of learning in knowledge-intensive enterprises. Moreover, Conklin (2006) brings these perspectives together within the realms of social complexity and wicked problems likely to be encountered in the 21st century, like sustainability, to argue that “social complexity requires new understandings, processes, and tools that are attuned to the fundamentally social and conversational nature of work” (p. 6). More recently another direct connection between leadership and learning was made by Laudeman (2012) in relation to complex environments. Here ‘the transformation of leadership via convergence with learning' and his arguments closely match those made by Hames (2007) for learning metabolism, as well as my own theorisation of the importance of melding these two elements. These are shown by Laudeman (2012) in his argument that:

It is no longer meaningful to conceptualise leadership without including learning. Nor can we practice or theorize about learning without incorporating leadership. The complexity of today's world demands the integration and transformation of leadership and learning. Leading enhances learnership and learnership enables leading (p. 55).

This discussion investigated enablers for leadership to work with, rather than tame or order, the complexities that beset the 21st century. It also introduced the notion of learning metabolism as a key concern, and indeed an enabler, for leadership in these times. The next section about mindsets considers why this emphasis on complexity and learning, and indeed unlearning, is necessary. It considers the notion of mindsets, how these are constructed for the particular social conditions of their times, and why longstanding thinking patterns are difficult to shift.

3.2.1 Mindsets

In acknowledging unique and complex contexts of current times it follows that leadership for these same times may be substantially different from the past. This possibility is encapsulated in Hames's (2007) aphorism that “the Iron Age did not end because humans ran out of iron. It ended because it was time for a rethink about how we live” (p. 282). In following this line of inquiry, it is necessary, to delve into what sits behind our underlying assumptions about mindsets, where these might spring from and how leadership studies today might benefit from such explication. It is my contention that mindsets from each of the three periods investigated affect contemporary leadership practice and their presence contributes to the complexities and ambiguities experienced in the workplace today. I am interested in explicating the conditions that
led to the dominant mindsets for the three periods under investigation by “tracking
culture instead of trying to cage it” (Price 2010 p. 203); given that mindsets acculturate
in response to the times they emerge from. These dominant mindsets reside within
individuals and collectively within organisations and societies, and are examples of
Geertz’s aphorism regarding the “stories we tell ourselves about ourselves” (1973).
This is a rich area of interest for my inquiry concerned with leadership and grounded in
critical management studies.

By explicating these legacies I present a snapshot of thinking patterns and
assumptions that underpin particular worldviews and thus impact on leadership. This is
important because the current era did not arrive fully formed. It evolved from the
dominant discourses and mindsets from past times, namely the bureaucratic Industrial
Era and the networked Information Age and so some overlap is to be expected.

Mindsets associated with different cognitive dispositions from three distinct historical
periods are used to explore this issue. In so doing it is contended that the abiding
metaphor for the Industrial Era is the machine, for the Information Age it is networks. In
this early part of the 21st century where knowledge production as driver of economic
growth is emblematic of the era, the emerging metaphor for the times is one of
ecologies. These three separate periods will be taken in chronological order beginning
with the Industrial Era.

The 21st Century and its precursors

I contend that the speed and magnitude of the technical and economic changes
experienced in the last 50 years have contributed to the complexities of life in the early
part of the 21st century. This is due to less time to process their effects, resulting in
archaic values and cultures lingering and intermingling with those congruent for current
times. This presents ongoing challenges in these volatile, uncertain, complex and
ambiguous times that have significant implications for the study of leadership. The
magnitude of these changes suggests that we are living through social change similar
to those accompanying the invention of the printing press or the Industrial Revolution.
Such change demands different ways of working, living and viewing ourselves and our
communities, where knowledge production is the main driver of growth and wealth
creation (APEC Economic Committee 2000 p. 7; Staron et al 2006 p.23) and
deepening concerns about our world’s environmental sustainability are of concern (Ben
Eli 2009).

To better understand the mindset of the current era it is first necessary to investigate its
precursors, to investigate the drivers of those times, triggers for their demise and their
effects on leadership. My understanding of the dominant mindsets of past eras is
based on the five significant historical periods identified by Staron et al (2006) who
name them as the Nomadic Era (160,000 BC) characterised by small groups; the Agricultural Era (10,000 BC) typified by the growth in hierarchy; the Industrial Era (19th and early 20th centuries) characterised by bureaucracy; the Information Era (late 20th Century) distinguished by networks and, finally, the current Knowledge Era (21st century) portrayed by ecologies (p. 23). Unlike many accounts that conflate the Information and Knowledge periods, this model separates the two, an important distinction for this thesis as it captures the subtle, yet crucial, differences in conditions, patterns and mindsets of a relatively short lived period which nevertheless continues to influence actions, understandings and leadership approaches today.

The Industrial Era, in the 19th and 20th centuries, was a period when conditions favoured Cartesian\(^{24}\) and Newtonian\(^{25}\) linear and reductionist thinking, and its abiding metaphor was the machine. Scientism\(^{26}\) was a dominant influence which led to the Scientific Management Movement. Scientism and Scientific Management both emanated influences that privileged the breaking up of the whole into parts to be scientifically studied for improvement. This point, as will be discussed further in the next chapter, cementing views about the role of management.

The Industrial Era’s dominance waned in the mid 20th century and in its place emerged the Information Age, during which the means of production became information, driven by emerging communications technologies. The Information Age (c. 1950s-2000) was, I argue, a short lived yet distinctive period, that acted as a vital bridge between conditions and thinking of two major worldviews. The metaphors most often used to describe the Information Age are networks and networking. Networks capture the organising principles and dominant functions of the Information Age, because as Castells (2000) contends, “networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies, and the diffusion of networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power, and culture” (p. 500).

There is slippage in the way this period is described with terms such as era, age and society evident. The notion of an information society was first taken up with the work of Daniel Bell (1973) in his assertion that:

\[\text{... the post-industrial society is an information society, as industrial society is a goods-producing society...[and the] main axis of this society will be theoretical}\]

\(^{24}\) of or pertaining to Descartes, his mathematical methods, or his philosophy. Especially with regard to its emphasis on logical analysis and its mechanistic interpretation of physical nature (source: dictionary.reference.com/browse/Cartesian).

\(^{25}\) Schwarz (1997) surmises that Newton immortalized the poetic notion of the universal clockwork. Newton’s celestial mechanics reduced operations of this clockwork to mathematical simplicity that galvanized the eighteenth-century mind. The equations of motion that he deduced possessed an aesthetic elegance which seemed to do justice to the divine will behind creation (p. 154).

\(^{26}\) the belief that the assumptions, methods of research, etc., of the physical and biological sciences are equally appropriate and essential to all other disciplines, including the humanities and the social sciences (source: dictionary.reference.com/browse/scientism).
knowledge...transformed into the central structure of the new economy and of an information-led society, where ideologies will end up being superfluous (p. 467).

Bell’s statement points to the promise and high expectations of a time that was optimistically expected to evolve into an historical era in its own right. Given that the measure of historical eras are their means of production, it is clear that the promise of theoretical knowledge and machine cognition as the basis for this shift ultimately did not materialise. This period nevertheless absorbed many of the taken-for-granted scientific assumptions that drew on Cartesian and Newtonian worldviews from the Industrial Era. In the Information Age, rather than continuing to apply these assumptions to the machines of production, these assumptions were applied instead to machine cognition, thus forming the foundations for patterns of thought and development that fuelled the technological advances from the 1950s. Assumptions based on Newtonian logic, described here by Heylighen (2006) also played their part:

The world view underlying traditional science may be called "mechanistic" or "Newtonian". It is based in reductionism, determinism, materialism, and a reflection-correspondence view of knowledge. Although it is simple, coherent and intuitive, it ignores or denies human agency, values, creativity and evolution (p. 1).

Hames (2007) argues that this period where "Newtonian science, together with linear, reductionist thought, resulted in new means for production" (p. 53). This new means of production was built largely on the work of Claude Shannon whose interests in Boolean algebra and telephone switching circuits led to the publication of a seminal paper (1948) which introduced theories for digital logic, data compression and digital storage (Anon., 2002). These works drew on Newtonian and Cartesian mindsets to develop the binary logic, which served as the catalyst for the many technological advances made in the Information Age that have carried into the 21st century. Indeed, it was these technological advances from the late 1940s through to the 1960s that set the Information Age apart from the Industrial Era, and led to the networked global reach of information and communication technologies today. These developments led to economic and societal changes that saw data and information commodified by developments in computing technologies and exponential distribution options made possible by the emerging networks of information and communication technologies today. This elevated information in its own right to a possible signifier of the era, that of its means of economic production. However, the Information Age was relatively short lived and I argue that one reason is because the promise of machine cognition (in particular the promise of codification of data and information in and of itself as being all that was required) eventually stalled. As a buffer between disparate Eras, the Information Age allowed for a smoother transition to the next, Knowledge Era that might have otherwise occurred if mindsets from the Industrial Era had not been filtered through it. Particularly helpful was the shift in thinking made from the dependence on machines themselves to
a dependence on machine cognition that was then taken into the Knowledge Era. However this was notably as tools to be used in the service of knowledge and intellectual capital of people, not in their own right as had been the original expectation. The impact of this mindset on leadership is explored in the next chapter. In summary, the metaphor for the Information Age was ‘networks’ or ‘networking’, which captured the organising principles and dominant functions of this period. The conditions of this Age were accelerated by codification and access to information, compression of time and globalisation. The pace of change was much faster than in the Industrial Era but less so than the Knowledge Era that soon followed it. Leadership approaches rested on assumptions of a more humanist form of scientific management than in the Industrial Era and favoured participative and networked approaches.

This brings the discussion to the present where I argue, albeit without historical hindsight, that the early part of the 21st century is likely to be regarded as the Knowledge Era. This arbitrary framing of the times for the purposes of explicating mindsets, locates discussions about the present to earlier containers for the mindsets of earlier periods.

The so-called ‘Knowledge Era’ is a term used extensively, yet its ambiguous and contentious conceptual presence, as Morris-Suzuki (1988) states, is “more often used than defined’ (p. 8). This suggests a largely uncritical treatment of it and its underlying assumptions that have been variously named as post-capitalist (Drucker, 1993b), post-industrial (Bell, 1973; Kumar, 2005), information (Morris-Suzuki, 1988; Webster, 1995) as well as the Knowledge Era or knowledge economy. Kenway et al (2006) argue that debating the existence of this phenomenon, no matter how it is named, is doubtful because “these concepts, ill-defined or not, have been taken up in policy mean[ing] they are already determinants of social and economic change…[and so] the knowledge/information economy/society policy discourse is of consequence despite its ambiguity” (p. 11). This is an important argument for this thesis, intent as it is on investigating leadership as it unfolds, and how this might relate to professional staff in universities. Leadership for these times involves making spaces for “productive work in today’s society and economy…that applies vision, knowledge and concepts—work based on the mind rather than the hand” (Drucker, 1959 p. 120). Despite the term remaining unclear, this Knowledge Era/economy discourse has captured imaginations and influenced the policy development of nation states and supranational entities (such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank), giving a political dimension. The Knowledge Era concept was cemented globally into policy and practice discourse with the release of an OECD report *The knowledge-based economy* (1996) which described it as one that:
... results from a fuller recognition of the role of knowledge and technology in economic growth. Knowledge, as embodied in human beings (as ‘human capital”) and in technology, has always been central to economic development. But only over the last few years has its relative importance been recognised, just as that importance is growing. The OECD economies are more strongly dependent on the production, distribution and use of knowledge than ever before (OECD, 1996 p. 9).

Antecedents that led to the development of this seminal OECD report (1996), and indeed to the enduring concepts of the Knowledge Era, were provided by early theorists such as Frederick A. Hayek, Peter F. Drucker and Fritz Machlup. Hayek (1937, 1945) was one of the first to discuss knowledge use in society and to connect economics with knowledge. Machlup (1962) made explicit linkages between knowing, learning and action relationships. Drucker’s early conceptions of knowledge work and knowledge workers, together with his prescient coinage of the term ‘social ecologist’ (1993c p. 441) as a way to describe his life’s work (delving in to the political and social institutions of modern society), are foundational to Knowledge Era discourse (see for example, Drucker, 1959, 1969, 1993a, 1993b). An early contribution to contemporary discourse is evidenced whereby “productive work in today’s society and economy is work that applies vision, knowledge and concepts—work that is based on the mind rather than the hand” (1959 p. 120).

In this thesis I have deliberately chosen to work with the overarching notion of the Knowledge Era to typify the mindsets of the 21st century. This is instead of knowledge economy because an era refers to a particular period of human civilisation, whereas economy refers to just one aspect of that era, albeit a pervasive one, its means of economic production and distribution. That we are more than our economy is an argument supported in feminist (Nelson, 2003; Blackmore, 2005; Kenway et al, 2006), humanist (Reiser, 1940; Senge & Carstedt, 2001; Bragdon, 2009) and critical literatures (Evans, 2008; Elkington, 2010). An example of these critiques is the work of Eva Cox (2011), a noted Australian feminist and social commentator, who has consistently lamented the shift since the 1980s from social goals to economic ones, causing in her view a devaluation of connections between people, society and community.

Although this commitment to develop a more holistic view of the era is supported by feminist, humanist and critical theory, it is incommensurate with neoliberal economic principles. Neoliberal ideology27 is famously represented by the thinking of the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher, who in 1987 stated that “…there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look to themselves first” (Keay, 1987; Theobald, 1999 p. 8). In acknowledging the overarching

27 As defined in Chapter 1.
presence of the 21st century, it is my intention to investigate and critique social and environmental issues, as well as expanded notions of economic principles [i.e. concepts such as Living Asset Stewardship (Bragdon, 2006), triple bottom line accounting (Elkington, 1998) and the emerging notion of Conscious Capitalism (Aburdene, 2005; Legault, 2012)], that promise to be more amenable in the conditions of the 21st century. However, as Urry (2006) reminds us, the pervasive nature of economics within society is never benign:

... the economy is shown to be so deeply interwoven with life, culture, and meaning that it is everywhere, and far too important to be left to economists and their embrace of the thrill of the knowledge economy (p. viii).

Given that the economy is so deeply embedded within society and that triggers for significant change have historically been economic means of production (indeed the names of past eras were derived from their economic means of production), attention to economic conditions remains a key concern within the wider Knowledge Era discussions in this chapter. The implications for leadership, made more apparent since the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, is that leadership seems to have been co-opted, more than we had realised, into the service of economic management (this point is discussed in more detail in this chapter in discussions about power relations and language). The 21st century ushered in discontinuous change marking this period in history as one of complex and discontinuous changes, reliant on new developments dependent on knowledge as both the game changer and the primary means of production. Staron et al (2006) define the Knowledge Era as:

... characterised by impermanence, turbulence, multiple competing agendas and priorities, diversity in ideologies, ambiguity, multiple roles, irritations, uncertainty and contradictions and a great amount of energy and creativity. It is also the ‘intangible era’, where instead of goods and services the growing economic commodity is knowledge itself (p. 23).

In summary, the most common metaphor for the Knowledge Era is ‘ecologies’. It captures the interrelatedness necessary to work with the pressures to adapt to the conditions of the times. If there are such things as normal conditions they are exemplified by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) (Johansen 2009). The pace of change is very fast compared to the historical periods that preceded it. These explorations about mindsets and the times in which they were set within has important implications for contemporary leadership studies and practice. I argue that all of these thinking patterns are still active in the workplace, yet they remain below the surface. Explicating them as possible complications within an already socially complex environment of leadership in contemporary times is therefore necessary. James (1996) articulates why archaic mindsets are so difficult to shift:

Anthropologists use social data and models from the past to provide a frame or a context for the future. The details of millions of years of history and hundreds of
societies reveal patterns. When you understand these patterns of the past, culture is often the last system to adapt. Vestiges of old beliefs hang on long after the technological, economic and demographic systems have changed (p. 22).

In addition to mindsets associated with particular dominant forms of industry, there have been significant shifts in thinking about our place in the world. The geographical focus of Western society and the world of work has moved from the ‘local’ to the ‘global’. Hatton & Williamson (2005) situate this in terms of distinct waves of economic globalisation in the modern era. The first (between c1820–1914) moved from local to national focus, while the second, beginning after World War II, moved from national to global. More recently, there are indications that a possible third wave of globalisation is imminent, due to the realisation that concerns for the world run deeper than economic imperatives. These possibilities move focus from ‘global’ to ‘worldly’ understandings of globalisation. This third wave of globalisation moves the agenda away from a ‘global’ standpoint of profits at all costs, towards more sustainable and ‘worldly’ futures. Indeed this more worldly standpoint builds upon thought and actions at the intersections of sustainability and economy discourses (see for example, Schumacher, 1973; Daly et al, 1989; Henderson, 1991; Elkington, 1998; Theobald, 1999; Daly & Farley, 2004; Hatton & Williamson, 2005; Hames, 2007). This is leading to growing understanding of the imperative to work together for sustainable economic and environmental good.

In summary, from an anthropological perspective, we can trace several historical cycles that have had both economic and geographic influence, to the metaphors, or what Stamps & Lipnack (2004) call ‘emergent signature form of organization’ (p. 30), that capture them. Economic metaphors have moved from the machine (Morgan, 1998 p. 33) to networks, (Castells, 2000 p. 1; Ito, 2008) and now to the metaphor of ecologies (and more specifically learning ecologies), as indicators of the current knowledge-intensive era (Staron et al (2006 p. 25). At the same time, geographical metaphors have moved from the local, to national, to global, and now worldly (which makes a place for all that went before). What this alludes to is the significant challenge of making sense of the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous nature of change and complexity. This is no less the case for attempts to understand leadership.

The presentation of these significant societal shifts through the elucidation of historical and globalisation perspectives opens them up for discussion and reflection about our own underlying mindsets and values. This is needed in order to understand how contemporary approaches to leadership may be influenced by leadership and management metaphors from earlier historical periods. That there may exist in contemporary workplaces mindsets from these separate historical periods serves to

---

28 This work was foreshadowed by earlier theorists such as Kenneth E. Boulding (1966); Fuller (1969); and members of an Ad Hoc Committee who wrote to US President Johnson in 1964 (Pauling et al, 1964).
illustrate the depths of the problem. In this situation it is no wonder that there exists multitudes of approaches to leadership and identification of leadership responsibilities. Taking the notion of sustainability as protagonist, serves to illustrate the effects that differing mindsets have for leadership responsibilities emerging from current global conditions.

**Sustainability as Possible Zeitgeist**

Issues of sustainability and ecologies are adding to the complexities of leadership in the 21st century. That such contexts are increasingly placed within the circle of leadership responsibilities suggests interest in more worldly understandings of globalisation discussed in the last section. This has possible implications for leadership in all arenas, including Australian universities as the sites of professional staff work and this is why sustainability as possible zeitgeist is explored in this thesis.

In accepting the world as volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous [theorised as VUCA and discussed within the leadership domain by Johansen (2009)], there are nevertheless ways of understanding and taking responsibility for the concerns facing our planet. Complexity theories bring these issues within the circle of concern of contemporary leadership as an example of ‘super wicked problems’. Levin et al (2010) describe these as:

> ... new class of global environmental problems that comprise four additional key features ... time is running out; the central authority needed to address them is weak or non-existent; those who cause the problem also seek to create a solution; and hyperbolic discounting occurs that pushes responses into the future when immediate actions are required to set in train longer-term policy solutions.

The term builds upon others such as ‘super complexity’, ‘wicked problems’ and ‘complex problems as messes’ that seek to explain complex conditions. Recognition of these emergent issues brings with it the need to include within holistic frameworks that encompasses, and entwine, economic and environmental issues. This signals an epistemological turn towards what Evans (2008) describes as counter-hegemonic globalisation, where responsibility for ecological, social and financial governance is taken at all levels of society and valued accordingly. If this epistemological turn is indeed occurring, and I argue that it is, sustainability will be its probable zeitgeist. I make this claim given that contestations about environmental sustainability have been newsworthy for much of the 21st century. These environmental issues continue to consume much public and political energy and are indicators that the issues of

---

29 The arguments about sustainability as zeitgeist contained in this section were first advanced at the European Academy of Management Conference, Rome (Davis 2010b).
30 used by Barnett (2000) in relation to the higher education sector.
31 A term coined by Rittel & Webber (1973).
33 Zeitgeist is defined as “the spirit of the time; the intellectual and moral tendencies that characterize an age or epoch” Funk & Wagnall (1984). In its native German, the word has even more layers of meaning than the English translation, including that the zeitgeist can only be observed after the fact (p. 798).
environmental sustainability are indeed the *spirit of our times*. They also highlight the politicisation of these issues and the underlying mindsets that ground these contesting ideologies.

To illustrate how sustainability as zeitgeist integrates the contexts for leadership taken up in this chapter, complexity, mindsets, ecologies and learning metabolism are all factors discussed in the following reflection taken from my reflections concerning these issues, about how intractable thinking patterns associated with leadership may shift, in a similar way that they did in recent changes of perceptions about sustainability:

Hindsight about the *inconvenient truth* of the state of the global environment signals sustainability as zeitgeist and how change in a volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environment might occur. It is not that concerns about the environment such as global warming, sustainability, rising sea levels, ozone depletion, etc. had only just emerged when Al Gore (2006) released his now famous slideshow. Rather, it took several converging schools of thought and one or two powerful advocates, like Gore, to make the space for world leaders to shift their entrenched patterns of thinking, or at least no longer be prepared to plausibly deny its importance. These patterns of behavior are material examples of how leadership more appropriate for the Knowledge Era might also break through (excerpt from Davis, 2010b).

The issue of sustainability is indeed central to uncovering from where current thought patterns—our own and our organisations—emanate, which is a good first step in making the necessary space for conversations, then relationships, then action to occur. An ecological metaphor has deep resonance with the complexities, ambiguities and speed of change today. The art of denial as strategy and how denial can stifle dialogue is evident in the climate change debate as well as more general sustainability issues in leadership discourse. Notions of unlearning and relearning are also necessary when considering the role that learning metabolism might play in knowledge-intensive enterprises. Frameworks and metaphors are sense making devices that connect what is familiar with either a new concept or a deeper understanding of a complex one, and are ways to counter this.

Frameworks such as Johansen’s (2009) VUCA model for working with Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity (2009); Martin’s Knowledge Funnel (2009); and Snowden’s Cynefin Model (Kurtz & Snowden, 2003) are just some of the available tools that frame the epistemological turn towards working with the difficulties we are facing in leading, learning and life of the planet and its inhabitants. More than that learning metabolism as a means to explicate these complexities, in this *permanent white water* (Vaill, 1996), are central to this thesis and to understand the critical contexts of 21st century leadership. Ecological metaphors are devices that trouble entrenched thinking because they open up dialogue in ways that counter neoliberal hegemony. These metaphors portray concerns for the world as running deeper than economics; and that adversarial language will not solve the problems of an uncertain
world (or workplace) already dealing with flux and complexity. I contend that rapprochement between factions to find ways of integrating our economic, social and environmental systems in every layer of society, including the workplace, is more likely to bear fruit. This standpoint immediately shifts our understandings of accountability which should no longer be conscripted to be read within the narrow bounds of performativity. This is because there is a premium on time to respond to super-wicked problems like the environment and indeed putting of decision making is, in itself, a decision. Implied here is the art of denial as strategy. This resonates with Argyris’s (2004) work on undiscussability which he explains as ‘Theory-of-Action’ models. Theory-of-Action looks in depth at people’s ‘espoused’ versus ‘in-use’ behaviours (Argyris, 2004, pp 8-9) and identifies denial in his Theory-of-Action Model 1 which seeks unilateral control by encouraging defensive reasoning and single loop learning. Model 1 seeks to win-at-all-costs with entrenched defensive routines prevailing in societal, organisational and personal practice:

Defensive reasoning thrives in contexts where the defensive features cannot be legitimately challenged. One consequence of this is that not only are issues undiscussable, but that undiscussability is itself undiscussable. The consequences of defensive reasoning include escalating misunderstanding, self-fulfilling prophecies, and self-sealing processes (p. 2).

These issues call for deep impact thinking and learning (including unlearning and relearning) with many turning to nature for clues for how best to navigate this terrain. The ecological metaphor is increasingly used to work through issues of environmental sustainability (see for example, Allen et al, 1998; Senge & Carstedt, 2001; Bragdon, 2006; Hames, 2007; Bragdon, 2009) in which deep impactful changes to cognition will occur to transform global societies and economies into environmentally sustainable enterprises (see for example, Dunphy et al, 2007; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2008; Ben-Eli, 2009; Obama, 2009). Sustainability is also an emotive issue which draws out differing underlying mindsets and values. These mindsets generally range from denial, to those who think aiming just for sustainability is not going far enough. There may be no easy or certain solutions, but nevertheless lines of inquiry taken from the domains of ecologies and the environment may be useful sensemaking frames to counter what Levin et al described as ‘hyberbolic discounting that pushes responses into the future’ (2010 p 3). Indeed, Ben-Eli (2009) is one of many who warns that “we are rapidly approaching a meta-crisis—the crisis of sustainability—that is rooted in the very relationship of humanity to the planet” (p. 2).

Sustainability is also an indicator of the growing interest in a ‘worldly’ mindset that sees the world as an interrelated and ecological whole, with responsibility resting on us all to be mindful of how our own actions affect living assets (i.e. people and the planet) both near and far. This reading of sustainability also indicates the interest in a much more
worldly view that troubles the current hegemony of neoliberal globalisation insofar as accepting all actions as being interrelated and of consequence. This more worldly perspective normalises change and highlights that 20th century notions of change as disruptions to normalcy are outmoded. This is argued by Rohr (2009) that a “transitional phase between two stable states is ridiculed by everyday experiences in our globalised world. Constant change is the actual state of our living world” (n.p.).

Sustainability as zeitgeist also connects concerns directly with economics. It illuminates that, at an economic level, neoliberalism based on the Newtonian worldview of the Industrial Era although still dominant, may not be the best approach for conditions where knowledge, creativity and innovation are the main drivers of growth and prosperity and concerns for the world run deep. There are, and always have been alternatives and these alternatives are now becoming discussable. Bragdon (2006, 2009) for example, developed the Living Asset Stewardship (LAS) model that counters this disconnect between neoliberal ideology that places profits before people to model a growing interest in both environmental and human sustainability. The LAS model is an alternative that makes its argument in the only language that neoliberalism entertains (which Edwards (2002) notes is directly—and only—to the bottom line) and at the same time stresses that Industrial Era models of capitalism do not serve the long term viability of contemporary enterprises, the planet and its inhabitants. Bragdon (2006) also foreshadowed the dangers of the ‘profits above all else’ approach of industrial era forms of capitalism, which subsequently came to pass as the Global Financial Crisis in 2008, when arguing that:

... generally accepted accounting principles that favor nonliving assets over living assets are blind to the bottlenecks forming within the global economy and mislead corporations into self destructive behaviors (p. 149).

Bragdon’s LAS notion (2006, 2009) that privileges living assets34 as well as the usual non-living variety managed by the enterprise extends earlier work about what counts as good governance in business (these include triple bottom line (Elkington, 1998), balanced scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1992, 2004) and the five capitals of sustainability35 (Viederman, 1996) approaches to governance). These emerged to counter the detrimental effects of neoliberalism and to provide fairer weighting to financial, social and environmental accountability in leading and lagging indicators of success. These models contribute to a lexicon that might help shift resistant Industrial

---

34 The first are living assets which include people (i.e. employees, customers, community stakeholders, etc.) and also the enterprises’ relationships with that other important living asset—the environment. The second kind of assets are the more traditional nonliving variety which account for financial assets such as equipment, plant, buildings etc held by the enterprise and until recently have been the major focus for accountability and measurement of success for the enterprise, particularly the shareholder.

35 (i.e. natural, human, human-created, social and cultural)
Era mindsets in favour of ecologies. This approach recognises the prescience of Peter Drucker, who considered his role as a ‘social ecologist’. He claimed:

...the work of the social ecologist is to identify changes that have already happened. The important challenge in society, economy, politics, is to exploit the changes that have already occurred and to use them as opportunities (1993a p. 450).

In response to these complexities, there are now specific corporate sustainability models to draw upon that directly link these with the Decade for Education for Sustainability Development (DESD)—2005-2014 (UNESCO, 2005) and to the work of universities (i.e. Talloires Declaration, 1990). Gestures toward leading sustainably and planning for sustainability development are already evident in many sectors and in many parts of the world (see for example, Kirkby et al, 1996; Moffatt, 1996; Viederman, 1996; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2008), including higher education (Shriberg, 2002; Toakley, 2004; Leal Filho, 2011). Such models recognise that issues of human and environmental sustainability have emotive triggers, yet they can nevertheless be traced to draw out underlying mindsets. An Australian example of a corporate sustainability development model is by Dunphy et al (2007). This model places these standpoints on to three waves and considers responses to sustainability development from positions of rejection to fully integrated. This particular model addresses both environmental and human sustainability (pp. 24-28) which are both key leadership concerns for the 21st century.

In summary, this discussion on the provenance of mindsets has been presented as useful for understanding intangible factors contributing to contemporary leadership concerns for the 21st century. The metaphors also illustrate that these mindsets were socially constructed in response to the conditions and contexts of their time. This leads to recognition of the importance of language and power relations and the influence this has on the privileging of particular language and perspectives. It also points to sites of contestation when differing mindsets and perspectives collide, as happens in times of significant societal change. This can be seen in the leadership domain and the dominance in the 20th century of heroic leadership discourse. In the 21st century this has moved to post-heroic discourse but vestiges of old cultures and beliefs about heroic models of leadership are still evident. This is most evident in what I discern as the shift of emphasis from the ‘leader’ to the activities of ‘leading’, a crucial factor I will explain in the next chapter. These deeper glimpses into what lies beneath mindsets given so far and the discussions about power relations and language to follow (where hegemony underpins taken for granted assumptions of particular times, beliefs and circumstances), make a place for these concerns in leadership discourse. They are integral for understandings for contemporary approaches to leadership to be explored in the next chapter.
3.2.2 Language and Power Relations

The use of the term ‘Leadership Literacies’, as the overarching container I have chosen to address leadership concerns in this thesis, is in recognition that the power of language has for possibilities for working with intangible and complex conditions of the 21st century. In this section this is addressed by detailing metaphors of war to illustrate how language is used in the service of hegemony and how it connects to deeper understandings of underlying culture. This is another complication adding to the complexities of the times for leadership. Given these and others surfaced in the exploration of the 21st century as context for contemporary leadership practice, it is timely to consider ways to work with these conditions. Just as it is important to understand the influence of mindsets for leadership, so too is a deeper understanding of language and power relations. I argue from a CMS perspective, that these are far from neutral entities, especially in the context of hegemony and power relations. While metaphors are a way to surface competing worldviews, they are also the source of language that describes these worldviews. Language may serve to open up or shut down spaces for dialogue.

The hegemony of neoliberalism is the focus of this section. Hegemony, described as the “processes by which dominant culture maintains its dominant position” (Felluga, 2011 p. 4), does its best to shut down opportunities that air different perspectives, by co-opting language and power to resist change thereby maintaining status quo. Invisible bonds between hegemony and language are very strong. One way to trouble hegemony and orthodoxy is to shine a light on the usually unexamined values and conditions that underpin them, and start a dialogue about what is hidden. Language—otherwise—privileges hegemony and silences dissent.

Before going any deeper in to discussion about the hegemony of neoliberalism, it is timely to consider the role of language, in particular metaphor, as disruptor of power relations. The use of metaphor is one way to interrogate current conditions as they unfold because they are regarded as “powerful tools for social analysis” (Blyton, 1989 p. 15) and as a linguistic device that explicates assumptions about language, thought and action. They do this by connecting what is familiar with either a new concept or as an aid to understanding complex ones. Metaphors are constructive, categorising (Glucksberg, 2001 pp. 38-40) or generative (Schön, 1983 p. 185) devices that point to underlying assumptions about language, thought and action and are necessary in thought processes to make the requisite cognitive leaps to think in new ways.

---

36 Some of the arguments for this section were first advanced at the International Conference on Thinking (Davis 2009) and the EURAM conference (Davis 2010b).

37 The arguments for this discussion on language and hegemony were first discussed in a paper presented at the 2009 International Conference on Thinking where I applied the five languages of war to the workplace Davis 2009).
Furthermore, Lakoff and Johnson (2003) argue that our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of how we think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (p. 3). Dominant metaphors of the times are rarely the only way to see the world but rather highlight the ones that are privileged, that in turn silence others. Metaphors are also powerful tools to trouble hegemony and orthodoxy, because they shine light upon unexamined values and conditions thereby allowing space to begin dialogues about the silences. Indeed, as already discussed, remaining silent only serves the status quo and the status quo, in turn, always serves the dominant force. Indeed, resisting efforts for dialogue and keeping values and conditions hidden from view are the preferred and time tested strategies of any hegemon.

Alvesson & Spicer (2011) recently investigated the use of metaphors in the study of leadership. They argue that metaphors are a viable means to capture the ambiguities inherent in leadership because:

> Complex and multidimensional phenomena call for considering a variety of aspects, thereby acknowledging but also dealing with ambiguity ... because leadership is difficult to get a handle on ... we need to find a way that allows us to get hold of this complexity and try to capture the multiple possible meanings associated with the idea (p. 31).

In a knowledge-intensive era therefore, leaders need a different set of *leadership literacies* to absorb and develop which are very different to the command and control doctrine of the machine-age Industrial Era, for the reasons that Hames (2007) articulates:

> Cartesian approaches to organisational development and the leadership of change were predicated on the assumption that it was possible to predict, design and control reality. Network science unlocks us from such deceits, letting us see the world as a living system of dynamic flows and interconnections rather than a banal clockwork mechanism...The incessant, chaotic, essentially unknowable, interaction of all individual components ensures that living systems are in a constant process of renewal—and emergence (p. 55).

An example of how language may trouble hegemony of neoliberal agendas is an exposition about the implications metaphors of war might provide. Hage (2005) argues that societies are now framed within ‘warring societies’ rhetoric in the 21st century, “where the defense of the good life takes precedence over the enjoyment of the good life” (p. 20). The effect on citizenry, Hage suggests, is that people are transformed from ‘citizens to conscripts’ (p. 3). Indeed, Fullan and Scott’s (2009) ‘ready, fire, aim’ methodological metaphor used in this thesis, only works because it is a play on words that have warlike connotations.

I argue that these invisible bonds are felt no less in workplaces of professional staff in universities. Here language manages neoliberal technical activities, where conscription to managerialist agendas—rather than war—pervades the work of professional and academic staff alike. Therefore, how such power relations are enacted and indeed just
how much latitude for technical activities like performativity and managerialism are afforded in any workplace, including universities included, are leadership concerns. To illustrate this, using Perkins’s (2007) rhetoric of adversarial language he calls ‘the languages of war’ I was able to map this rhetoric directly to the workplace to surface this rationalist and managerial rhetoric (Davis, 2009). This rhetoric of—gain and god; dominance and resistance; good and evil; regrettable necessity; and, zealous allegiance, are designed to generate and sustain no-win conflicts and its rationale is the same, whether applied to international diplomacy or the workplace. This illustrates that understandings of the world and leadership are still underpinned by adversarial power relations favoured in the 20th century. This is, however, out of step with changes occurring in society, framed by interrelationships of knowledge production as the main driver of growth and wealth creation, globalisation, social media and deepening concerns about our world’s environmental sustainability.

This illustration about the power of language using metaphors of war illustrates that power relations use language to privilege some things and silence others. Until we can see the full picture, and not just what has been made visible by hegemonic privilege, it is not possible to nurture or design the optimal leadership capacities needed for contemporary times. This reading of hegemony accords with the notion of dominant ideology in the Marxist tradition. This claims that each historical era is dominated by the intellectual ideas of its economic and political ruling class which manifest as the principal ideas, values and morals in a given society (Abercrombie et al, 1980). Having adopted a CMS approach I accept the argument that the dominant ideology driving Western politics and economic globalisation, from the mid 20th century to the present, is neoliberalism (in Australia this is termed economic rationalism). Quiggan (1997) provides a succinct account of the pervasiveness of economic rationalism in Australia:

The term 'economic rationalism' first entered the Australian lexicon in the early 1970s ... The critical and sceptical thinking that characterised the first phase of economic rationalism was gradually replaced by a dogmatic, indeed, quasi-religious, faith in market forces and in the supreme importance of 'efficiency' and 'competition'. More and more, economic analysis was based on deductions from supposedly self-evident truths, which were effectively immune from any form of empirical testing. Thus, economic rationalism now has very little to do with rational debate (p. 3).

Drawing on a growing disquiet and dissatisfaction with neoliberalism, Evans (2008) theorises an alternative approach on the basis that neoliberal globalisation fails to deliver social protection and collective goods. These are defined as protection reasonably expected from the State as well as fair distribution of collective public goods. Furthermore, he argues that neoliberalism is congenitally blind to the need for social protection. From the late 20th century, responsibilities under these conditions have slowly shifted from governments and corporations to individuals with far less
capacity to bear them, leading to corrosive effects on social relations and communities (pp. 277-278). Bringing this discussion back to sustainability to illustrate failures to deliver social protection and collective goods, I turn to the issue of stewardship of the environment, where Evans (2008) work is also illuminative:

Stewardship of the environment is the archetypal collective good and illustrates the way in which the consequences of failure to deliver such goods have been magnified during the period between classic liberalism’s early-twentieth century crisis and neo-liberalism’s current travails … As the human footprint on the planet has grown larger and heavier, the consequences of treating nature as though it were something produced for purpose or exchange and therefore something indefinitely reproducible looked potentially cataclysmic (p. 277).

Put simply, decades of neoliberal globalisation that place profits before living assets is faltering due in no small measure to a reduction in basic levels of social protection (i.e. in health care, education, immigration policies and the environment) that are failing to meet societal expectations. These points illustrate some of the reasons for the growing disquiet, especially since the Global Financial Crisis of 2008 (Shiller, 2008; Lamba, 2010), about a general lack of societal benefits and the concentration of the wealth generated through neoliberal capitalism and globalisation to a very small percentage of people. Evans (2008), builds upon Polanyi’s social protection theory (2001), and applies it to contemporary conditions to identify alternatives to neoliberalism which he calls counter-hegemonic globalisation:

...defined as a globally organized project of transformation aimed at replacing the dominant (hegemonic) global regime with one that maximizes democratic political control and makes the equitable development of human capabilities and environmental stewardship its priorities (Evans 2008, p. 272).

The goal of counter-hegemonic progressive movements for social protection rest on a “democratically controlled political economy in which markets are embedded in society rather than dominating society” (p. 297). It is within this space that leadership approaches that might work with today’s complexities are sought. A preference for adversarial and combative language in society, politics and the workplace is rarely challenged. Restated, hegemony uses language to powerful effect in privileging and silencing discourse. Yet language itself is just the visible tip of the cultural iceberg. Hall reminds us that hegemonic practice also hides more than it reveals (even from ourselves) and controls our lives in unsuspecting ways:

Culture is a mold in which we are all cast and it controls our daily lives in many unsuspected ways ... Culture hides more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants (1959 p. 16 and; 1966 p. 59).

Good governance in the 21st century accepts timely financial, social and environmental responsibility. This is summed up eloquently by Theobald (1999) who warned that “free markets are, indeed, the best way to decide how to do things. They are not the right way to determine what is worth doing (p. 8).
In this final section I have drawn together the power of language and metaphor to surface the complexities, stemming from archaic mindsets and represented by adversarial language, that contribute to the challenges of leadership in the 21st century. The next section brings all of these discussions together to identify key premises for leadership studies to take to the next chapter.

3.3 Key Premises for Leadership Studies

The key premises from this chapter amplify particular concerns for contemporary leadership studies which require particular leadership theories and practices to address them. Today mindsets from as many as three historical periods, the Industrial Era, Information Age and Knowledge Era, are evident in the workplace, alongside cultural, sense of place and generational diversities. It is therefore a key leadership concern that in these times marked by complexity, turbulence and significant change, space is made to explicate these underlying assumptions and work with them and each other to find solutions to the many challenges and opportunities that spring from such entanglements.

This in turn calls for more expansive cognitive frames for leadership studies and a more expansive notion of leadership responsibilities than those resting on Industrial Era cognition. These further responsibilities call for leadership approaches that work with notions of sustainability and ecologies as key considerations for the conduct of leadership in the 21st century. These frames include alternative sensemaking models and languages that encourages rapprochement of economic and environmental imperatives. Social complexity theories, Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) theory, Johansen’s visions for working with these VUCA (2009) conditions, and corporate sustainability development models (i.e. Dunphy et al, 2007) lay foundations to work with amenable leadership approaches to accommodate these shifts. These premises call on leadership studies and practice that look past heroic leadership models and look deeper into our relationships with each other and the world to better harness the energies of all who work in organisations; then to focus these energies to improve leadership, learning and working capacities of the enterprise.

They further reframe many of the underlying assumptions about power relations and responsibilities for leadership and followership from the industrial era. This is evident in the groundswell of protests in 2011 against oppressive conditions stemming from industrial era notions of politics and economics. The ‘Arab Spring’ (Anon, 2011; Gamson, 2011) and ‘Occupy’ movements (Baker, 2011; Hames, 2011; The Telegraph, 2011) gave voice and considerable power to citizenry across the globe, and I argue that this shift in the power dynamics between leadership and followership may filter to the workplace as well. These more relational and holistic approaches accord with
Grint’s (2005b) notion that of ‘leadership as social construction of context’ thereby encouraging the “reintroduction of the proactive role of leadership in the construction of context” (p. 1471).

Drawing on these premises, I argue that the contexts for leadership in the 21st century include more worldly understandings of responsibilities that incorporate both wider and inner world perspectives. Further, these ‘worlds’ have expanded to include responsibilities for living assets (people and the planet) thereby adding to the complexities of an already socially complex phenomenon. The role of learning, encapsulated by the notion of learning metabolism, is crucial to work with and keep pace with these challenging conditions. Therefore I take the notions of ‘worldly’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘learning metabolism’ into the next chapter as key contexts for leading in universities operating in the 21st century. The next chapter draws on these premises to identify leadership approaches in keeping with these contexts and the workplaces that professional staff working in universities find themselves navigating today.
Chapter Four | 21st Century Leadership Literacies

4.1 Introduction

Before naming the Leadership Literacies Framework, leadership theories and practices that accord with shifts identified in Chapter 3 will be investigated. The specific shift I am exploring focuses more on the act of leading and less about the leader, per se, in order to work with the inherent complexity and turbulence that beset the times. When considering the means to work these conditions, Grint’s (2005b) notion of ‘leadership as social construction’ from the last chapter, is foundational, as he identifies this shift towards a more proactive standpoint for leadership in terms of moving the focus of leadership from noun to verb (p. 1471). Grint further reframes this notion of leadership as social construction, for illumination of this argument:

... put another way, we might begin to consider not what is the situation, but how it is situated ... [to argue that leadership] depends upon a persuasive rendition of the context and a persuasive display of the appropriate authority style ... rooted in persuading followers that the problematic situation is either one of a Critical, Tame or Wicked nature (pp. 1471 & 1477).

This captures an expanded set of leadership responsibilities for all, emergent in the early part of the 21st century. This shift appears to be situated in broader contexts discussed in Chapter 3 as well as located in a rediscovered interest in ‘soft power’ (Nye, 2004), reciprocity and, co-operation as relational leadership preferences in response to these challenges. Building on contexts explored in the last chapter, the premises of a ‘worldly mindset’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘learning metabolism’ are brought forward as key leadership concerns to consider when exploring theories and practices for leadership of the 21st century. These contexts are representative of cognitive shifts needed for times marked by rapid and discontinuous change, uncertainty, volatility and an openness of communication afforded by information and communications technologies. The investigations in this chapter identify salient connections with theoretical understandings from the 1930s. Indeed, the work of Mary Parker Follett and the Human Relations Movement, while largely unprivileged in the 20th century, provides solid foundation to theorise ways to work with the complexities of our times. They help to make human and social systems visible and acknowledge active and lived engagement of leadership which has always been present, if difficult to research under scientific management principles underpinned by scientism. Goldstein (2011) posits that insight into complex social systems (like leadership) is possible by actively modelling them, “making interventions on them, and leading them” (p. 118). His

---

38 Nye (2004) argues that “soft power uses a different type of currency (not force, not money) to engender cooperation—an attraction to shared values and the justness and duty of contributing to the achievement of those values ... an intangible attraction that persuades us to go along with others’ purposes without any explicit threat or exchange taking place (p. 7).
argument is a pointer to the means to research these phenomena as well as to locate them and fits well with Fullan & Scott’s (2009) ‘ready, fire, aim’ approach as methodology.

In response to the complexities of the times, the purpose of the Leadership Literacies is to provide a language to express these concerns in the face of hegemonic resistance, thus adding to repertoires that encourage dialogue about the significant shifts caused by discontinuous change affecting leadership, learning and life in the early part of the 21st century. Fairhurst (2009) considers such repertoires as “tool bags of terminology, tropes, themes, habitual forms of argument…that in effect, contextualize by supplying leadership actors with a set of linguistic resources” (p. 1617).

Once these shifts are understood, it is possible to locate leadership theories that work with, rather than try to tame or order, the complexities of the 21st century. Theories that underpin social complexity are not new, rather they have been reclaimed in leadership studies by Complexity Leadership Theory (Uhl-Bien et al, 2007; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009, 2011) which seeks to work with complexity, whilst at the same time recognising that enterprises are still largely bureaucratic structures; Dynamic Complexity Theory (Chia, 1998 p. 350); and Complex Adaptive Leadership (Obolensky, 2010).

Harle (2011) is another to connect complexity theories with relational aspects of leadership. In an extensive review connecting complexity theories with contemporary leadership approaches, he argues that complexity theories generally provide insights for leadership because of connections to living systems, self-organisation and emergence (p. 34). Pointing to Mandelbrot’s (1982) fractals theory for application to leadership studies in the 21st century, Harle distils this notion as “repeating patterns in nature observed at different levels” (p. 36). For the purposes of leadership studies he argues that:

… with our focus on living systems, it is naturally occurring patterns that provide a vivid window into the world of leadership. In particular, the idea of repeating patterns at different levels provides a helpful conceptual framework for study global and local—or worldly (Gosling & Mintzberg, 2003)—leadership (pp. 37-38).

Snowden and his colleagues have made significant contributions to the fields of leadership and management by first acknowledging more than one ontological position and the conditions that contribute to them (Snowden & Stanbridge, 2004); and in developing the Cynefin Framework to identify these particular contextual conditions and how to effectively work with them (Kurtz & Snowden, 2003; Snowden & Boone, 2007). From this foundation I argue that complexity theories, and in particular social complexity theories, are ways to identify and make sense of leadership concerns for the 21st century.
Given that the 21st century conditions are likely to call for different ways of thinking about and enacting leadership than those that may have served in the past (Hames 2007), these Leadership Literacies simultaneously shape by and are shaping the literature investigated in this thesis. Central to this is my stated theoretical intention to ‘trouble’ our seeming dependence on certainty and rationality to make room for alternative cognitive frames with which to engage leadership. These are as much about how we think about leadership as what we think about the place of leadership in the 21st century.

Key to the construction of the Leadership Literacies Framework is the power of language and its role as a signifier of underlying mindsets and cognitive frames that influence leadership. This aligns with Fairhurst’s (2009) view that critical theorists and discursive scholars understand that “language does not mirror reality, but constitutes it” (p. 1608). I argue that depending on underlying mindsets, words such as modest, quiet, feminine, service, relationships, and sustaining, may be construed as signs of strength or weakness depending on whether one is literate in 21st century/Knowledge Era or Industrial Era leadership approaches. This assumption is enacted in this chapter by expanding the notion of ‘literacy’ to add it to the leadership lexicon, by building on a term traditionally more narrowly defined as just an ability to read and write.

The American Pragmatist and Pragmatist Feminist cognitive frames that ground this thesis have much to offer leadership studies, because they eschew certainty and rationality to instead advocate more mindful and considered approaches that suit the times. Yet they do so in a manner that may be incomprehensible to those holding on to Industrial Era values, who see the world as rational, linear, certain and able to be bent to one’s will. A salient reminder of these worldview clashes since the beginning of this inquiry have been responses to events such as the Global Financial Crisis of 2008 (Shiller, 2008; Lamba, 2010) and environmental disasters, where these have often been portrayed as ‘rogue’ events. Bob Parker, Mayor of Christchurch New Zealand, in the aftermath of Christchurch’s earthquakes, acknowledged this as “the gross overconfidence we have as a species in our ability to control this planet and the world around us” (Parker in Robson, 2012 p. 26). Moreover, if past experiences of cultural shifts are any indication, these alternative frames expect something more onerous and seemingly difficult to grasp. That is, they expect more from us, as leaders and followers, in asking that we all take responsibility for our place in the interrelated worlds in which we live. Underlying the seeming simplicity of these expectations are many

39 The word ‘rogue’ often prefaces such discussions suggesting that these events “behave in ways that are not expected or not normal, often in a destructive way” but that the world is otherwise certain and predictable and thus able to be managed. Rogue has been used in this way to describe unsettling events, for example, natural disasters (‘rogue wave’), terrorism (‘rogue elements) or financial indiscretions (‘rogue’ traders). (Source: dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/rogue_1).
layers of cultural, power and identity issues at multiple levels of society. Such changes to macro, meso and micro norms are very difficult shifts to make and are therefore often resisted.

Drawing on arguments from Chapter 3 that complexity theories are suitable for conditions of uncertainty and turbulence, I return to Cilliers. His work provides a strong theoretical basis for the place for complexity theories to make sense of, and to work with, the socially complex leadership environments inherent in the 21st century. He does this, not by claiming that we need to know it all, but importantly to counter this very standpoint that permeated the 20th century (and privileged heroic leadership models), to acknowledge the ethical dimensions of any claims we make about knowledge of complex systems. Furthermore, any such claims need to be declaratively modest in the face of ostensibly unknowable conditions in order to “describe reflective positions that are careful about the reach of their claims being made and of the constraints that make these claims possible” (2005 p. 256). Here the term modest signifies a position of strength from a 21st century standpoint and illustrates the power of language to surface underlying mindsets as already discussed in this thesis. I argue that Cilliers nuanced arguments for the relevance of such mindfully modest claims are a welcome counter to heroic posturing that expect ‘THE answer’ all of the time. Moreover they clearly locate the ethical implications of such a position:

Complexity theory underscores the importance of contingent factors, of considering the specific conditions in a specific context at a specific time. No general model can capture these singularities. Although we cannot escape the use of models, we can also not escape the responsibility involved in using them—a responsibility that can never be shifted to the models themselves (Cilliers 2001, p. 145).

Importantly for this thesis, such mindfully modest claims can be made for the other alternative cognitive frames suitable for leadership studies. If history is any indicator, significant shifts are not likely to unfold in an orderly or timely manner. Therefore such modest positions are an appropriate means to work effectively with the resultant lags, overlaps and contestations in leadership practice and scholarship in the foreseeable future. These contestations emanate largely from the disjunct between 19th century thinking from the Industrial Era, as depicted by heroic leadership and command and control practices, with the leadership studies and practices more suitable for the 21st century, that seek to match and work with the conditions of these times marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) (Johansen 2009).

---

40 This paragraph recalls the discussion from Chapter 3 and is drawn from the work of Cilliers 2001 p. 145; 2002 p 83; and 2005 pp. 256 & 259: Richardson et al 2001 p. 17).
4.2 Leadership Literacies

The term ‘Leadership Literacies’ adds to the proliferation of literacies which began to surface in the latter part of the 20th century, mainly because of the emergence of information and communications technologies. As previously stated, my engagement with expanded notions of literacy began in the 1990s when experiencing firsthand the effects of information and communications technologies in libraries. Then, as my professional interests expanded to the field of leadership, and particularly leadership for contemporary times, I readily took up the concept of ‘leadership literacies’ as defined in the literature (Rosen, 2000; Hames, 2007; Renesch, 2007), and applied it to the contexts of the 21st century. Leadership literacies build on other business and industry literacies described by Sensenbaugh (1990) in his investigation of the term ‘literacies’ where he identified references to business and industry literacies dating back to the 1980s (p. 1). To be literate also implies a deeper understanding of the particular phenomenon under review and an ability to make sense of, embody, comprehend, interpret, analyse, respond, and interact with complex sources of information and experiences within that domain.

The concept of literacies is also strengthened by emerging connections and examples with leadership and sustainability. Nussbaum (2011) stated “CQ (creative intelligence) is about abilities. I call them literacies or fluencies” (p. 4). Likewise, sustainability literacies (Stibbe, 2009) and ecological literacies (Orr, 1992) have also been theorised. Within this space Freire’s (1970) notion of literacy as conscientization in terms of empowerment, social transformation and emancipation of people and the planet is again finding a place:

Conscientization refers to the process by which man, not as a recipient but as a knowing subject, reaches a deeper awareness both of the socio-cultural reality on which his life is built and of his ability to transform that reality (p. 27).

Understood this way, the term literacy connotes more than just the ability to read and write41, as language is clearly affected by power relations in any given situation. It underscores the power of language and metaphor and how these are used to manage and govern (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). This cements the relationship between language and literacies and how metaphorical and literal meanings of words and actions may be comprehended differently through lenses of Industrial or Knowledge Era mindsets. Such fluency also surfaces the need for some degree of translation to uncover the meanings ascribed through each of these mindsets. For example, displays of humanity such as vulnerability, empathy or concern for others, as well as modest claims, may be viewed as signs of weakness or strength, depending on our underlying worldview. In

---

41 The argument for this expanded view of Leadership Literacies was first advanced in a Journal of Spirituality, Leadership & Management article (Davis 2010a, p. 47).
order to become fluent with the literacies that suit the conditions of the 21st century then very different understandings than those that served machine-age Industrial Era are required. Using the term 'literacies' to describe leadership factors suggests deeper and intentional engagement with the phenomenon under review, in this case leadership studies. This is a deliberate action on my part to encourage conversations and reflections by leadership researchers and all who work in knowledge-intensive enterprises regarding the critical connection between language and hegemony. Here 'literacy' suggests intentional engagement with the wider contexts of leadership as it is practiced and theorised. Often these are intangible and murky such is the nature of, for example, power relations and assumptions based on underlying mindsets. By paying attention to the word 'literacies' I am inviting a commitment for intentional engagement with and responsibility for our actions regarding this elusive and at times difficult subject, no matter where this may take us in our leadership and followership practices and reflections.

4.3 Scoping 21st Century Leadership Concerns

In this thesis I accept Bryman's argument (first made in 1986) that leadership is about “influencing the goal-directed behaviour of others, since this notion underpins most definitions of leadership” (2007 pp. 694-695). Whilst “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Burns, 1978 p. 53) this wide ranging notion and its underlying mindsets have largely been uncovered depending on how “three basic concrete entities of traditional leadership research: leaders, followers and shared goals” (Crevani et al, 2010 p. 81) are understood and positioned. This is also described as the ‘tripod of leadership’ by Bennis (2007 p. 3).

Before detailing leadership theories and practices explicated as useful considerations for professional staff in universities, it is necessary to acknowledge that this chapter was guided from the outset by limits set by the methodological and contextual imperatives already discussed in this thesis. My line of inquiry seeks to critique traditional leadership assumptions that privilege leader-ship ahead of the work of leading due to its limitations in relation to the contexts for leadership described in Chapter 3. With this wider lens in mind other leadership ontologies are discussed. For example, Drath et al (2008) are interested in a more integrative ontology for leadership and have begun to frame a ‘Direction, Alignment, Commitment (DAC) leadership ontology to be addressed more fully in discussions about relational aspects of leadership later in this chapter. They argue that the DAC model has the scope to ‘include and transcend the tripod ontology” (p. 643) which they see as limited because it reinforces the “view of leadership as commanding, telling, persuading, influencing, motivating—conceived as activities in which there is a point of origin (leaders) and a
point of reception (followers)” (p. 651). Bolden et al (2011) build upon these claims to argue that:

while representations of leadership as something done by leaders to followers in pursuit of a common goal ... occurs in certain situations, such a representation does not fit well with emergent, informal and collective forms of leadership within complex and collaborative environments (p. 173).

With these limits in mind, several filters were applied to the literature to guide the location of sources and their provenance for the resulting Leadership Literacies Framework constructed in this Chapter. This framework is not positioned as the only possible outcome of such an investigation, but rather one that has been mindfully developed within a particular timeframe, with a particular methodological scaffold leading to the selection of these particular leadership literatures for their subsequent empirical exploration. This exploration will be taken up in the following chapters and is concerned with the exploration of whether or not these Leadership Literacies are evident in the theory and or practice at the sites of professional staff work in Australian universities, understanding that as knowledge workers within knowledge-intensive enterprises such as universities this cohort is dealing with the contextual complexities described in Chapter 3. Three factors, other than the timing this literature exploration between March 2008 and October 2009, applied limits to this investigation. The first of which was the three contextual expositions detailed in the last chapter that surfaced particular epistemologies, practices and theorists that might work with ambiguity and paradox evident in conditions underpinning leadership at this time; the second was afforded by the theoretical guiding principles of this inquiry which continue to ground leadership concerns, just as they did the contextual concerns of leadership in the previous chapter. Third, was to investigate largely western standpoints for leadership at this time. There were two reasons for this, given that I am very interested in indigenous and other accounts of leadership, learning and life, having explored some of them, such as the notion of Ubuntu (Davis 2010b) in this chapter, and called upon indigenous understandings of counting to help frame one of my research methods in Chapter 2. The main reason for limiting this review in this way was to see just how well Western leadership studies literature might support the notions for leadership I was developing so that in the future I might be able to clearly mark the likely entanglements with other sources. The second reason was one of time limitations given my PhD scholarship timeframe. Given these limits, a robust account has nevertheless been produced, detailing a long lineage of leadership literatures that engage with ways that work with these challenges. These considerations limit the scope of this inquiry to theories and practices that signal disruptions to a status quo defended by the hegemony of rationalist and managerial ideology evident since the mid 20th century. This inquiry instead focuses on longstanding humanist principles and the inclusion of issues of
sustainability, complexity, power relations and learning as explicit leadership concerns for knowledge-intensive enterprises where professional staff in universities work. These factors expand the focus of leadership from just the ‘leader’ towards leadership relationships and the interior and exterior spaces where this occurs in knowledge-intensive organisations.

Next, three contextual filters were applied to the large, dense and contested body of leadership knowledge that remained within these limits. These are concerned with the notion of energy management; situating this work within post-heroic leadership theory which naturally expands the focus of leadership to be more than about the leader; and the work of Mary Parker Follett to illuminate a pathway through the selected literature. The first and overarching filter is Kets de Vries’s (2003) notion that “leaders are in the business of energy management” (p. 111). Energy management has yet to be strongly associated with leadership theory, but there are some who have considered this as the essence of leadership. The reason I chose this concept to centre this discussion was because when I first read about (kets de Vries 2003) and began to reflect upon this notion, it seemed to encapsulate the reasons for the disquiet that led me to this inquiry as a practice led researcher. By addressing energy management as a key leadership responsibility and driver opens up possibilities to extend into likely contexts for leadership in the 21st century as raised in Chapter 3. It accepts responsibility for energy management of living assets (i.e. the self, peers, followers, stakeholders, as well as the environment and planet in which the enterprise operates) as being inside the leadership domain. This situates 21st century leadership as congruent with ‘triple bottom line’ governance approaches (Elkington, 1998; Bragdon, 2006); conscious capitalism (Schwerin, 1998; Aburdene, 2005; Legault, 2012); the progressive movements for social protection where “markets are embedded in society rather than dominating society” (Evans, 2008 p. 297) and an emerging Worldly Leadership research agenda that bring all of these together as a leadership approach (see Turnbull et al, 2011).

Second, the filter acknowledging the emergence of a post heroic leadership era was applied (see for example, Heckscher, 1994; Fletcher, 2002; Gronn, 2002; Fletcher, 2004; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Sinclair, 2007c; Carroll et al, 2008; Eisler & Garrick, 2008; Western, 2008; Guthey et al, 2009; Gronn, 2011). This filter distinguishes contemporary leadership theory and practice from those underpinned by heroic, command and control understandings that served the Industrial Era. This filter was also a salient entry into an expanded focus of leadership from just ‘the leader’ to the more expansive view I theorise in terms of ‘leading’. This can be found in the literature as ‘leadership as practice’ (Fletcher, 2004; Carroll et al, 2008; Crevani et al, 2010; Raelin,
2011) and ‘leadership as work’ (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Ospina & Foldy, 2010). That leadership is dispersed throughout the organisation, even though it has often been written out of ‘celebrified’ (Guthey et al, 2009) accounts of leadership, is made visible, as Fletcher (2004) argues, through this post heroic leadership lens:

> We might see—and even need to see—figureheads at the top. But new models recognize that these visible positional ‘heroes’ are supported by a network of personal leadership practices distributed throughout the organization. Positional leaders … are sustained by larger forces and the numerous, countless acts of enabling, supporting and facilitating that make up the collaborative subtext of what is often mistakenly labelled “individual” achievement (p. 648).

Third, the earlier works of Mary Parker Follett, from the period 1899-1933, were used to illuminate a path through leadership literature to confirm that an interest in people-centred leadership and management approaches have a long, if unprivileged, history. Indeed, Martin (2008) contends that “Follett’s ideas provide a platform for the next level of theory development that is multilevel and postheroic” (p. 316), thus neatly combining two of my filters. From a CMS perspective I reclaim, through the work of Follett, an early Pragmatist Feminist, much of what has been rendered invisible by the hegemony of scientific management and neoliberalism of the 20th century. Follett’s work is able to bear this responsibility, indeed, Bathurst & Nannette (2008) and Gaspar (2004) suggest that she was ahead of her time. Bennis (1995) contends that “just about everything written today about leadership and organisations comes from Mary Parker Follett’s writings and lectures” (p. 178) while Drucker (1995) proclaimed her “the prophet of management” (p. 9). For all this kudos, that such a prominent thinker had been neglected for much of the 20th century only to be rediscovered in the 21st century, also illuminates the contested spaces and power struggles that are sometimes uncritically treated in discussions about leadership. Much of Follett’s work is foundational (whether directly attributed to her or not) to contemporary leadership practices that suit the turbulent conditions of the 21st century. In addition, it is clear from investigations of contemporary leadership theory that American Pragmatists have influenced the field and Follett, an early adopter, provides a salient link to earlier Pragmatist notions that have re-emerged for contemporary use, particularly abductive reasoning, warranted assertibility and apperception. Peirce’s (1903) abductive reasoning is the logic of ‘what might be possible’ and offers an epistemological alternative to inductive and deductive logics grounded in positivism. Abductive logic has been rediscovered by both management design scholars (Martin, 2005) and leadership scholars for its ability to “make intuitive connections among seemingly unrelated information and begin to shape

---

42 Much of Follett’s work was published after her death in 1933, the period depicted is from her first work to her death.
43 Follett received a posthumous Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Leadership Association in 2011 (source: http://www.ila-net.org/Awards/LLA/MPFollett.htm).
order out of chaos” (Horth & Buchner, 2009 13). Dewey’s notion of warranted assertibility (1941) offers an alternative for qualitative leadership scholars to the otherwise positivist notions that underpin the idea of the hypothesis. Lastly, James’s re-engagement with Leibniz’s (1714) notion of apperception, the process of understanding something perceived in terms of previous experience (James, 1899), has been recognised in leadership studies by Levy & Carroll (2008 p. 21) as an important element of reflexive professional practice.

Some of the body of knowledge production concerning leadership theory that remains within these limits and filters will now be discussed. Follett’s work illuminates this path where possible to locate cogent ideas, memes and theories congruent with the arguments in this thesis that ultimately led to the construction of the Leadership Literacies Framework at the end of this Chapter. Leadership theories that are still pervasive yet unlikely to work with the inherent complexities in the 21st century (Uhl-Bien 2011) have been deliberately left out in response to calls such as Reiser’s (1940) to address what he termed a failure of philosophy where “the modern world needs a new system of thought to replace the outmoded views which still linger on, reluctant to depart, and still confuse us by their very presence” (p. x).

There are three particular leadership concerns left within the scope of this chapter after the application of these factors and filters. First is the Human Relations Movement, upon whose understandings of the world enable a place to be made for the notion of ‘leadership as energy management’. Next is the space where leadership is enacted, thereby addressing leading as work; leadership as relational and social; the distributed processes and practices of leadership work; a post-industrial lens on followership; and the central and unifying role of purpose. Finally, how these leadership concerns directly relate to the 21st century, with particular emphasis on the key role of learning when working with the inherent complexities of these times are discussed. As these leadership concerns can already be found in humanistic Worldly Leadership approaches (Turnbull 2008) from the mid 2000s as well as earlier Servant Leadership theory (Greenleaf 1977) these will also be explored in detail.

4.3.1 Human Relations Movement

The Human Relations Movement evolved as a response to Scientific Management (also referred to as ‘Taylorism’) which, in the early 20th century, had been adopted in the United States and elsewhere largely due to the work of engineer, Frederick Winslow Taylor (1911). Taylor’s model championed productivity boosted by efficiency with his model adopted not only to address productivity concerns in the United States, but also as a way to deal with the then burgeoning unskilled immigrant workforce.
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Taylor’s model did take humane principles into consideration, including “intimate, friendly co-operation between management and labour, as well as education and development of workers” (Taylor, 1911 p. 45). However it was to be, as Schachter (1989) notes, the mechanistic principles of his efficiency model for productivity that fuelled the movement which took his name at the expense of his humanist ideals. These mechanistic principles sought “order, rationality and efficiency out of the disorder, the irrationality, and the wastefulness of the times” (Banta, 1993 p. ix). Newman and Guy (1998) argue that Taylorism’s pervasive influence resulted in “every management reform this century had increased productivity as a principal goal” (p. 287). They were based on the principles of “top down control, centralization of authority, hierarchical structure, differentiation between management and labour, and reliance on ‘laws’ of human nature” (p. 288).

In response to concerns for the worker that arose to counter the excesses of ‘Taylorism’, the Human Relations Movement evolved in the 1930s. It did so by acknowledging the human face of the enterprise, and by proposing more humane treatment of workers. Whilst both movements espoused productivity as a principal goal, they differed in how they viewed the enactment of such productivity and efficiencies. By design, scientific management de-personalised workers and dehumanized their work so that they (just like the machines they worked upon) were viewed as interchangeable parts in the large industrial machine. Conversely the Human Relations Movement advocated that productivity gains should not be at the expense of the worker. Kansal & Rao (2006) articulate the thread that connects the Leadership Literacies in keeping with the conditions of the 21st century to earlier Human Relations Movement advocates who argued, even back then, that work had a dual purpose:

First, the organization is a system designed to produce and distribute products or services at a reasonable cost-price-profit relationship [and] the organization is a social system through which individuals try to express their hopes and aspirations, as well as satisfy economic needs. The second function is to keep people working effectively while allowing individuals to develop their potential and find their place in a society (p. 40).

The resulting polemic movements from the 1930s underpinned by ways of thinking about increased productivity based on value drivers from Scientific Management and Human Relations continue to influence theories of leadership, management and organisational studies today. It is my contention that leadership theory and practice evolving from the Human Relations Movement better suits the conditions of the 21st century, especially once these foundations are more clearly understood and articulated. Therefore three theorists known to have influenced this movement will be discussed to draw upon their prescience and the suitability of their work to the conditions some eighty years later. Following this throughlines of the Scientific
Management and Human Relations Movements standpoints and their impact on contemporary leadership theory will be traced. This interest in human relations is itself grounded in American Pragmatist philosophy which likewise critiqued issues its day. In particular it responded to the growing disquiet about rationalist hegemony in the face of significant change. More recently, due a similar contemporary disquiet, this philosophical standpoint is enjoying a resurgence. Today it is useful a means to raise concerns about global economic conditions, the state of the environment and other conditions contributing to the complexities of our times.

Unsurprisingly, Mary Parker Follett was a key Human Relations proponent and her views on power relations are central to it. Follett preferred ‘power through’ rather than ‘power over’ working relationships (1925a pp. 101-107) and held that “genuine power is not coercive control, but coactive control” (1924 p. xii). She also advocated that “knowledge specific to the performance of a task may lie with those who are most intimately involved in doing the task; that workers should thus be valued not only for their labor but also for their knowledge” (Nohria, 1995 p. 157). Follett was demonstrably critical of the way that Scientific Management ignored human relations:

In all our study of personnel work, however, we should remember that we can never wholly separate the human from the mechanical problem. This would seem too obvious to mention if we did not so often see that separation made ... But you all see every day that the study of human relations in business and the study of operating are bound up together. You know that the way the worker is treated affects output. You know that the routing of materials and the maintenance of machines is a matter partly of human relations (1925b p. 124).

Elton Mayo, is regarded by many as the founder of the Human Relations Movement (Mayo, 1933; Gillespie, 1991). He had long argued that if “commerce specializes in business methods that take no account of human nature and social motives, so long may we expect strikes and sabotage to be the ordinary accompaniment of industry” (1919 p. 56). Mayo, an expatriate Australian, advanced this movement in the United States through his involvement with the Hawthorne experiments (Gillespie, 1991) and by his multi-disciplinary approach to organisational research. Denning (2010) distils Mayo’s work as an interest in organisations as social systems; the belief that leaders of organisations should attempt to understand the emotions and sense of recognition and satisfaction of non-monetary needs of their workers; that workers were motivated by social needs, good on-the-job relationships; and, that they responded better to work group pressure than management control (p. 101). Mayo’s way of understanding the world of work and workers was prescient, if not for his time then for the 21st century, and all of his interests described by Denning are taken up within the cognitive frames that underpin the five Leadership Literacies to be named in this chapter.
Lastly, Chester Barnard was one of the first to identify informal processes in organisations (1938 pp. 114-123) which he saw as necessary to maintain cohesiveness and feelings of integrity and self respect. He understood the social imperatives of work and learning whereby “learning the organization ropes’ in most organizations is chiefly learning who’s who, what’s what, why’s why, of its informal society” (p. 121). Barnard argued that the organisation was a system that to survive “must be ‘effective’ in the sense of achieving organization purpose and ‘efficient’ in the sense of satisfying individual motives” (Andrews, 1968 pp. vii-viii). The threads of Barnard’s work, particularly the importance of ‘informal processes’ can be found in contemporary leadership theories such as Uhl-Bien’s Relational Leadership Theory (2006), as well as Complex Leadership Theory’s ‘enabling function’ (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009 p. 645).

The ontological throughlines of Scientific Management or Human Relations Movement lie at the heart of, and connect, most contemporary leadership, management and organisation studies theories. These include Reiser’s (1958) attempt to find rapprochement between science and humanist concerns (p. 2), and McGregor’s (1960) Theory X and Theory Y propositions. McGregor proposed two explanations for how managers perceive employee motivation. While both assumed the manager's role was to organise resources, including people, to best benefit the company, beyond this they differed on the means to organise and manage these resources. The resulting polemic, based on how the psychological contract was understood, closely matched the earlier ontological arguments found in Scientific Management and the Human Relations Movement. Scientific Management principles directly influenced the Theory X assumptions such as “the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can”; whereas Human Relations Movement assumptions guide Theory Y understandings such as “the average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility” (pp. 65-66).

In summary, while Scientific Management influenced management theories, leadership theories are more influenced by the Human Relations Movement. Examples include Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), Leaderful organisations (Raelin, 2003); ‘Five practices of exemplary leadership’ (Kouzes & Posner, 1987a), post heroic leadership (for example, Fletcher, 2004) and Worldly Leadership (Turnbull et al, 2011). All of these place people at the centre of leadership endeavour and seek ‘power-through’ relational approaches to leading (Follett, 1925b p. 76). This assumption also underpins the emergent interest in energy management as a leadership responsibility.
**Energy Management**

Kets de Vries's notion that ‘leaders are in the business of energy management’ (2003 p. 111) brings this leadership responsibility to the fore. This particular line of inquiry can be traced to Follett’s work, where she commented upon the significance of energy management on at least three occasions. In 1927 she stated that “the leader releases energy, unites energies, and all with the object not only of carrying out a purpose, but of creating further and larger purposes” (p. 268). She argued that a “great leader…develop[s] power wherever he [sic] can among those who work with him, then…gathers all this power and uses it as the energising force of a progressing enterprise” (1933 p. 173). In drawing on William James (1927 p. 315) she explains the interrelatedness between one’s purpose and the untapped energy reservoirs within us all:

> He tried to show us that...my capacities are related to the demands of the universe. I believe that the great leader can show me this correspondence, can arouse my latent possibilities, can reveal to me new powers in myself, can quicken and give direction to some force within me. There is energy, passion, unawakened life in us—those who call it forth are our leaders (Follett, 1928 p. 293).

More recently, the notion of energy management has been gaining momentum in leadership studies since the turn of the century (see for example, Bijur, 2000). Loehr and Schwartz (2003a) argue that “leaders are the stewards of organizational energy … [where] the skillful management of energy, individually and organizationally, makes possible…full engagement” (p. 5). Energy management in this context aligns with Human Relations Movement ethos and contemporary leadership discourse with the recognition that people bring their ‘whole selves’ to work (HBR, 2008); that leadership and followership are embodied experiences (Sinclair, 2007a; Ladkin, 2012); and that these relationships are entwined with the central and unifying role of the purpose of the enterprise (Follett, 1933 p. 172; Chaleff, 2009 p. 13). Schwartz (2007) argues that energy comes from “four main wellsprings in human beings: the body, emotions, mind, and spirit” (p. 64). The idea of managing energy makes a place for sustainable ecological practice to be likewise identified as a 21st century leadership concern, evidenced by Living Asset Stewardship (Bragdon, 2006) and Conscious Capitalism (Schwerin, 1998; Aburdene, 2005; Legault, 2012).

Given that motivations are connected to such ‘wellsprings of energy’ as Schwartz suggests, it is timely to discuss these connections. Ho (2000) describes the concept of motivations in organisation studies as:

> the sum of all that moves a person to action. Motives can be mixed. They can range from consensus to unconscious. Motives are necessary for action but not sufficient in themselves (p. 21).

The study of motivations have been classified by Griffin and Moorhead (2010) as generally fitting into needs-based (pp. 93-99), process-based (pp. 99-106) or learning-
based (pp. 107-112) concepts of individual motivation. Moreover, individual motivation factors are clearly a primary concern of Steers, Porter and Bigley (1996) in their studies of motivation and leadership at work:

When we discuss motivations we are primarily concerned with 1) what energises human behaviour, 2) what directs or channels such behaviour, and 3) how this behaviour is maintained or sustained (p. 8).

Moreover, that energy management has been traced back as far as Follett’s work in the 1920s and motivating drivers encouraging energising outcomes for workers theorised from at least the 1960s, with for example, by in McGregor’s Theory Y (1960), it is timely to discuss motivations in terms of 21st century drivers.

I have chosen to address this by considering a needs-based concept of individual motivation which refreshes Maslow’s work, which itself was chosen due to its wide recognition in the field of organisational behaviour and by lay people. This approach is taken with the understanding that whilst Maslow’s (1943) work is widely recognised his work is not without its critics (see for example Neher 1991) or early modifiers such as Alderfer’s (1969) ERG theory, and that this necessarily leaves out options to explore process-based and learning-based concepts of motivation at this time.

In this thesis I have taken some time to consider what a contemporary hierarchy of needs might look like and then locate these as either deficiency or growth needs to connect them back to the notion of energy management. This conceptualisation emerges from my synthesis of Maslow’s original model (1943), the work of Martin and Joomis’s (2007) who added Cognitive and Aesthetic needs to Maslow’s original hierarchy (as well as the demarcation between deficiency and growth needs) and the addition of Maslow’s rediscovered notion of self-transcendence as the highest order need (Koltko-Rivera, 2006) shown in Figure 3.

---

44 ERG Theory is a modification of Maslow’s theory that removes the hierarchy of Maslow’s conception and groups Maslow’s needs into three unranked categories called existence, relatedness and growth (Alderfer 1969).
Figure 3: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Expanded for the 21st Century


 Whilst it is acknowledged that there are contestations about whether such needs must be met in strict order from the lowest to the highest motivators (for example Alderfer (1969) as discussed above), the elements of the hierarchy itself are generally accepted in many disciplines and useful for the purpose of this discussion (see for example, Hall & Smith, 1976; Hall & Thompson, 1980; Beck & Cowan, 1996; Harris, 2005; Wilber, 2008). In integrating the work of Maslow, Martin and Joomis, and Koltko-Rivera, the pyramid depicted in Figure 3 refreshes Maslow’s classic model to better suit contemporary conditions in knowledge-intensive enterprises, with its inclusion of cognitive, aesthetic and self-transcendence needs. Maslow’s original model was selected as a model to explore the nexus between energy management and motivations because it is reasonably well known in the workplace.

4.3.2 A Space for Leadership Enactments

To anchor discussions about contemporary leadership it is necessary to address many intangible factors that occur in what can be described as enactments of leadership. In the 21st century these enactments expand Industrial Era notions of leadership (which mainly focused on ‘the leader’ as noun) to include the activities of ‘leading’ to incorporate the responsibilities, processes and practices of leadership by all. These significant ontological shifts occur under the surface so the purpose of this section is to
explicate these and make them discussable so that they may be investigated. This is not to say that ‘the leader’ is not important, rather that formal leaders in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century also have responsibility for making spaces amenable for the work of leadership by many. This requires serious consideration of intangible factors like energy management, relationships and purpose. For this reason, the expanded notions of leadership discussed in this chapter are philosophical as much as theoretical. Indeed, these ontological shifts rest with what Wood (2005) argues:

...is best understood as a process rather than a property or a thing...[where] the actual character of leadership extends into a portion of another as a relation or continuity of flow rather than a solid state (p.1103).

The roots of this standpoint can be traced back to Pragmatist, William James (1905), who argued that:

There are in fact three distinguishable ‘activities’ ... the ‘elementary’ activity involved in the mere that of experience, in the fact that something is going on, and the farther specification of this something into two whats, an activity felt as ‘ours,’ and an activity ascribed to objects ... [and] all the processes in question are active, and their activity is inseparable from their being (p. 8).

These enactments illuminate the space where leadership occurs. Its proximal and liminal affordances are theorised by Cooper & Law (1993), Bradbury & Lichtenstein (2000), Gosling & Mintzberg (2003), Wood (2005) and Ladkin (2012). Ladkin (2012) argues that leadership “is not located in ‘leaders’ or ‘followers’; instead, it actually occurs in an energetic field through which leaders and followers move together towards purposeful action” (p. 8). Gosling & Mintzberg (2003) contend that “to manage context is to manage on the edges, between the organization and the various worlds that surround it--cultures, industries, companies” (p. 59). Moreover, Wood (2005) posits that “leadership is the unlocalizable ‘in’ of the ‘between’ of each other, a freely interpenetrating process” (p. 1105). Raising these intangible aspects of leadership gives voice to the complexities and inherent uncertainties of leadership, and makes a place for social complexity theories in leadership discourse. Such complexity theories work with the inter- and intra-connections between agents within holistic systems, and can be co-opted as cognitive models to work with, and help to make sense of the conditions for leadership practice and scholarship in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. These spaces have been made visible in this thesis through the theoretical guiding principles of this inquiry. They have particular congruence with ‘realities that are continually in the making’, implications for ‘social models of knowledge’, ‘pluralist methodologies’, and the connotation of ‘embodied rationalities’. Indeed this likely conceptual turn situates terms such cognitive shifts, leadership literacies and mindsets more generally as

\footnote{Cooper & Law (1993) understand proximal thinking in organisational contexts as viewing “organisations as mediating networks, as circuits of continuous contact and motion—more like assemblages of organizings” (p. 239).}
concerns about the work of leadership and these connect to both intra-personal understandings of self, collective and relational understandings of this work and indeed the interplay of these within the liminal spaces where this work occurs.

**The Work of Leading**

These spaces foreground a growing interest in the work of leading as it pertains to the 21st century, where this is increasingly being recognised as dispersed throughout the organisation, not just as the responsibility of the designated leader. Such work thereby privileges the relational nature of leadership, as well as its distributed processes and practices. Crevani et al (2010) argue that the “empirical study of leadership should be based in a process ontology, focused on leadership practices as constructed in interactions” (p. 77). Heifetz & Laurie (1997) argue that “solutions to adaptive challenges reside not in the executive suite but in the collective intelligence of employees at all levels” (p. 126) and likewise Ramsden (1998) argues that leadership “in universities should be by everyone from the Vice Chancellor to the casual car parking attendant, leadership is to do with how people relate to each other” (p. 4). Raelin (2003) refers to this as leaderful practice; Kouzes & Posner (1987b) view leading as ‘everyone’s business’; and Ospina & Foldy (2010) consider that leadership is “found in the work of that group, not in specific individuals” (p. 294) and privilege Reckwitz’s (2002) contention that “practices represent the basic unit of analysis in the social world” (p. 295). Furthermore, Reckwitz’s standpoint resonates with Spillane et al’s. (2004) contention that the:

> …appropriate unit of analysis is not leaders or what they do, but leadership activity. We argue that leadership activity is constituted—defined or constructed—in the interaction of leaders, followers, and their situation in the execution of particular leadership tasks” (p. 10).

This leads on to more considered understandings of the social and relational processes of leadership.

**Leadership as Processes of Relational and Social Factors**

Hosking (2011) considers relational approaches to leadership, together with “its special interest in ecological ways of relating [show greatest promise] when viewed less in terms of knowledge and truth … and more in terms of ethics and local (interconnected and extended) pragmatics” (p. 460). Bradbury & Lichtenstein (2000) take a ‘relational perspective’ in organisational research (pp. 552-553) and Hosking and her colleagues (1995; 2011; McNamee & Hosking, 2012) have explored this idea extensively. Uhl-Bien (2006) developed a Relational Leadership Theory ahead of her foray into complexity leadership theory, presenting an overarching theory for the investigation of relational leadership, to argue that:
…relationships—rather than authority, superiority, or dominance—appear to be key to new forms of leadership...[and yet] investigation into the relational dynamics of leadership as a process of organizing has been severely overlooked in leadership research (p. 672).

These standpoints accord with Drath et al’s (2008) Direction, Alignment, Commitment (DAC) model mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. All of these theorists encourage exploration of relational aspects of leadership in ways that 20th century leadership models are unlikely to accommodate. For example, Drath et al argue that their alternative (DAC) ontology that focuses on outcomes rather than agents “fully integrates context as an inseparable part of leadership” (2008 p. 639) and that they transcend and include the earlier tripod ontology, that they argue is otherwise too narrow to “support emergent theory already underway regarding shared and distributed leadership; applications of complexity science; and relational approaches” (p. 639). The DAC ontology rests on processes that focus on outcomes and views “all leadership practices as collective enactments” (p. 646).

In considering where we might invest in such relationships in the 21st century, Hock’s work is helpful. When Hock (1999) coined the term ‘chaordic age’ to describe the turbulent conditions we are now experiencing he advised, presciently, that we look to the self to counter these ensuing complexities. In what are still largely aspirational goals for the investment of energies in working relationships, he argued for investment of 50% of time in managing the self “a complex, never-ending, incredibly difficult, oft-shunned task ... and something rarely excel [led at] precisely because it is so much more difficult than prescribing or controlling the behaviour of others” (p. 69). Next in order of weighting are responsibilities to those who have authority over us (25%); our peers (20%); and then those “over whom we have authority” (p. 70) for the remaining 5%. These statements privilege leadership as social processes. Furthermore, these high levels of trust that underpin post-heroic notions of leadership would be unimaginable to those with Industrial Era or Theory X mindsets.

Given that the relational nature of leadership and leading has been expounded, its enactment in the 21st century needs to be explored and tested. Whether these are termed processes, practices, distributed or hybrid leadership theories, they nevertheless accord with Follett’s relational ‘power through’ approach. Moxley (2002) explains why this is necessary for our current conditions:

The resources—the gifts, skills, and energies—of a single person will invariably run out. To be successful over the long haul, organizations need systems, structures and practices of leadership that call forth the energies of all employees (p. 47).

Raelin’s (2003; 2005) ‘leaderful practice’ encapsulates the moves, no matter how else they may be defined, that argue that the work of leadership is ‘everyone’s business’ (Kouzes & Posner, 1987b). Raelin (2003) portrays this as integrative and a “true mutual
model that transforms leadership from an individual property into a new paradigm that redefines leadership as collective practice" (p. 5). More recently, Raelin (2011) melded this thinking with ‘leadership as practice’ theory developed by Carroll et al (2008) who argue that:

... relationality, a logic of practice and a mode of dwelling [focusing on immanence and purposiveness] provide an equally appropriate paradigm and place [to counter the hegemony of competency] within which to explore leadership and its development (p. 367).

Raelin (2011) recognises linkages between ‘leadership as practice’ and his notion of leaderful practice as where “the work of leadership is likely to be found...not in the plans for or in the evaluation of our managerial actions but in the day-to-day discourse of human exchange” (p. 200). Raelin positions these leadership understandings as the property of groups and collectives and then considers the changing role of formal leader in this context. In this regard, Raelin considers that leaders in these situations are “leaderful individuals who can affect the status quo ... [and] can work with all contributors to identify the needs and wishes for their own community” (p. 204). Bolden et al (2011) similarly identify a rerouting of leadership practice that “requires leaders who are prepared to ask questions and involve others in determining what to do rather than seeking to provide an immediate solution or decisive action" (p. 179). Leadership as process is an aligned standpoint and likewise interested “more about where, how and why leadership work is being organized and accomplished than about who is offering visions for others to do the work” (Raelin, 2011 p. 196). This trend has also been identified by Crevani et al (2010), Pierce & Newstrom (2011), Thorpe et al (2011 p. 244) and where Parry (2011) argues there has been a:

... move away from the examination of traits and behaviours towards context and process ... [even though] researchers in many areas of organization theory espouse the aim of researching leadership, yet continue to research the leader, or senior manager (pp. 65-66).

In addition, distributed leadership theory, which began in the school sector in the United States and is now emerging in the higher education sector, epitomises this shift of theoretical direction (see for example, Gronn, 2002; Spillane et al, 2004; Roth, 2006; Spillane, 2006; Gronn, 2008; Bolden, 2011; Thorpe et al, 2011). Spillane (2005) makes an explicit link to the relational nature of leadership, as already discussed in that the “distributed perspective on leadership ... gives center stage to leadership practice...[from this] distributed perspective, leadership practice takes shape in the interactions of leaders, followers, and their situation” (p. 149). Gronn (2002; 2008) is a leading proponent of Distributed Leadership and, like Reckwitz (2002) and Spillane et al (2004), argues “for a revised unit of analysis in leadership” (2011 p. 437). Over time Gronn (2011) has re-imagined these as ‘hybrid’ rather than ‘distributed’ configurations
of leadership to “better align the ways in which scholars theorize leadership with the hybrid actualities and emergent complexities of reality” (p. 451).

**The Invisible Leader: The Trinity of Leadership, Followership and Purpose**

These relational enactments of leadership, no matter how they may be named, point to different working relationships from those that served in the Industrial Era considerations that now test assumptions about leaders, followers and the context of their work. In particular, these enactments challenge assumptions about ‘distance’ (Grint, 2010 pp. 93-95) between leaders and the people they are responsible for, as well as power relations. These relationships are central for closer and cooperative ties that are necessary in knowledge-intensive work.

Whilst accepting Ladkin’s (2010) argument that “leadership’ is not located in ‘leaders’ or ‘followers’ [but rather]…in an energetic field through which leaders and followers move together towards purposeful action” (p. 8), the dynamics of these relationships and their interrelatedness with the purpose of 21st century knowledge-intensive enterprises needs further discussion. Here again Follett’s work is foundational, having made these connections and distinctions to then name common purpose as ‘invisible leader’ where “leader and followers are both following the invisible leader—the common purpose” (Follett, 1933 p. 172). Further to this, she argues that these elements are contingent on the ‘law of the situation’46 (1926 pp. 65-66) so that ideally:

> The best leader does not ask people to serve him [sic], but the common end. The best leader has not followers, but men and women working with him. When we find that the leader does less than order and the expert more than advise, subordinates both executives and workers will respond differently to leadership. We want to arouse not the attitudes of obedience, but the attitudes of cooperation, and we cannot do that effectively unless we are working for a common purpose understood and defined as such (Follett 1925c p. 262).

Spillane (2005) echoes these sentiments in arguing for more distributed models for leadership so that it “is not simply that situation is important to leadership practice, but that it actually constitutes leadership practice—situation defines leadership practice in interaction with leaders and followers” (p. 145). Other scholars have made these connections between leadership and the central and unifying role of purpose that Follett raised in the 1920s (see for example, Drucker, 1993b; Blanchard & O’Connor, 1997; Senge et al, 2004; Quinn & Quinn, 2009; de Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2010) and to the changing dynamics of leadership/followership relationships (see for
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46 Follett argued the ‘law of the situation’ as “the integration being the basic law of life, orders should be the composite conclusion of those who give and those who receive them; more than this, that they should be the integration of the people concerned and the situation; more even than this, that they should be the integrations involved in the evolving situation. If you accept my three fundamental statements on this subject: (1) that the order should be the law of the situation; (2) that the situation is always evolving; (3) that orders should involve circular not linear behaviour then we see that our old conception of orders has somewhat changed, and that there should therefore follow definite changes in business practice (Follett, 1926 pp. 65-66).
example, Heller & Van Til, 1982; Kelley, 1988; Goffee & Jones, 2001; Greenwald, 2008; Hollander, 2008; Küpers & Weibler, 2008; Chaleff, 2009; Ladkin, 2010; Bligh, 2011; Jackson & Parry, 2011). Indeed, Jackson & Parry (2011) acknowledge Follett’s influence in their discussions about the resultant leadership enactments that require more nuanced understandings of the dynamics of leaders, followers and purpose (p. 64). These follower-centred perspectives can be traced to Follett’s ‘power through’ enactments of leadership. Fletcher’s (2004) post heroic leadership theory is congruent with these more co-operative relationship models, which she theorises as ‘followers as leaders: shared leadership’ (pp. 61-63) and ‘followers as co-producers of leadership’ (pp. 63-67). These more nuanced understandings of relationships contribute to leadership discourse because, as Jackson & Parry (2011) argue:

...a more holistic and complete picture of how leadership works or fails ... follower-centred perspectives also provide plenty of scope for producing fresh and exciting new research [and] ... encourages us to reflect and actively think about what we might change in our much rehearsed role as followers to co-create better and higher forms of leadership (p. 67).

4.3.3 Learning to Lead in VUCA conditions

The discussions about leadership for the 21st century are incomplete without taking the contexts of complexity, learning and power relations as discussed in Chapter 3, into account. The speed of change and the volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) (Johansen 2009) of the conditions that mark the 21st century call for engagement with these phenomena with the requisite level of engagement and deeper understanding of both the tangible and intangible consequences for leadership at this time in knowledge-intensive enterprises. These conditions, and the central role that leadership and learning will likely play, are summed up well by Klenke and Chaharbaghi (1999), drawing on a three year ‘Project 2001’ investigating the interrelationships of management, education, cybertechnology and leadership and expected paradigmatic change at the turn of a century:

Change swirls around us as we move into the third millennium...In today's brave new world, individuals, organizations, and nations are in the eye of a cyclone and a state of perpetual revolution. Rapidly changing technologies, increasing globalization and worldwide competition, shifting demographics, new workforce configurations, the erosion of traditional sources of managerial authority, demands for alternative models of education at all level ranging from elementary school to executive education and development programs and the widely acknowledged leadership crisis, are prompting the search for new ways of doing business ... Many of the changes that are impinging upon us come from having to unlearn the rules of the past ... relearning means finding new ways of managing and leading the 21st century organization, making a commitment to lifelong education and learning and integrating new technologies into our personal and professional lives (p. 1).

The notion of Learning Metabolism (Hames, 2007 p. 267) introduced in Chapter 3 is pivotal to these aims and learning as the vehicle of change in such turbulence cannot
be understated. Indeed, Toffler’s aphorism attests to this, where he argues that “the illiterate of the 21st century will not be those who cannot read or write, but those who cannot learn, unlearn, and relearn” (Toffler, nd, n.p.). Just as leadership has been defined in this chapter as ‘everyone’s business’, so too is learning if it is to meet the scale required to adapt and thrive in the kinds of VUCA (Johansen 2009) environments already described. This scale and these kinds of learning, unlearning and relearning are yet to be determined, but they are imminent, so learning needs to be embedded into the work of knowledge-intensive enterprises more than ever before. This can only be achieved when this level of learning imperative is considered an investment rather than a cost of doing business and integrated into the way people work towards the purpose of the enterprise. To be able to harness these capacities and energies is a key literacy for 21st century leaders. It will call on leader and followers to do the hard work of knowing themselves well, just as Hock’s aspirational model of relationship management suggests (Hock, 1999 pp. 69-70). Indeed, in a keynote address at the 2009 International Conference on Thinking, Howard Gardner reflected on the 25th anniversary of his theory of multiple intelligences (1983). He drew particular attention to his earlier arguments about the pivotal role of intrapersonal intelligence in times of flux, and singled out intrapersonal intelligence as “becoming more relevant every decade\textsuperscript{47}:

In this rapidly changing environment, the role of intrapersonal intelligence becomes increasingly important—indeed, essential. When people did the same work as their predecessors, self-knowledge was a luxury, if not a burden. Given today’s extreme fluidity of jobs, roles, and preferences, it is essential that people have an accurate, up-to-date, and flexible understanding of their own desires, needs, anxieties, and optimal ways of learning. People with particularly strong Intrapersonal intelligence ... make optimal use of their talents, especially under rapidly changing conditions, and they know best how to mesh their talents with those of their coworkers (Gardner, 1999 p. 200).

Moreover, such capacities for gains made by individuals (with deeper understandings of themselves and their personal, interpersonal and intrapersonal skills), to then be shared in the spaces of knowledge-intensive work also cements the importance of relational aspects of leading and learning. This is why learning and relationships have been clearly articulated as leadership concerns for the 21st century by their inclusion as Leadership Literacies in this thesis.

This in turn leads to different power relations compacts than the ones privileged in the Industrial Era where command and control and heroic models prevailed. The recognition of both formal and informal leaders, and indeed Follett’s notion of purpose as ‘invisible leader’ (1933 p. 172), mark these significant changes from adversarial to more reciprocal, co-operative and, ‘convivial’ (Hames, 2007 p. 9) leadership.

\textsuperscript{47} From my personal notes taken as a participant of the 2009 International Conference on Thinking, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
approaches where the energies of the enterprise are harnessed in the service of its purpose. This understanding of more leadingful approaches to knowledge work is prefaced on the notion that all are leaders, at the very least, of themselves. To bring the best out of the people working in knowledge-intensive enterprises it is likely to be more productive to engage in ‘power through’ relationships, where:

...leadership is not defined by the exercise of power but by the capacity to increase the sense of power among those led. The most essential work of the leader is to create more leaders (Follett, 1924 p. 108).

Few formal leadership theories work effectively with the expansion of what constitutes this work of leadership, as discussed so far in this chapter. Indeed current models of organisations are still very much influenced by conceptualisations of power relations and rewards from the Industrial Era, where they tended to be, as Grint (2011) suggests, “irredeemably masculine, heroic, individualist and normative in orientation and nature” (p. 8). To seek out any one particular theory as a replacement, or the only possible answer, is itself a futile task in the face of the fast paced, turbulent and complex conditions of the 21st century. However, if we go deeper and investigate leadership concerns for these conditions, there are several theories that show promise and accord with humanist and relational principles outlined in this thesis. Worldly Leadership and Servant Leadership connect with Drucker’s knowledge intensive work theories (1993b, 1993a, 1999b); follow Theory Y principles (McGregor, 1960; Kochan et al, 2002); and underpin sustainable leadership practices (Senge & Carstedt, 2001; Bragdon, 2006; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Senge, 2008; Western, 2008).

Worldly Leadership theory (Turnbull & Edwards, 2008; Turnbull, 2009; Turnbull et al, 2011) is a relatively new line of inquiry and is emerging as a way to work with these conditions. The Worldly Leadership research agenda draws on Mintzberg’s ‘worldly mindset’ which rests on the premise that managers “need to get into worlds beyond their own—other people’s worlds, their habits and cultures—so that they can better know their own world” (Mintzberg, 2004 p. 304). Turnbull (2008) takes up this call and considers it “an important lens for leaders ... [and that] adopting a worldly mindset is not simply about observation, it is also about the way that we engage with and act within and across these worlds” (p. 2). Applied to global leadership, this worldly lens adds a new and refreshing perspective, as Turnbull and Edwards (2008) argue:

It goes beyond individual competencies to include leadership as a networked process of interconnectedness and boundary-spanning. It goes beyond the emphasis on top leaders to include shared leadership and a focus on giving a voice to the disenfranchised or marginalized. Furthermore, Worldly Leadership has been shown to encompass stewardship, leadership for the common good, as well as leadership for sustainability. It is a way of seeing the world and living in the world, and goes beyond knowledge to include ethics and action (p. 27).
Servant Leadership theory (Greenleaf, 1977), goes some way to articulate a *worldly* view of leadership and the leader. It shows promise as a theoretical framework emblematic of the renaissance of humanist principles of leadership since Follett, Mayo and Barnard and was thus chosen to explore the nascent concept of Worldly Leadership at a time when the approach itself was still being theorised. This is not to say that more aligned approaches for exploring the concept of Worldly Leadership will not emerge, just that they were not evident in late 2009 when the empirical data for this inquiry was collected. Servant Leadership theory encourages leaders to embody certain humanist qualities in relation to themselves and the outer worlds. Leaders adopting Servant Leadership principles privilege the qualities of listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualisation, foresight, stewardship, growth and building community (Greenleaf, 1977; McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears & Lawrence, 2002; de Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2010; Frick, 2011). Servant Leadership in practice enjoys mixed reviews, and in some circles is regarded as outdated or only concerned with what Sendjaya et al (2008) call “Jesus Christ’s Model of Servant Leadership” (pp. 58-59). This may be partly explained by what Nanschild (2008) argues are values projections, where terms such as ‘values’ (and in this case ‘service’) are themselves values laden and tend to make people uncomfortable (p. 135). There are similar values assumptions placed on the word ‘servant’ which, for some, connotes as servile; or that it has unwelcome religious precepts; or that it is seen as weak or passive when epistemologies from the Industrial Era that conform to masculine and heroic notions of leadership are applied. However, it is an established theory that has the capacity to look at more than just the leader, to bring people together, manage their energies and ensure that all may work productively in the service of the purpose of the knowledge-intensive enterprise. Therefore, as an established leadership theory, Servant Leadership is relevant to this inquiry as a suitable foundation for exploring signs of the worldly leadership literacy. In particular Sendjaya’s Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale (SLBS) was selected from other measures of servant leadership because its six factors resonated with the emerging focus for this leadership literacy. The Servant Leadership Behavioural Scale (SLBS) contains six factors drawn from 35 questions) germane to this inquiry. These are named as Voluntary Subordination, Authentic Self, Covenantal Relationship, Responsible Morality, Transcendental Spirituality and Transforming Influence (Sendjaya et al 2008).

*Voluntary Subordination*, is defined by Sendjaya et al (2008) as “the willingness to take up opportunities to serve others whenever there is a legitimate need regardless of the nature of the service, the person served, or the mood of the servant leader” (p. 406).
This is a strong indicator of stewardship and Worldly Leadership mindsets that look to long-term goals and a strong sense of purpose. In the 21st century these responsibilities also encompass human and ecologically sustaining business practices. The next two factors, Authentic Self and Covenantal Relationship, are largely intertwined. Both of these factors identify a concern for ‘other’ that is central to post-heroic leadership practices, including Worldly Leadership. They highlight that other-centredness is a key understanding for leadership in the 21st century, although it is not an easy notion to define or otherwise measure. Other-centredness is at once personal and yet, in a spiritual sense, it’s about being part of something bigger and is bound to understanding of our intricate interconnectness to others and the planet.

Operating from such positions of inner strength founded on robust levels of authenticity and covenantal relationships manifests as higher order consciousness states of mind. This is demonstrated by Gandhi who is widely attributed as stating “you and I are the same thing. I cannot hurt you without harming myself” (Muhs, 1996 p. 82). Covenantal Relationship factors, which are largely concerned with developing ‘power with’ (Follett, 1925b p. 76) relationships with staff, are entwined with the Authentic Self. Sendjaya et al (2008) argue that unlike leaders who maintain distance between themselves and their followers, those who have strong covenantal relationship capabilities “treat all people with radical equality, engaging with others as equal partners in the organization” (p. 407). A strong and authentic sense of self is necessary in this endeavour so that leaders have the capacity to “be accountable and vulnerable to others [and are] marked by the absence of self defensiveness when criticized and the capacity to abandon themselves to the strengths of others” (p. 407). Responsible Morality is concerned with the exercise of authority and power at a more worldly and post-industrial understanding of organisational moral reasoning than was the case in the 20th century. This accords with Worldly Leadership and shared and distributed leadership practices stemming from a ‘Folletian’ ‘power with’ mindsets for the 21st century. Sendjaya et al (2008) define this higher order engagement with morality as one that “facilitates good moral dialogue between leaders and followers [and] … relies on internalized principles of justice and right rather than the expectations of others, attainment of reward, or avoidance of punishment” (pp. 407-408). These are more worldly ethics than served in the Industrial Era and one way to describe them is ‘Ubuntu’, a South African term:

A person with Ubuntu is open and available to others, affirming of others, does not feel threatened that others are able and good, for he or she has a proper self-
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48 I first explored the notion of other-centredness in a journal paper Other-centredness as a leadership attribute: from ego to eco-centricity (Davis 2010a).
assurance that comes from knowing that he or she belongs in a greater whole and is diminished when others are humiliated (Tutu, 1999 p. 31).

Transforming Influence factors rest on aspirations for those served by such leadership to be “positively transformed...emotionally, intellectually, socially, and spirituality into servant leaders themselves” (Sendjaya et al, 2008 p. 408) with the intention that these transformations occur “collectively and repeatedly, and in turn, stimulate positive changes in organizations and societies” (p. 408). Transcendental Spirituality is itself a values laden term that has religious as well as spiritual connotations. For its purpose as an indicator of adoption of a Worldly Leadership mindset, it is viewed as a calling for leaders to make deep connections which are “not simply about observation, it is also about the way that we engage with and act within and across these worlds” (Turnbull, 2008 p. 2). This factor brings together service and meaning and to “respond to the needs of individuals whose lives in today’s modern workplace are often characterized by disconnectedness, compartmentalisation and disorientation” (Sendjaya et al, 2008 p. 408).

Servant Leadership and other humanist leadership theories seek alternatives to 20th century western politics and globalisation policies by critiquing neoliberal standpoints that seemingly fail to meet societal expectations for “basic social protections and collective goods” (Evans, 2008) from an outside in perspective. There are of course those working inside these systems, for example, in health care (Segal & Chen 2001) who attempt to navigate such systems rife with contestation and scarcity for the sake of their constituents. Servant Leadership as stewardship and other humanist leadership theories also aim to protect human and environmental resources instead of sacrificing them for growth and profit; and to factor in environmental and human costs into the price of doing business (Bragdon, 2006; Hames, 2007). In this regard they view leadership as serving the purpose of the enterprise and its people and taking responsibility for the social, environmental and financial governance and the long-term future of that enterprise.

These sections of this chapter have traversed a great deal of theoretical territory, including the contexts for 21st century leadership as well as recommending possible ways of addressing leadership in the VUCA environment we find ourselves in at the beginning of the 21st century (Johansen 2009). The next section draws these together and provides the rationale for choosing the Leadership Literacies for professional staff in universities.
4.4 Naming Leadership Literacies for Professional Staff in Universities

By synthesising the general notion of leadership literacies with contexts for leadership for the 21st century (brought forward from Chapter 3) together with the exploration of broader leadership literatures in this chapter, a set of concepts have been identified as reflecting the necessary cognitive shifts for 21st century leadership in universities. These Leadership Literacies for professional staff working in universities, are named in this chapter as the Leadership Literacies Framework and this construction is claimed as a major contribution to new knowledge. This framework makes room for conversations in the contested spaces where old and new mindsets collide. In doing so it contributes to a lexicon contesting the privileged assumptions of Industrial Era hegemonies, with the intent to encourage action towards theories and practices that accord with the conditions of our times. The claims for this Leadership Literacies Framework is intentionally ‘modest’ (Cilliers, 2005) as a ‘tactic’ (de Certeau, 1984) seeking to redirect precious energies towards rapprochement rather than contestation, and convivial rather than adversarial actions for change necessary to work with super wicked problems (Levin et al, 2010) facing society and leadership in these times. This approach illustrates the power of language and its connection with underlying mindsets. Here my claim may be ‘modest’, in that I understand and take responsibility for its reach in times of complexity, it is nevertheless an intentional signal critiquing a rationalist insistence of certitude.

The two literature chapters in this thesis traversed contexts for contemporary leadership and particular lines of inquiry into leadership literature intentionally extended outside the realms of university leadership studies, and more directly about literature pertaining to professional staff. Given there was so little literature regarding leadership studies about professional staff in universities I chose to widen the scope of the study to capture some of the contexts and leadership approaches affecting leadership and work within knowledge-intensive enterprises. As a practice-led researcher, my focus and interest remained with the work and leadership of professional staff in universities and the intent of this thesis was to explore whether or not the Leadership Literacies distilled from these literatures have relevance to this cohort. This exploration is empirically captured in the following two chapters after they are conceptualised in this chapter.

4.4.1 What Are They?

In naming these Leadership Literacies and their provenance I am arguing that although our current conditions are volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous we don’t necessarily have to invent new ways of dealing with these conditions as well. At least
not until due care is taken to consider what might already be available to call upon. For this reason, I regard complexity as contributing to the conditions that leadership finds itself within, and not a ‘literacy’ itself. Three Leadership Literacies are derived from the contexts of 21st century leadership brought forward from Chapter 3, namely, ‘Worldly’, ‘Sustaining’ and ‘Learningful’. Two capture the shift of leadership focus towards leading (and away from leader) as already discussed in this thesis. These are named as ‘Leadingful’ and ‘Relational’. The ‘Worldly’, ‘Sustaining’ and ‘Leadingful’ Literacies are foundational as cognitive shifts that also extend to deeper understandings of how leaders in the 21st century see their world. The remaining two, ‘Relational’ and ‘Learningful’, are enablers to be of particular value once these shifts in thinking have occurred. They are the means to rally energies in support of the large scale changes likely to be encountered in the coming decades and are likely to be of interest in expanded notions of leadership development for the 21st century. I argue that all the Leadership Literacies have a home within the ‘Worldly’ literacy, but at this nascent stage of development they are named separately in this thesis so all that ideas can be fully explored.

This Leadership Literacies Framework comprising of the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies, and the theoretical provenance for each Leadership Literacy are outlined next. Interestingly, at the time of empirically exploring these Leadership Literacies, another study was published outlining similar concerns regarding leading in complex times also suggesting possibilities for ‘working with’ complexity in the 21st century (Berman & Korsten 2010). In this report the views of over 1500 global leaders were canvassed and they named complexity as being of most concern and suggested very similar ideas to work with such complexity as those conceptualised within my Worldly, Sustaining and Leadingful Literacies. The contribution that this inquiry makes to the field is that it has taken these concepts and empirically explored them with a particular cohort, professional staff working in universities between November 2009 and February 2010, just prior to the release of Berman and Korsten’s (2010) report theorising similar concepts.

The Worldly Leadership Literacy acknowledges that leaders understand themselves as well as their place in the many interrelated inner and outer worlds they occupy. It is grounded in the Worldly Leadership approach (Turnbull et al, 2011), an approach that does not deflect from the social responsibilities of leadership, to including good governance of social, environmental and financial concerns. For deeper empirical analysis it is be explored through Sendjaya’s Servant Leadership Behavioural Scale (SLBS) based on Servant Leadership theory (Greenleaf, 1977). This approach was chosen because the SLBS was being theorised at a time when the Worldly Leadership
approach was in a nascent form. Given that the data for this inquiry was collected in late 2009 I chose an established theory with which to explore what I felt would become an important leadership concern in the future. This follows Fullan and Scott’s (2009) contention that in times of uncertainty and turbulence it is better to go with a “ready, fire, aim” approach than a ‘ready, ready, ready’ one and to do ‘something’ rather than ‘nothing’ but wait for more certainty.

The Sustaining Leadership Literacy signifies its ontological importance as likely zeitgeist and its significance in the leadership domain as a detector of underlying mindsets where sustainability and ecologies are key considerations globally and locally for the conduct of leadership in the 21st century. Its ontological importance is due to the significance of societal concerns about human and environmental sustainability that are making their way into the leadership studies arena as context for the work of leadership today. There are other emerging contexts from within the leadership studies arena that critique conceptions of leaders and leadership, for example celebrity, competition or the brand. However these are unlikely to resonate at the societal level enough to be considered triggers for zeitgeist. This shift regarding sustainability was identified and discussed in Chapter 3 as an example of the ‘super wicked problems’ (Levin et al 2010) besetting current times. Even though there are no certain, easy or right answers to guarantee success, leaders and followers literate in sustaining leadership thinking nevertheless understand that it is still possible to work through such intractable issues rather than succumb to threat rigidity (i.e. being paralysed by fear and unable to act) or pretend that they do not exist. Indeed, it is possible to make sense of these conditions by adopting more holistic and interrelated approaches for leadership and to find the ways to match the ‘requisite variety’ Boisot and McKelvey (2011) of these situations; which means that we need to be “efficaciously adaptive, the internal complexity of a system must match the external complexity” (p. 279). For deeper empirical analysis it can be tested by theories like Dunphy et al Corporate Sustainability Development Model (2007) as well as energy management indicators such as motivating drivers using the 21st century Hierarchy of Needs theory underpinned by Maslow’s work and Hock’s ‘managing relationships’ theory informing empirical analysis.

The Leadingful Leadership Literacy signifies two major shifts in 21st century leadership discourse. The first shift is theorised as a shift to a post-heroic age for leadership which turns away from leadership studies just focussing on ‘the leader’, thereby acknowledging the distributed nature, processes and practices of leadership for all. Indeed the responsibilities for leading apply to everyone in knowledge intensive enterprises, not the least to the self and in the informal roles of the enterprise. Further to this, these Leadership Literacies are located within current leadership approaches
and discourse that privilege the social complexities of leadership in real time. This shift is encapsulated in Fletcher’s (2004) Post-Heroic Leadership typology of Leadership as practice: shared and distributed; leadership as social process: interactions; and leadership as learning: outcomes (pp. 647-650). Fletcher’s work is one of the few contemporary leadership theories to explicitly make links to learning as part of the leadership remit. Those concerned with the work of leadership by all rather than just focussing on the leader such as Leadership-as-Practice (Carroll et al, 2008; Raelin, 2011), also resonate with this approach and are useful theories to underpin empirical analysis of this Literacy. Furthermore, the ideas attributed to these ways of thinking about leadership are directly attributable to the seminal work of Mary Parker Follett (see for example, Follett, 1924, 1925d, 1925b, 1927, 1928, 1933, 1949; Drucker, 1995; Graham, 1995).

The Relational Leadership Literacy is closely aligned with the Leadingful Literacy and provides the means of enacting leadingful approaches by privileging relationships. These are relationships with the self, with others, with our place and purpose in the world. Uhl-Bien’s (2006) Relational Leadership Theory provides a solid foundation for this Literacy as does Drath et al’s (2008) integrative leadership ontology with a focus on outcomes rather than agents, named as ‘Direction, Alignment, Commitment’ (DAC). For empirical analyses it takes up Spillane et al’s (2004) challenge to use appropriate units of analysis for leadership studies that they regard as ‘the leadership activity constituted in the interaction of leaders, followers and their situation’ (p. 10). Post-industrial understandings of the leadership/followership/purpose trinity are also useful for bringing theory into empirical analytic conversation.

The Learningful Leadership Literacy acknowledges the significant challenges and opportunities likely to feature in the coming decades. Mindsets emanate from the times within which they were set to meet the conditions of their time. However, these thinking patterns are very difficult to dislodge. At present there may be as many as three mindsets from different periods located within the workplace. In times marked by complexity, turbulence and significant shifts, alternative sensemaking models and languages that encourage rapprochement of economic and environmental and human sustainability are required, and unlearning and relearning become key components of this learningful necessity. This cognitive reframing can be advanced by adopting theories that work with these conditions, rather than against them. Social complexity theories as well as Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) and Johansen’s (2009) uptake of the VUCA environment and how to work with it are examples of framing theories that open up possibilities for a quickening of enterprise learning metabolism. (Vaill, 1996; Hames, 2007; Ritchhart & Perkins, 2008).
4.5 Conclusion

These Leadership Literacies explicate a means to interrogate leadership in times of complexity and turbulence that marked the beginning of the 21st century. They provide the means to surface underlying assumptions based on mindsets from the Industrial, Information and Knowledge Eras that contribute to the complexities of knowledge-intensive enterprises. Furthermore, they provide space to reflect and consider the significance of such changes and challenges at a time when, to extend Hames’s (2007) earlier aphorism a little further, if the ‘Industrial Age is indeed ending, it is not because we are likely to run out of industry per se, rather it will be because it is time to rethink how we live’.

As part of the warrant of the American Pragmatist philosophy that underpins this emergent research design, I have used abductive logic and deep reflexive practice to identify these Leadership Literacies and their underpinning theories. I was buoyed by the presence of other ‘agents acting in parallel’ clearly expressing similar responses to what I have found. In particular, my Leadership Literacies accord with research findings from the well regarded IBM report of 2010. Recalling this report, as discussed in Chapter 3, it found that over 1500 ‘private and public sector leaders believed that a rapid escalation of ‘complexity’ was the biggest challenge confronting them’ (Berman & Korsten, 2010 p. 3). Their findings of what leaders regarded as the required qualities in the next five years (p. 24) are very similar to those conceptualised as Worldly, Sustaining and Leadingful Leadership Literacies. That my inquiry aligns with these ideas is an example of ‘many agents acting in parallel’ understandings afforded by Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) theory.

Indeed, now they have been identified, the challenge is to empirically explore these largely intangible concepts defined as Leadership Literacies. It is expected that the inquiry will result in data to make interpretations about what the testing of the Leadership Literacies means for the Leadership Literacies themselves as well as the site of the inquiry, that tests them. The research focus of this inquiry is about leadership for professional staff working in universities. The case is Australia, therefore before focussing specifically on professional staff in Chapter 6, their site, Australian universities, is introduced in the next chapter. This Chapter situates the broader contexts for leadership, discussed in Chapter 3, as relevant for the site of this inquiry. It also tests for signs of theorisation of the Leadership Literacies more broadly within Australian higher education. Then, in Chapter 6, the focus will return to professional staff working in Australian universities to inquire about their lived experiences of work and leadership in the early part of the 21st century.

49 A key element of complex adaptive systems (CAS).
Chapter Five | Testing Times for Australian Higher Education Leadership

The purpose of this chapter is threefold: first, it outlines the reasons for locating Australian universities as context for this inquiry by presenting a general picture of its higher education sector. Second, it serves as a bridge between Australian universities as the site of this inquiry and the previous chapters, locating more broadly important contexts for leadership studies. Third, it introduces professional staff, the people who work in ‘other than’ academic positions in Australian universities as the focus of the research. This chapter addresses the applicability of the Leadership Literacies Framework to the site of professional staff work, that of Australian universities. It does this by identifying the extent to which there may be theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies evidenced in policy and theory relating to Australian universities. Once this broader context is addressed and these Leadership Literacies explored within it, attention turns in the next chapter to the ‘lived experience’ of work and leadership given by a cohort of professional staff in Australian universities.

My interest in this site and the people who work there, is due to my standpoint as a practice-led researcher. As stated in the introduction, my interest began as a growing sense of disquiet regarding my work and the sector. By the mid-2000s I had juxtaposed my own, personal and faculty, experiences of continually trying to do more with less while maintaining promised high standards of service delivery, with the realisation that Australia was not meeting international averages of knowledge nation indicators (OECD, 2007). When I joined these ‘dots’, an ensuing powerful sense of disquiet led me to pursue research. These ‘dots’ are similar to what Winefield et al (2008) describe as key sources of occupational stress “insufficient funding and resources, work overload, poor management practice, job insecurity and insufficient recognition and reward” (p. 21). This experience also led me to look more broadly at leadership literature in order to consider wider implications for leadership in times of change in the sector.

5.1 The Australian Higher Education Sector as Context

As I have argued earlier, leadership is a socially complex phenomenon dependent on context. It is first necessary, therefore, to capture the context and conditions in which professional staff work. The contexts to be discussed in this section are the wider implications of global higher education, and how the idea of the university has changed over the past fifty years, as influenced by neoliberal agendas. All of these factors contribute as possible contestations in the workplace of 21st century Australian universities. I begin with the global nature of higher education systems and their contribution to nation-building capacities. Over a decade ago Meek et al (1991)
summarised factors that were converging to shape and manage global higher education systems. These are congruent with the contexts within wider leadership literature discussed in Chapter 3, in terms of mindsets; language and power relations; and complexity. They stated:

…financial stringency, increased demand, effective articulation between higher and other education sectors, labour market priorities, aging populations, changes in the structure of the ‘welfare state’, and the interests of minority groups. Increasing participation and the transformation of higher education from ‘elite’ to ‘mass’ systems inevitably leads to much larger community involvement and makes higher education more of a ‘political issue’. Financial pressures, and the wish of governments to get more value per dollar, appear to be driving higher education systems to change, as does the wish for higher education to be more closely tied to national economies, both in terms of meeting national labour market needs and through research discovering new products or resources. (p. 451).

Underpinning this is the importance of knowledge—its creation, production and dissemination—as a driver of economic growth, a factor that directly links a strong and vibrant higher education sector with economic prosperity and collective good. This is recognised by supranational entities such as UNESCO and the OECD (2007):

Information and communication technologies, globalization of economic activity and the trend towards greater personal autonomy and responsibility have changed the education demands of individuals and nations. Education is also increasingly considered an investment in the collective future of societies and nations, rather than simply the future success of individuals (p. 7).

Most nations perceive their higher education sectors as both prestigious and high status (Marginson, 2008b pp. 7-9, 2011 p. 429) as well as signifiers of their contribution to public goods (Stiglitz, 1999; Marginson, 2011). Their citizens generally regard the sector as both a right and a ‘collective good’ (Evans, 2008 p. 277-278). Australia is no exception (Considine et al, 2001; Marginson, 2002; Lopez et al, 2008; Crossick, 2010; Mellow & Woolis, 2010). From the turn of this century, higher education has been a major contributor to Australia’s export earnings, peaking in 2007 when education exports were 5.6% of total exports, behind only coal and iron ore (Hall & Hooper, 2008). However, investment in Australia’s higher education does not compare well against international comparisons, having a consistent record of falling below international averages (OECD, 2005, 2007).

In this context, policy related to higher education is important. However, adopting a CMS standpoint, it is argued that policy reform is also a values-laden activity. Marginson (2011) confirmed this in his reminder that “the nature of higher education is policy-determined; and while limited by its form of production these are themselves open to politically-driven change” (p. 413). In a relatively short period of time in Australia, government policy has made considerable change to the ‘idea of the idea of the university’ (Rothblatt, 1997). This is illustrated by a major shift in thinking that has redefined universities in Australia from the Menzies Era [1949-1966 (Knott, nd)] to
present day. In the 1960s, Prime Minister Menzies, a staunch advocate of university autonomy, set policy to “consistently refrain from interfering in their work with what I call political executive directions” (1964 p. 13). This changed in the 1980s when, like most Western governments of that time, the Australian government began to engage with neoliberal ‘market forces' economics. This period, still referred to as the Dawkins Era, based on the (Dawkins) Higher Education: A Policy Statement [White Paper] (1988), signalled the government’s intention “to tie education to the national economic interest very tightly” (Laming 2001, p. 260). This represented, claimed Laming (2001), the “transition from the traditional Labor commitment to social justice to an economic rationalist approach…efficiency and economy became the two catchwords of the period” (p. 260). Dawkins had no qualms about applying “political executive direction” (Menzies 1964, p. 3). By the 21st century, the higher education sector, as well as the public sector more broadly, is operating within what is loosely referred to as a mixed economy50 (Orchard, 1998; Marsh, 2002; Sharrock, 2012). Now, the autonomy that Menzies advocated is no longer favoured. Instead, there are responsibilities for both public reporting and compliance (as indicated by the raft of government reporting regimes), as well as private interest and competition in the market for student places and staff (in line with neoliberal market forces economics). Sharrock (2012) argues that “Australian public universities reflect this trend, in accelerated form...[confirming] that the transition has been rapid” (p. 323). These significant and rapid changes in a relatively short period introduced competing values and cultures, themselves products of the conditions of the Menzies and Dawkins eras, as well as those emerging from 21st century notions of ‘the idea of the university’. This redefinition of the ‘idea of the idea of the university’ in Australia, framed by neoliberal agendas, has been noticed and critiqued in Australia, notably by critical theorists (i.e. Considine et al, 2001; Biggs & Davis, 2002; Marginson, 2004), and feminists (for example, Davies, 2003; Richter & Buttery, 2004; Blackmore, 2005). These perspectives, surfacing the ideological drivers for current conditions, are also tempered with more sympathetic attitudes to this form of management in Australian universities. Sharrock (2012) argues that these “focus on new tasks emerging for institutional leaders as their enterprises contend with the demands and dilemmas of the new higher learning context” (p. 324). Furthermore, he argues that ideological critiques aiming to "crack the code of corporate managerialism" typically lack workable alternatives to managing in a mixed economy (p. 324). My arguments, set within the CMS framework of this inquiry, frame these conditions as 'produced'. Nevertheless, I
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50 This is not an easy concept to define, it alludes to a mix economic of freedom as well as government regulation, thereby dealing with public and private governance.
share Sharrock’s calls for “complementarity of scholarly and managerial agendas” in Australian higher education (p. 325). My interest in understanding what lies beneath, as context for our work, is also to seek complementarity (indeed, rapprochement is one of the subjects of my reflections in the concluding chapter) and ways to do so, with approaches such as Complexity Leadership Theory (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009) theorised within bureaucratic environments.

These contexts contribute to the ambiguities that are a part of the everyday work of university staff today. With these considerations in mind, I argue that the idea of leadership, as well as the idea of the university, are under considerable pressure. This is partly due to neoliberal technical activities encroaching upon the creative energies of staff, as well as reducing the space that leadership usually occupies. All the while inklings of such redefinitions remain ‘un-discussable’, further adding to the many ambiguities and complexities of work. This dissonance is captured by Lee (2005):

... the current situation in relation to government funding is that the increase of regulatory intervention and audit by Government is in inverse relationship to the proportion of universities’ incomes from Government sources. This state of affairs hangs in a precarious balance with enormous longer-term implications for the future of the governance of the educative work of Universities (p. 26).

Sentiments such as Lee’s are deeply held by people working in higher education, as evidenced by the earlier Universities in Crisis Inquiry (Collins J. (Chair) et al., 2001). There are now indicators that it may be timely to consider alternatives, particularly options that articulate good governance as having equal responsibility for social, environmental and financial energies. Many of these indicators are captured in the Sustaining Leadership Literacy, derived from broader discussions about sustainability as zeitgeist in Chapter 3. Even though it is extremely hard work to shift the status quo and the invisible powers that shape the psychological and ideological boundaries of participation, it is timely to imagine more sustaining alternatives for leadership and economic management models for 21st century universities. As a practice-led researcher, the purpose of my thesis is to define such Leadership Literacies, encapsulating these significant changes, in order to provide these as sensemaking frames for the consideration of professional staff in Australian universities. Not only are these leadership approaches more expansively theorised by the notion of Leadership Literacies, they have also been applied to a cohort that is largely underrepresented in the discourse of university leadership studies. This approach connects to what I have identified as interest in alternatives, particularly evident since the Global Financial Crisis (Shiller, 2008) that have shaken rationalist so-called ‘certainty’. Leadership in
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51 VeneKlasen & Miller (2002) explain this as: “Significant problems and issues are not only kept from the decision-making table, but also from the minds and consciousness of the different players involved, even those directly affected by the problem. By influencing how individuals think about their place in the world, this level of power shapes people’s beliefs, sense of self and acceptance of the status quo – even their own superiority or inferiority. Processes of socialisation, culture and ideology perpetuate exclusion and inequality by defining what is normal, acceptable and safe”.
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these terms has deep resonance with Follett’s expanded notion of purpose as “invisible leader” (1933 p. 172) and its rallying capacities for energy management and staff morale. For example, Fullan and Scott (2009) argue for ‘turnaround leadership for higher education’ to address, with agility, such challenges. They define this work as:

…shifting the focus to strategic thinking requires a considerable change in culture. To survive and thrive in uncertain context of the 21st century, universities have to shift from a propensity to engage in ready, ready, ready (have a subcommittee, conduct a review, etc.) to ready, fire, aim—a process in which ready is a need to act, fire is to try out a potentially viable response under controlled conditions, and aim is to articulate what works best and scale this up once it has been tested and refined (p. 85).

In this chapter, I am interested in capturing any signs of these shifts in relation to Australian university leadership theorisations, whilst at the same time acknowledging that these shifts are more global in nature and affect many nations and industries.

5.2 University Leadership in Australia

Despite not being a major focus in Australia during the period of this inquiry (2008-2011), research into leadership in higher education had earlier been comprehensively addressed by Ramsden (1998). Indeed, his engagement with leadership in Australian universities, although not the first to do so, is regarded as a seminal moment in Australian and global higher education discourse. Ramsden’s work connects many of the leadership concerns, identified in the broader leadership literature used to underpin the Leadership Literacies, with the work of universities. This is evident in his encouragement for “people to address this seemingly depressing future with vigour, energy and optimism [in the]…sharp and stimulating times…when leadership comes into its own” (p. 3). The tenor of Ramsden’s work predates arguments for working with complexity, now evident in leadership literature, (Uhl-Bien & Marion’s (2009) Complexity Leadership Theory, for example). The title, Learning to lead in higher education, is prescient, considering the emergent interest in learning as integral to the work of leadership (at the heart of the Learningful Leadership Literacy). Theorisation of higher education leadership in the UK, where Ramsden now resides, is very active. This is indicated by the establishment of the UK Leadership Foundation for Higher Education in 2004, as well as publication of several research reports in the period of this inquiry (see for example, Bolden et al, 2008a; Herrmann, 2008; Bolden et al, 2009; Bryman, 2009).

Another notable work is Elaine Martin’s Changing Academic Work: Developing the Learning University (1999). Connecting student learning theory with then nascent ‘learning organisation’ literature to frame her study, Martin captured the effects of change in academic work through the lived experience of academics. In this snapshot

52 This concept has also been taken up on the methodology of this thesis.
of change in the UK and Australia, Martin (1999) reflected that it did “not make happy reading. They paint a picture of despondence and frustration, with the occasional pocket of optimism” (p. 13). The research revealed 60% of leaders, as well as 80% of academics (in non-leadership positions), complained that accountability was excessive (p. 17). Their concern was “not with accountability itself, but with the battery of accountability mechanisms which they saw as getting in the way of real work” (p. 17).

In addition, Martin captured the effects of change on people, something that I emulate in the next chapter, albeit with a different cohort of university staff. She found that while 77% of leaders felt ‘undervalued’, so did 88% of academics (in non-leadership positions) [p. 21]. Two statements from contributors to Martin’s (1999) study are especially poignant, and support my argument that energy management is a key leadership responsibility in the 21st century:

The first, airs frustration: “I feel like the miller’s daughter in Rumpelstiltskin. Each day I do the impossible, I perform the miracle—but there is only greed for more, never gratitude for what I am doing” [Senior Lecturer, Social Science] (p. 21).

The next is simply heartbreaking: “I gave to my work what I should have given to my family, I now have no family ... and soon may have no job” [Lecturer, Economics] (p. 22).

Both Ramsden’s and Martin’s contributions, at the close of last century, still have much to offer current leadership studies for Australian universities. In the next section, reports detailing policy and research activity of interest to leadership in Australian universities, are discussed and analysed for signs of theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies.

5.2.1 To What Extent Are The Leadership Literacies Being Theorised In Australian Universities?

In the two major governmental reviews affecting Australian higher education during the period of my inquiry, 2008-2011, there was little direct mention of leadership. The Review of Innovation in Australia (Cutler, 2008) was focused on research capacities of universities, while the Review of Australian Higher Education (Bradley et al, 2008) was charged with setting overall policy for the sector until 2020. Closer inspection of the Bradley Report draws out the few references about leadership in Australian universities. Although given the brief to set policy direction for the foreseeable future, leadership for the sector was not raised. This omission is significant however, and worthy of further analysis, given the CMS warrant of this inquiry which expects that critique “related to performativity, denaturalization and reflexivity” (Fournier & Grey, 2000 p. 17) be included. Apart from reference to a need for good governance, leadership and management in universities, there were few indications as to what this meant. However, it was assumed “universities with historically acquired status and resources, supported by good governance, leadership and management, [were] likely
to prosper under almost any set of arrangements and conditions" (p. 2). Bradley et al also made a passing statement about the Australian Learning & Teaching Council’s (ALTC) brief to include “a national grants scheme for leadership and innovation” (p. 77).

It is evident that the period of my inquiry, 2008-2011, fell between old and new funding regimes for the Australian tertiary education sector’s leadership development and research. Whilst leadership was not part of the terms of reference for the Bradley review, the Australian government had, in 2007, established the L. H. Martin Institute for Leadership and Management (LHMI) to ‘meet the urgent need in Australia and the region for high quality leadership and management education in higher education and VET institutions’. Research undertaken by the LHMI was in progress for much of the period of my inquiry. A prior source of leadership development, the Australian Vice Chancellor’s Committee (later Universities Australia), stepped out of this role at the time the LHMI was established. The commissioning of the LHMI, together with the mention of the research commitment to learning and teaching leadership in the Bradley Review (Bradley et al 2008, p. 77), suggest that there was some theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies evident in broad higher education policy direction. This policy direction, importantly, was supported by funding, signifying a commitment to change, develop or otherwise improve leadership in Australian universities to the tune of a $10 million dollar grant to establish the LHMI, as well as an earlier commitment to the ALTC’s Academic leadership capabilities for Australian Higher Education program (2005-2010), where in excess of $4.1 million had been spent in just the first two years (2005-2007) of the program (Parker, 2008 p. 3). The LHMI operates somewhat differently to the Leadership Foundation in the UK, in that its initial focus was on training for improved leadership in universities, but it nevertheless has an interest in research into leadership for the sector. Given this, and that the Bradley Review had singled out the ALTC as a source for research funding for leadership in Australian universities, I now turn attention to the ALTC.

In 2006 the ALTC (then Carrick Institute) established the Academic leadership capabilities for Australian Higher Education program, based on an initial review by Marshall (2006). The ALTC adopted a much broader remit that the traditional ‘heroic’ leader standpoint (mentioned in Chapter 4) to embrace the work of leading within learning and teaching work in universities. Marshall’s blueprint gave attention to broader concepts regarding the work of leadership that also underpin the Leadingful Leadership Literacy. This is shown in the vision for critical, integrated and co-ordinated
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engagement of this proposed research. Marshall also identified people likely to be active in these endeavours as "academic staff appointed to formal leadership positions in learning and teaching; followed by mainstream academic staff responsible for convening units of study; and professional staff" (the subject of my inquiry) [p. 9]. He further argued that “central to our effectiveness in learning and teaching, or leadership and management, is our capacity to develop and maintain productive and harmonious working relationships with others” (p. 12), thus confirming theoretical congruence between the sector and the Relational Leadership Literacy I identified. Importantly, he theorised a vision for this work to be “systemic, multi-faceted, coherent, use a variety of policy instruments; and be guided by the principles of critical action learning” (pp. 13-14).

The Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching research program funded 61 projects from 2006, in three leadership categories: positional/structural institutional leadership; distributed institutional leadership; and disciplinary/cross-disciplinary leadership (overviews provided by Parker, 2008 pp. 29-60). Each were funded “to strengthen leadership and build the capacity to lead change for the future enhancement of learning and teaching in Australian higher education” (ALTC, 2011 p. ii). Despite the broader remit proposed by Marshall, but perhaps explained by the attention to learning and teaching, these projects focus exclusively on academic staff. Even within the completed distributed leadership projects (Parker 2008, p. 42), professional staff remain under-theorised, except for a mention of the need to explore their inclusion further in a project that undertook a meta-analysis of finalised distributed leadership projects (Jones & Ryland, 2011 p. 21). This is interesting, given emerging interest in the UK on the rise of the ‘blended professional’ (Whitchurch, 2009) evident in learning and teaching environments in universities.

While acknowledging this absence of mention of professional staff, the purpose of this chapter was to nevertheless explore the context for professional staff work within Australian universities, for signs of theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies. Two reports from this program were selected for this task. The first focused on leaders, and the other on the work of leading. A thematic and descriptive analysis of these published reports located indicators of theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies. This analysis was undertaken to the descriptive level (Thomson, 2011) of empirical analysis in this chapter. This analysis is brought into conversation in the concluding chapter, with the investigation for signs of experience of the Leadership Literacies undertaken in Chapter 6, exploring the work of professional staff working in universities.
Chapter 5 | Testing Times for Australian Higher Education Leadership

**Report 1: The Learning Leaders in Times of Change Report**

This first report was prepared by Scott, Coates & Anderson (2008) from their investigation to identify capabilities and competencies that characterise productive ways for learning and teaching leaders to lead in times of significant change. This report is still widely regarded as a salient contribution to leadership studies in Australian higher education.

It was clear from the outset that the *Learning Leaders in Times of Change* Report had affinities with the supporting theories underpinning the Leadership Literacies conceptualised in this thesis. Similar to the sources of leadership literature I reviewed for this thesis, the Scott et al (2008) report is grounded in post-heroic leadership studies literature with very little to recommend heroic understandings of leadership, save perhaps for the inclusion of generic and role-specific competencies in their model. Even then, when discussing the competency components they acknowledge that these only include competencies:

> that are known to be instrumental in effective academic leadership ... [framed by] competency movement and to the development of lists of discrete tasks to be performed to set standards, and the key knowledge incumbents of particular roles are expected to possess (p. 25).

At no time do the authors suggest that these competencies are enough on their own, which further critiques heroic models of leadership studies. Indeed they state quite strongly that:

> the possession of these skill and knowledge components of academic competence is necessary but not sufficient for effective performance as a leader. For this to occur the capabilities [in this model] have to be present and all five components have to work in an integrated and productive way over time (p. 26).

The Academic Leadership Capability Framework used in the Scott et al (2008) report is shown in Figure 4:

**Figure 4: Academic Leadership Capability Framework**

![Figure 4: Academic Leadership Capability Framework](Scott et al, 2008 p. 18)
The next part of the discussion takes each Leadership Literacy in turn and looks for signs of the particular leadership literacy in the Scott et al (2008) report. This process used descriptive analysis to explore this text for signs of the Leadership Literacies. The intention of this analysis was to determine whether theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies in the place where professional staff work, the Australian higher education sector, before they were to be explored in more depth with professional staff working in universities.

**Worldly Leadership Literacy**

The Report clearly identifies an imperative for leaders to understand the contexts in which they work. It draws on Wheeler et al’s contention that “the effectiveness of leaders depends, more than is generally realized, on the context around them” (Wheeler in, Scott et al, 2008 xv). Indeed, the Report devotes a whole chapter to ‘new contexts of academic leadership’ (2008, pp. 29-48). The Report also criticises past reliance on ‘competencies’ (a similar critique to that of Bolden & Gosling (2006) in the UK) as unsuitable and unhelpful when seeking to lead in the turbulent times in which higher education leadership is situated. Instead, they prefer the term capabilities (p. 11). This distinction suggests a more worldly and nuanced understanding of the complexities, ambiguities and uncertainties addressed in the everyday work in universities. Indeed, in recommending that we “get comfortable with paradox” (p. 15), they connect to the Worldly Leadership Literacy to convey a deeper level of understanding of context for the 21st century university than what otherwise might by simply addressing levels of ‘competency’. The authors suggest managing paradox be framed as “the ability to figure out where to put the ‘and’ when seeking to balance, for example, top-down and bottom-up strategies to change management, listening and leading, stability and change, work and family” (p. 15).

The Report, as early as the second page of the ‘about this study’ section, articulates a worldly understanding of the interrelated nature of ‘change forces’ that leaders in Australian universities are experiencing, where the term ‘wisely’ can be easily matched with the Worldly Leadership Literacy I have identified. The authors draw on Fullan’s contention that “to remain viable, universities must build their capacity to respond promptly, positively and wisely to this interlaced combination of ‘change forces’” (Scott et al, 2008 p. vi). There is also a sense of awareness of the wider world in this part of the Report, evident in the inner world connections back to participants as well as wider world connections to literatures from around the globe to inform their inquiry. Specific interpretations of the Worldly Leadership Literacy within the document include the
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“recognition that ‘culture counts’ (pp. xvii & 85) and the intimate and reciprocal interconnections necessary for individual and organisational capabilities (p. 85). This is summarised in their discussion about implications of the study, to theorise that:

leaders can shape culture (‘how we do things around here’) by modelling the behaviours that count, by actively reinforcing them in others and actively discouraging negative behaviours…the culture that this study…repeatedly found works best concentrated on student outcomes and is reciprocal … It is important for academic leaders to recognise that the top ranking items for individual leadership capability are identical to the values that pervade a positive, change capable culture and…in this way individual and organisational capability are intimately connected (p. 85).

Several references were given to "moral imperative for universities" (p. 39), suggesting a need for leaders to focus on issues bigger than the individual. The Report mentions of OECD (2008) research on leadership in school education that emphasised that "leadership is more than just technique or timing; it is about the morally purposeful pursuit of change beyond individual achievement for collective commitment to challenge inequality—in its broadest sense" (OECD in Scott et al 2008, p. 16).

These examples provide strong indications of theoretical congruence between the leadership capabilities identified in the Report and the Worldly Leadership Literacy. This paves the way to explore next whether there is mention of the Sustaining Leadership Literacy in the Report.

**Sustaining Leadership Literacy**

The Report focussed on sustainable practice as a hallmark of effective leadership. It states as a finding that “across all roles, being able to implement initiatives successfully and sustainably is seen to be a critical factor for effective leadership” (p. xvi). This fits with the Report’s identification of global warming as a ‘new context of academic leadership’, where “the impact of global warming and environmental (and social) sustainability have emerged as key political, national, international, research and learning themes for the new century” (p. 31). This clearly fits within the worldly understanding argued in this thesis—that locates sustainability as a key concern, and indeed responsibility, for 21st century leadership. The Report also identified “strong support for the triple bottom line—economic, social and sustainability outcomes” (p. 137) as a key leadership capability necessary for shaping and developing a change capable culture in universities.

In summary, theoretical congruence with the Sustaining Leadership Literacy I have identified was also confirmed. The next two Literacies address the means to enact the leadership responsibilities I have identified within the remit of the Worldly and Sustaining Leadership Literacies.
Leadingful and Relational Leadership Literacies

Given that Scott et al. (2008) discussed these concepts as intertwined, they were taken together for analysis in this case. The Report begins with reference to Ramsden’s argument that leadership in universities is everyone’s business, re-quoting his claim that:

a practical and everyday process of supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues … leadership in universities can and should be exercised by everyone, from the vice chancellor to the casual parking attendant (Ramsden, in Scott et al. 2008, p. 1).

This clearly situates the ‘work’ of leadership as exercised by all. The Leadership Capability Framework presented in the Report includes personal (self-regulation, decisiveness and commitment [p. 22]) and interpersonal (influencing and empathising [p. 23]) capabilities. It argues that:

it is important for leaders first to be able to manage their own emotional reactions…and to have a high level of interpersonal capability in order to better understand what is happening and to sort out what might work best to resolve the situation (p. 19).

The Leadingful Leadership Literacy is further illustrated in comments like:

As the study unfolded it also became clear that direct attention to formulating a set of more clearly defined, complementary and distributed leadership roles for learning and teaching was necessary. This was confirmed at the study’s national and international workshops (p. 57).

In summary, there appeared to be theoretical congruence with these Leadingful and Relational Literacies. Indeed, the research underpinning this report showed congruence by referring to “the territory of leadership—what a distributed system of academic leadership might best focus upon and the indicators that can be used to judge effective performance” (p. 68). It also outlined ‘capabilities that count most for the effective delivery of each role’ under consideration in their study of learning and teaching leadership roles.

Learningful Leadership Literacy

A strong linkage between what I theorise as ‘learning metabolism’ and how it is taken up by the authors can be found in their discussions about the necessary capabilities needed for leaders. They proposed that:

capable learning and teaching leaders need more than the knowledge and skills … they need the intellectual, personal and interpersonal capacity to respond in effective ways to new situations as they arise. In this sense capability comprises the ability to identify and self-regulate [their own] leadership learning and development (p. 12).

---
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Furthermore, a connection to ‘unlearning’ is found in the executive summary, where the authors report that “it has become very clear, in analysing the extensive…data generated by the study, that current approaches to leadership development in higher education need to be radically reconceptualised” (p. xvii). The implications they made from this discovery were that learning and development activities for university learning and teaching leaders should focus on the need to:

- ‘practice what we preach’ (i.e. to model what they do when seeking to engage and retain their students by being more learner- and active learning-centred, to foster reflective practice and be change-focused [p. 102]);
- Concentrate on capabilities that count, using case-based and problem-based learning (p. 103);
- target support networks for people in the same role (p. 103);
- develop online Leadership Evaluation and Development Resource (LEADR) [p. 104].

Whilst the subjects of focus in the Scott et al (2008) report were largely academic teaching and learning leaders, discussions in this report making connections between learning and leadership are important ones for the sector more broadly. As will be discussed in depth in the next chapter, it is my contention that the positioning of learning as a key leadership concern is of relevance to professional staff in universities too.

Whilst the focus on learning goes no further than ‘learning about leadership’ in their Report, the notion of learning metabolism I have discussed expects timely and cognisant responses, not only about leadership, but also to much broader strategic learning for responsiveness to threats and opportunities of the enterprise. I could find no mention of this broader application of learning metabolism. However, the importance of learningful dispositions, foundational to the broader work implied by learning metabolism, were found. The authors assign a chapter, ‘learning leadership’ (pp. 91-106) to develop theory about “how leaders prefer to learn and develop their capabilities and what they want their leadership development to focus upon” (p. 91). The theorisation of the Learningful Leadership Literacy is thereby indicated.

In summary, the thematic analyses of this Report suggests theoretical resonance between the project and the Leadership Literacies I have identified. The next report is concerned with projects relating to distributed learning in Australian universities.


The second report chosen for this analysis is by Jones and Ryland (2011). It was the result of a meta-analysis of four ALTC leadership projects funded to investigate distributed leadership in higher education. I expected at the outset that a Report
focussed on distributed leadership would have resonance with at least the *Leadingful Leadership Literacy* I was exploring. My analysis indicates that there is congruence with all of the Leadership Literacies, save for a specific reference to environmental sustainability within the *Sustaining Leadership Literacy*.

**Worldly Leadership Literacy**

The Report clearly conveys congruence with a worldly mindset, evidenced by clearly articulated values towards:

...acceptance of trust rather than relying on regulation as a basis for leadership ... and that participants need to be able to see their 'self' in relation to others and recognise their interdependence rather than being ego-centric ... and by working independently but also accepting responsibility for the collective (p. 12).

This connects with the interrelated nature of the Worldly Leadership Literacy that locates individuals within the wider world, as well as connecting to their inner worlds (intra- and inter-personal). This is necessary to shift focus from "individual activities to collaboration", a main feature of this Report (pp. 13 & 28) and to be expected in ‘Leadingful’ leadership theories such as distributed leadership, as discussed in Chapter 4. Specific interpretations of the *Worldly Leadership Literacy* within the document included an awareness of culture (pp. 10 & 12) and the need to develop dynamic processes that move "beyond evaluation" (p. 27). Unlike the Scott Report analysed previously, there is mention of professional staff within their scope for distributed leadership approaches for learning and teaching within universities. Like the Scott et al (2008) Report, they also locate leadership activity as situated broadly within the work of universities. The Report also conveyed an understanding of the broader implications of this work and the challenges associated in this setting. They situate these conditions, and notably include professional staff, as a :

...process of significant change as it seeks to respond to the many and varied challenges upon it. These pressures require both institutional change and individual change for all employees in universities, whether they are academic, administrative or professional staff. These changes have led to much discussion about what constitutes leadership in higher education and how to build systematic, multi-faceted and collaborative leadership capacity (p. 21).

In summary, there was evidence in this Report that theoretical congruence with the *Worldly Leadership Literacy* was indicated.

**Sustaining Leadership Literacy**

Whilst there was no mention of ecological sustainability in the Report, there were indicators that human sustainability and sustaining practices underpinned the outcomes of the Report, which was itself a synthesis of earlier projects that focussed on embedding leadership as a participative concept. One of the outcomes of the Report was a self-evaluative enabling tool to assist the implementation of distributed leadership by positioning this tool as a “set of indicators for institutions ... upon which
institutions can take action by identifying what needs to be done and the priorities for action” (p. 13). This suggests strong intent by the researchers to embed sustaining leadership practices in learning and teaching.

Save for the self-evaluative enabling tool, this report showed few other indications of engagement with the sustaining leadership literacy.

**Leadingful Leadership Literacy**

This Report synthesised earlier ALTC Reports funded to explore distributed leadership in Australian universities. Therefore, it closely aligns with one of the foundational tenets of this Leadership Literacy, that is, distributed leadership theory that moves the spotlight from leader to the work of leading, in this case within knowledge-intensive work within Australian universities. Unsurprisingly, there were many signs of congruence between the Report and the **Leadingful Leadership Literacy**. One of the outcomes of the synthesis of these projects was to consolidate thinking about the importance of “the hybrid nature of Distributed Leadership that values working with, rather than replacing formal leaders” (p. 1). Furthermore, they recognised the magnitude of the task ahead for “capacity development for both formal and informal leadership with higher education institutions” (p. 4). The ASERT framework was produced in response to this challenge, from the express values drivers to “move from individual activities to collaboration” focus (p. 13) and “from top-down to bottom-up leadership style” (p. 12). This task was made all the more evident when their synthesis found that in practice there was yet “little evidence of the effectiveness of distributed leadership in institutions, with most participants claiming that examples were in their early stages and no measures of effectiveness had yet been developed” (p. 7).

One of the most striking affinities between this Report and the **Leadingful Leadership Literacy**, was not the clear theoretical congruence, rather that these theories were clearly embodied in the practice of the researchers. The title, the action-orientated methodology, even the reflections in the Report all conveyed a deep engagement with leadingful practice. An example, epitomising this propensity, is recorded in reflections of critical success factors captured, as the:

> active engagement of all members of the reference group in preparing for the meetings and contributing ideas provided new insights that assisted the project team to progress the outcomes from the project beyond what had originally been envisaged (p. 24).

These reflections closely align with the **Relational Leadership Literacy** (and the two Leadership Literacies were also found to be entwined in the Scott et al report). Theoretical congruence with the **Leadingful Leadership Literacy** was strongly indicated.

---

57 Drawing here on Gronn (2011).
58 Acronym for Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool.
Relational Leadership Literacy

As noted, this Leadership Literacy closely aligns with the Leadingful Leadership Literacy and given its strong confirmation, a similar result was expected. Indeed, this was so. There were particular references to intra- and inter-personal understandings, which closely align with my theorisations of leadingful relations. For example "self-in-relation" (p. 12) was discussed, as was a call for reflective processes (p. 1), and the ASERT model privileging concerned with "action, self-enabling and reflection" (p. 13). Further to this, a sense of ‘growth-in-connection’ with a focus on “mutuality where boundary between self and others is more fluid and multi-directional” (p. 12), along with a “shift of focus from individual activities to collaboration” (p. 13) epitomise the Relational Leadership Literacy. Theoretical congruence with the Relational Leadership Literacy was also strongly indicated.

Learningful Leadership Literacy

An emphasis on ‘collective learning’ was named as one four practices required to broaden leadership from a positional to a relational distributed leadership concept (p. 12). This was theorised as “collective learning through learning conversations progressing through a four stage dialogue of ‘talking nice’, ‘talking tough’, ‘reflective dialogue’ and ‘generative dialogue’ ” (p. 12). This very much captures the essence of the integral role that learning has with leadership, necessary for the complex environments of knowledge-intensive work. It closely resonates with what I have described in this thesis as a ‘conversations first, then relationships, then transactions’ approach. Theoretical congruence with the Learningful Leadership Literacy was indicated.

In conclusion, the thematic analysis of these two reports clearly indicate theoretical congruence with their work and the Leadership Literacies I have identified. Scott et al (2008) report was a bigger study, and therefore discussed in more detail their rationale, underpinning theories and standpoints that underpinned their research. These coincidentally closely aligned with all of my Leadership Literacies, and the similarities regarding contexts such as sustainability and triple bottom line governance were striking. The second, smaller study by Jones & Ryland (2011) also indicated close theoretical affinities with all the Leadership Literacies, except for the context of environmental sustainability. This second report also conveyed a commitment on the part of the researchers to the practice of distributed leadership. Both Reports were also deeply interested in the individual’s capacity to change, which I stated in the introduction as a key driver for my inquiry. This suggests strong indications of theoretical congruence with the Leadership Literacies and the two reports, Learning Leaders in Times of Change (Scott et al 2008) and the Lessons Learnt: Identifying Synergies in Distributed Leadership Projects (Jones & Ryland 2011).
This location of congruence is a necessary bridge between the wider context of leadership studies explored in Chapters 3 and 4 and leadership studies within university and academic settings as the site of professional staff work and leadership practices. This congruence as well as a similar focus of leadership context and response found in the IBM report by Berman & Korsten (2010) discussed in chapter four, provide a clear warrant to take this inquiry further into the realms of the work of professional staff in Australian universities.

5.3. Professional Staff in Australian Universities

Whilst my discussions and thematic analysis above identified significant congruence between the Leadership Literacies I have identified and the various academic writings, government reports and government funded practices to build leadership capacity (at least in the area of learning and teaching), these have been largely to the exclusion of professional staff. In a publication arising from the second analysed report, Jones et al (2012) acknowledge that professional staff were under-theorised within distributed leadership higher education research in Australia. Furthermore, they argue that more research which includes professional staff needs to be undertaken about leadership in Australian universities. Jones et al (2012) reflect that:

Given the learning and teaching focus of the ALTC projects it is not surprising that the focus of attention has been on engaging academics in the distributed leadership process. What is interesting...are the findings that place emphasis on the importance of engaging academic, executive and professional staff in [these] collaborative processes ... Although not a new revelation...the experience of each of the projects was that this is not only possible, but is positively embraced by the participants (pp. 72-73).

This confirms that the focus for my thesis, and the primary research data about professional staff, recorded and analysed in the next chapter, serves to address a significant gap in higher education leadership studies. Furthermore, although absent from these accounts of leadership studies, these wider contexts and conditions explored in this chapter provide a picture about the places where professional staff work, and therefore inform my inquiry.

The reason I chose professional staff as the case for this inquiry, other than my practice-led interest, is that in the wider discourse of higher education, the views of professional staff about leadership have been largely absent. Indeed, they are under-represented in the wider Australian higher education literature (Castleman & Allen, 1995; Conway, 2000; Szekeres, 2004; Davis, 2006; Graham, 2009), despite making up 57% of the higher education workforce in Australia, or 52,850 staff (DEEWR, 2010 Table 1.7).

Given this underrepresentation, professional staff may well be viewed by some as followers in relation to formal academic leadership, especially considering the official
classification for this group is still *non-academic staff* (DEEWR, 2010). In terms of power relations, people classified by what they are not, do not generally have strong claims to power. There has been ongoing debate about the dislike of the term non-academic staff from inside the profession of tertiary education management. This has been led by Conway (2000) and in 2009 the term ‘professional staff’ was officially adopted for use by the Association for Tertiary Education Management in 2009. More recently, in a report about university staffing nomenclature, Sebalj et al (2012) found that “perspectives gathered on staffing nomenclature reflect an occupational group wanting to define itself—to be visible, to be recognised, to be valued” (p. 469). More generally though, this cohort is still under-represented in Australian higher education literature, even as professional staff fare a little better in the UK, where some published research includes professional staff perspectives about leadership and management (see for example, Bolden et al, 2008b; Whitchurch, 2008).

It is difficult to provide a detailed picture about this cohort of staff working in universities, or of the nature of work carried out by them in Australian universities given their underrepresentation in the literature. Some reasons for this were first raised by Szekeres (2004) where she claimed professional staff were ‘invisible workers’. Drawing on her later meta-analysis of extant literature published between 2004 and 2011 (2011) to serve as a contextual starting point for my inquiry, we are able to glimpse a little about the nature of work, interactions with other stakeholders and ongoing debates affecting this cohort and others in the sector. This exploration Szekeres provides valuable insight about the work of professional staff regarding their interactions with other stakeholders in the sector and how this cohort may differ in terms of leadership, if at all, from other stakeholders like academic staff. It is an appropriate grounding for the exploration of the lived experiences of professional staff who are featured in the next chapter, given that “it is clear that professional staff have carved out a new space, it is not quite clear the exact nature and size of that space” (Szekeres 2011 p. 688).

Szekeres (2011) takes five themes from modest accounts of professional staff in recent leadership and management literature. These themes include communities and culture; fragility of relationships; senior and middle management and their structures, particular roles and functions; and professionalisation as context for professional staff work. Szekeres’s (2011) begins with the observation that “ongoing debate about the effects of managerial and corporate culture on the community of the university ... prevalent at the turn of the century has not died down” (p. 682). She brings technological advances and recognition that older systems “developed for universities with a few thousand
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59 Minuted in December 2009 Minutes as Item 4.3 where “it was resolved unanimously that ATEM formally adopts the term "Professional Staff " as the sole descriptor of its membership.
students” (p. 682) are pushing limits due to the massification of education, into the discussion as examples of further challenges for communities and culture of university work. Such challenges are met, she argues, by “government regulations, accountability and reporting ... that has resulted in the growth of the mid-level professional” (p. 682).

Fragility of relationships between academic and professional staff is not a new theme (Szekeres 2004) where “professionals and academics traditionally seem to inhabit separate worlds” (2011, p. 684). Szekeres also raises professional work as sometimes relational, making a direct link to the Relational Leadership Literacy I have explored in this thesis. Here she shows the “interpretive work at the boundaries between academic work, internal constituencies and external partners” (p. 684). Szekeres then points to the contested spaces of work, particularly for senior and middle management, where structures and systems controlling the work of universities appearing to be at odds with values of individuals and groups of workers. These contestations are sometimes between managerialist structures themselves, i.e. between ‘central’ and ‘devolution’ models, and viewed as “evidence of the impact of corporatisation” (p. 685). Szekeres notes that “numbers of professional staff at middle and higher management levels have increased, while those at lower operational levels, have declined” (p. 685). As well, she finds that “most universities over the last 10 years have seen the establishment of new functional areas and project-orientated services, mostly staffed by professionals” (p. 686). Szekeres lastly discusses the professionalisation of the work of tertiary education managers in universities and identifies that:

- a number of professional associations have developed; there are some quite strong networks between various university groupings leading to induction through “professional socialization” (p. 688), even as “professional qualifications and controlled entrance to the profession might be a future goal (688).

Interestingly, Szekeres voices similar observations regarding accountability and compliance to my own in the field, that most professional staff find these approaches frustrating “as these are largely unproductive activities ... that time spent dealing with the same material, same information, the same paperwork ... drives professionals and academics alike to distraction” (p. 683).

Fragility of relationships has been explored by Sharrock (2010) in terms of differing value drivers for academic and professional staff. The boundary work Szekeres refers to resonates with the notion of the ‘blended professional’ Whitchurch (2009) who captures the blurring of boundaries between academic and professional work, in the United Kingdom. Further. Discussions about structures and systems controlling the work of universities is closely linked to power relations as context discussion given in Chapter 3, especially Skekeres’s (2011) point that corporatised “management just expands to fill whatever void exists” (685).
Selecting professional staff from Australian universities as participants serves to further illuminate these contestes spaces and the blurring of formal leadership boundaries indicative of change surrounding the work of leadership in knowledge-intensive enterprises more generally. For example, as well as being positioned as ‘followers’ professional staff may just as well be identified as people leading the changes wrought by managerialism and performativity in Australian higher education. Adding to the ambiguities captured by the selection of this cohort is the discourse of knowledge work that further blurs the boundaries of work and leadership responsibilities. As the literature in previous chapters attests, everyone working in knowledge-intensive enterprises is likely to take simultaneous responsibility for leadership (at least of the self) and followership (Drucker, 1999a; Raelin, 2003; Davenport, 2005; Chaleff, 2009; Holtshouse, 2010; Ladkin, 2010). Within higher education discourse there is also a blurring of the type of work undertaken, and this renders formal distinctions between academic and non-academic work as unlikely to keep pace with these changes, or at the least adequately capture what Whitchurch (2009) defines as a third space inhabited by ‘blended professionals’.

From my perspective as a practice-led researcher with many years experience as a Research Manager, these themes resonate with my own experiences of work in the sector. They are solid contextual foundations this inquiry about leadership for professional staff.

In the next chapter these complexities are acknowledged and captured in the accounts of the lived experience of work and leadership of professional staff. Given that it is difficult to contextualise this cohort from the available research literature because they are largely invisible in it, the next chapter serves to add their voices to the higher education leadership studies body of research. As well as eliciting observations of leadership, the demographic information collected served to build a picture of who these participants were, their credentials, the kinds of work they do, how long they have been employed in the sector, how much time they spend doing this work and their motivations bringing them to work. This data also serves the exploration of how all of these lines of inquiry impact on their conceptions and experiences of leadership.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter addressed the second of the sub-questions, as part of the multi-method frame to address the research question for this thesis *What are leadership literacies for professional staff in universities?*. Analysis in this chapter suggests indications that the Leadership Literacies are, for the most part, theorised in higher education leadership reports, even though this is more for the practice of, rather than policy related to, university leadership. This chapter served to provide the context for professional staff
experiences of leadership in Australian universities. It sets the scene to focus on professional staff in universities in the next chapter by taking an account of their lived experiences of work. It made a space to do this by looking more widely at leadership in the higher education sector to first test for signs of theorisation of the Leadership Literatures I have identified.
6.1 Introduction

Leadership Literacies for contemporary times were named in the Leadership Literacies Framework constructed in Chapter 4. This framework was explored in the last chapter for signs of theoretical congruence within the site of professional staff work, Australian universities. This exploration identified that these Leadership Literacies were congruent with theorisations of higher education leadership found in the Learning Leaders in Times of Change (Scott et al, 2008) and Lessons Learnt: Identifying Synergies in Distributed Leadership Projects (Jones & Ryland, 2011) reports. The purpose of this chapter is to consider whether the Leadership Literacies named have yet been experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities. An online survey completed by 226 professional staff captured an account of their lived experience of work and leadership in Australian universities, gathered between November 2009 and February 2010. This data was analysed for signs of observation of leadership in general and these particular Leadership Literacies in particular by this cohort of participants in this particular time period.

This is the last component of the inquiry’s ‘between methods’ methodology previously denoted as a qualitative triangulation strategy which considered looking at the research question in two different ways. The first consideration in Chapter 5 explored, through thematic analysis, for signs of theorisation of the constructed Leadership Literacies in extant research publications. This chapter now considers whether these Leadership Literacies have been experienced in the field by taking accounts of the lived experiences of a cohort of professional staff working in Australian universities. This approach uses a qualitative survey method developed for this inquiry. This understanding of triangulation, as discussed in Chapter 2, is to counter possible bias and assumptions of the ‘researcher-as-research-instrument’ by considering particular parts as well as the whole to develop evidence-based images (Ragin, 1994) from the interplay of these three points of triangulation from which to draw conclusions from the data. For this reason, the data in this chapter is treated to a deeper level of exploration of the “dialogue between ideas and evidence” (Ragin 1994, p. 56) as well as a higher level of abstraction than was used in Chapter 5.

These Leadership Literacies also enact the unifying argument of this thesis in that they are ‘social theories in practice’. In so claiming, I return the statement quoted earlier having been "shaped by the social world in which they are located and in turn help shape that social world" (Law, 2010 p. 6). Due to the emergent nature of this inquiry, no universally agreed measures or theories were yet available to represent as a whole the
social phenomena that these particular Leadership Literacies represent, or to the necessary level of abstraction and analytic empirical analysis sought. Therefore the approach for this analysis repeats the overarching research design and is necessarily framed as something to be constructed from “pieces...borrowed from elsewhere” (Maxwell 2005, p. 35) with these decisions, in turn, shaping the findings. The questions chosen to represent the Leadership Literacies are underpinned by a number of ‘borrowed’ theoretical frames to spark the necessary level of dialogue between ideas and evidence and “bring them into conversation with the relevant literatures” (Thomson 2011, p. 1) for analysis. This is not to suggest that the themes constructed as Leadership Literacies might only be represented by these particular theoretical constructs, but rather, at the time of conceptualising ways to explore the Leadership Literacies for signs of them being experienced in the field, these particular constructs resonated more strongly than others I considered. My rationale for this approach was that due the conceptualisation of the five Leadership Literacies being drawn largely from my own critical engagement and reflections of the contexts for leadership and leadership studies literature explored in Chapters 3 and 4, that this part of the inquiry needed to be grounded within transparent theoretical anchors. Given that this method designed to explore these Leadership Literacies, as well as the Leadership Literacies and their theoretical anchors were newly conceptualised for this study, they too are being tested as part of this process. For this reason time will be taken to critically reflect on these choices in the section below entitled “How the data analysis was enacted”.

Therefore, the questions themselves and how they were enabled by the qualitative survey method are very much examples of social theories in practice, shaped by and shaping these Leadership Literacies.

6.2 Framing Questions to Represent Emergent Leadership Literacies Themes

One of the new knowledge claims in this thesis is the selection of questions that represent the Leadership Literacies themes in order to undertake the deeper levels of analysis required in this chapter, assumed necessary for a doctoral inquiry in an emergent interpretive inquiry methodology. The chosen questions represent the Leadership Literacies to be analysed in concert with the data collected about respondents’ lived experiences and observations of the work of leadership in Australian universities and about their direct leader, thereby capturing observations of the ‘work of leadership’ in the field as well as looking for signs of particular behaviours observed about leaders that encourage this ‘work of leadership’. This was to acknowledge that interest in ‘the leader’ is not completely overshadowed in the post-heroic standpoints articulated in the Leadership Literacies, but rather the lens of leadership studies is expanded to be more than ‘just’ the leader. For example in basing considerations about
‘the leader’ upon Servant Leadership theory and exploring just who the participants identified as ‘their leader’ were indicators of humanistic leadership work that underpin the Leadership Literacies.

The survey instrument (Appendix 1A) was designed to connect with the cognitive frames of this inquiry which favour experience and acknowledge that lived experience is a suitable lens for human relations. To capture these the survey instrument began with a section ‘About You’, followed by ‘About Your Work’, ‘About Your Workplace’, ‘Leadership in Your Workplace’ and finally ‘About Your Leader’, and contained a total of 27 questions. The data collected was then used to populate at least one of the Leadership Literacies for analysis. A thematic schedule populated by the selected questions was constructed to guide the analysis of the data Appendix 1B. Before the survey instrument and schedule were finalised they were considered by a reference group.

Several theoretical frames support these questions and provide opportunities for dialogue between ideas and evidence for analytic level analysis. As an example of how these frames are interwoven with the analysis, the main theoretical frame for this component, the Servant Leadership Behavioural Scale (SLBS) (Sendjaya et al, 2008), is given. This approach accords with my Pragmatist Feminist ‘embodied rationality guiding principle which, as discussed in Chapter 2, promotes more expansive and holistic views of research. The SLBS was selected early in the investigation for its congruence with the leadership concerns under investigation. It consists of 35 questions used to populate the “About Your Leader” section of the survey. These 35 questions, as a set or separately, were central to the analytical process for this chapter. As well as a whole, individual questions populate several Leadership Literacy themes or sub-themes as a deliberate strategy of parsimony to limit the questions in the survey instrument to a manageable level for participants. For example, all the questions in the “About Your Leader” section, as a whole, were of special significance to the Worldly Leadership Literacy as Servant Leadership theory (along with an engagement with sustainability) is taken to represent the Worldly Leadership. Some of the individual questions in ‘About Your Leader’ were also considered to represent other Leadership Literacy themes and sub-themes, including Human Sustainability, Relational Leadership and Learning Metabolism.

The intention for this research component was that it be treated to an analytical level of analysis so that an account of the investigation be built by “forming evidence-based images” (Ragin, 1994 p. 56) of the Leadership Literacies. In this way each of these images emerges from the interplay between ‘the dialogue of ideas [the Leadership Literacies] and evidence [the data]’ (p. 1). An account in this sense is the bringing
together of these evidenced-based thematic images into a coherent narrative that elucidates the continual conversations between these images and their underlying theories, analytic frames and evidence.

Before this account is articulated, the findings from this chapter are stated and details about how the analysis was enacted, as well as outlining a picture of the participants and how they engaged with the study.

6.2.1 How the data analysis was enacted

**A Qualitative Survey approach**

Any method chosen for research is itself a lens which limits constructions of understanding by illuminating a particular set of data, meaning, evidence and findings and at the same time limits or renders others invisible. The method chosen to explore this research question is located closer to the ‘constructed’ post-positivist end of a continuum of possible qualitative methods. This decision was not taken lightly and was grounded in my commitment to emergent methodology for this interpretive inquiry in order to meet my requirements and aspirations for this part of the research. Like the particular theoretical frameworks chosen to underpin the Leadership Literacies in this chapter, this method can only really be tested in the 'doing' of it to consider whether it produced an original data set and was likely to at least move the leadership studies understandings of professional staff in universities forward.

My decision to work with this qualitative survey method emerged from the particular circumstances surrounding this research question and this particular cohort of participants. First, given that professional staff in universities are underrepresented in higher education leadership studies literature I wanted to have as many professional staff as possible participate in this part of the study. This point was a significant values driver for this inquiry's methodology grounded as it was in Critical Management Studies and an interest to 'measure from the margins'. Given this underrepresentation, the recording of a broad snapshot of data about this cohort at this time was thought a necessary approach to provide a solid grounding for future research, after this data and my interpretations were presented. Second I needed to clearly identify whether the five Leadership Literacies were being observed and experienced in professional staff practice at this time. This method was able to provide this data given these questions were grounded in particular theoretical constructs representing the Leadership Literacies. These accounts were then to be brought into conversation with the underpinning theories “forming evidence-based images” (Ragin, 1994 p. 56) of the Leadership Literacies.
Third, while the underpinning theory of Servant Leadership appeared to suit my needs, my choice to adapt the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale (SLBS) instrument (Sendjaya et al 2008) for qualitative analysis only was not without risk. Upon reflection it did frame my thinking because in it I found that many of the SLBS questions could also be used to populate other themes I was constructing for this inquiry. In constructing this qualitative survey method in response to the particular set of circumstances that emerged, it certainly opened up particular possibilities explored in the data analysis, while others were rendered moot. In using this qualitative survey instrument to locate signs of the themes I had constructed, even with the inclusion of open questions, I acknowledge this decision to be risky. It was risky because it rests on having a place for numbers and counting within a qualitative methodology. As discussed in Chapter 2, even as I attempted to liberate numbers and counting from their usual positivist frame, I understand that having them in a qualitative methodology at all will not sit comfortably with all qualitative researchers. However, to be true to the wider methodology I employed for this thesis and following the emergent arguments where they led (Kelly 2011), this is where they took me. This place was quite uncomfortable and this decision was not taken lightly. Ultimately this led me to re-interpret the conventions of the survey as method as critique to the often taken for granted assumptions that particular methods are wedded to certain epistemologies. This qualitative survey approach rests on using descriptive statistics to explore meaning, not significance (as is the case when surveys are used within positivist frames). As discussed in chapter two, this signifies that numbers are not themselves an issue for qualitative research (Maxwell 2010, p. 478), rather the underpinning positivist notions of significance are the issue. If other understandings of numbers and counting, such as indigenous constructions of meaning as “one, two, a few or many” (Schumann 2010, p. 25) the patterns that emerge from these sit quite comfortably within qualitative frames. Such patterns of meaning can then be used in similar ways that coding has been used for data reduction in qualitative inquiry for many years. There are inherent weaknesses in this method, particularly its level of constructedness and its intent to ask only questions that directly relates to the theoretical underpinnings of the Leadership Literacies. Both of these standpoints leave little opportunity for other data to emerge directly from participants. This weakness is acknowledged and weighed up against the opportunity to first look more broadly into an emerging area of leadership studies with a cohort of participants who have, to date, had very little representation in research. The Leadership Literacies to be analysed have been named as Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful. Whilst they are largely interrelated, they will be analysed in this section in this order. Snapshots represented by the patterns of descriptive statistics from data collected from closed questions in the survey, were
used as a means to analyse the data. In addition information collected through open questions inviting participant observations of their experiences of work and leadership were analysed using the principles of Framework data analysis matrices (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994). Although it is possible to undertake such analysis manually, I chose to use the software that accompanies the method for two reasons. First, I had a large cohort of participants and thus a large dataset to analyse using qualitative data analysis principles. Second, the software made it possible to easily access all levels of abstraction and make direct links between each level and the original data source through the processes of tagging summaries and indexes. This provided a clear and accessible audit trail from the raw data to the subsequent analyses and interpretation made. In this way the software lived up to its promise of resonating “with the spirit of qualitative research, facilitating a fundamentally iterative approach and the flexibility to move back and forth between different levels of abstraction” (NatCen, nd p. 4). The model uses themes (horizontal) and cases (vertical) in its matrix and in this study, populated by the Leadership Literacies themes with the questions from the survey instrument recorded as the cases. The software also allowed for the tagging of participant comments according to their unique record locator from the survey instrument, and this made it possible to move back and forth between higher levels of abstraction and the data and stories contained in each respondent’s record while maintaining anonymity of the survey participant.

6.2.2 The Participants

The participants in the survey were professional staff employed by Australian universities with a double claim to the term ‘professional’. First, in acknowledging the CMS criticism (identified in Chapter 2), that people classified by what they are not do not have strong claims to power, the term ‘professional staff’ is generally preferred to the ‘non-academic’ classification used to describe this cohort in official statistics of the sector (DEEWR, 2010). Further to this, the participants were members of a professional association, the Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM). Access to participants was secured by asking ATEM to provide their membership list and to manage the process of inviting ATEM members into the research. Along with an invitation to participate which included the plain language statement (Appendix 2B), a letter of endorsement encouraging members to participate from ATEM’s President, Dr Stephen Weller (Appendix 2A) was also included in the call out for participants. ATEM’s Secretariat managed this process so I was able to stay at arm’s length in the securing of participants, given that I was also the Association Secretary of ATEM at the time of this study. The secretariat reviewed their membership list against my criteria.
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60 Framework uses the terms index and indexing where other qualitative data analysis models and theories (for example, Grounded Theory) and other software (NVivo) might refer to these as codes and coding.
and ascertained that 800 of their 2000 members met my eligibility criteria to be: ATEM members from Australian universities (and higher education sections of dual sector universities), employed in either Higher Education Worker (HEW) or equivalent positions or in executive contract/salary positions in other than 100% academic roles. Emails containing the invitation to participate and details about the aims and purpose of the research in plain language and link to a secure online survey site as well as Dr Weller’s letter of endorsement were extended on my behalf through official ATEM channels to these eligible ATEM members. This resulted in 226 of the possible 800 ATEM members agreeing to take part in an online survey (Appendix 1A). In order to ensure anonymity of participants, ranges rather than specific data for age, role levels and university names were requested. Further, where direct quotes are provided in this chapter, pseudonyms are used to reflect the gender and role level of the respondent (for example, Ann is an Administrator, Greg is a General Manager).

What is known about this cohort is that they are a largely heterogeneous group while some hold formal leadership positions; some take on informal leadership roles; some are self directed; some manage staff, and most would be likely to fit knowledge worker descriptors. Some hold elite leadership positions, however many more are situated at the margins, in the spaces where engagement with students and other stakeholders occurs every day and where policies, leadership, management and resourcing decisions are sharply felt. Given this breadth of coverage these are good reasons for choosing professional staff to detail their lived experiences of work and leadership in Australian universities. Such heterogeneity secures a data set from a diverse range of people which will allow the data analysis to build a broad picture of experiences of leadership and work of professional staff in Australian universities.

Of the 226 participants who took part in the survey 75% were female, with this percentage corresponding with ATEM’s membership gender profile. This is indicative of the broader distribution of professional staff in the sector, with 65% of the 52,850 staff were female (DEEWR 2010, Table 1.7). This provided further warrant for my choice of Pragmatist Feminist guiding theoretical principles used to underpin the Leadership Literacies I have identified. Despite only contributing at the rate of 25% of overall respondents, males nevertheless accounted for 61% of the executive level participants, which is indicative of gender representations at senior leadership levels in Australian universities (Blackmore, 2009 p. 73; Wallace & Marchant, 2011 p. 568). When grouped by role level, Executive staff made up 10% of overall respondents and General Managers (HEW 10+) making up 20%, Managers (HEW 7-10) were the largest representative grouping, contributing 47% followed by Administrators (HEW 4-7) at 22%. Finally an ‘other’ category made up the remaining 1%. Ages were classified according to generational periods by birth year range, which split ‘Baby Boomers’ into
early and late periods\textsuperscript{61}. The largest grouping were Generation Jones (1954-1965) (or late Boomers) at 50\%, earlier Boomers (1944-1953) added 13\% with the total for the classic ‘Baby Boomers’ generation of births between 1944-1965 being 63\%. Gen X (1966-1980) contributed 34\% of respondents, followed by Gen Ys (1981-2000) at 2\%. One respondent was born into the ‘Builder’ generation (1922-1943). The respondents were well credentialed, with 90\% attaining a minimum of an undergraduate degree level, and of these 4\% holding doctorates and 35\% Masters degrees. The majority of respondents were also long serving higher education sector staff, with 37\% of respondents reporting their length of service in the sector as between 11-20 years, 26\% having 6-10 years of service and 16\% having more than 20 years in the sector.

Whilst many respondents had worked for considerable periods in the sector they also reported their time in current roles to be relatively short. Here 20\% of respondents reported being in their current role for less than twelve months, 34\% between 1-2 years, and 25\% for between 3-5 years. This means that half of the respondents had been in their present role for two years or less, and 75\% of staff in their role for five years or less.

In order to gain an account of their lived experience of work and leadership, at the same time, incorporate my earlier discovery that emergent Leadership Literacies need to recognise leadership as a broader focus than simply leaders respondents were not asked directly about their own leadership. Rather, they answered a series of questions about their direct leader as well as broad questions that told a story about their experiences of the work of leadership. This revealed that the majority of respondents reported that the person they identified as a structural concept of leadership—their ‘direct leader’—was their immediate manager (62\%), with only 1\% identifying ‘their peer’ (i.e. of similar standing to participant). ‘This leader’ was identified by 23\% of respondents to be an academic with 4\% naming the university Vice Chancellor, 9\% a senior academic executive leader (i.e. PVC\textsuperscript{62}-Academic or similar) and 9\% a Faculty/Divisional Academic Leader. Of the 14\% of professional leaders identified, 8\% were senior professional executives (i.e. Registrar, PVC-Administration) and 6\% were faculty/divisional professional leaders. The respondents were employed in all of the university type groupings as defined by the Australian Education Network classification\textsuperscript{63}. The Australian Technology Network ‘ATN’ universities employed 17\%.

\textsuperscript{61} This segmentation of the generations draw loosely on Levy et al (2005) with an additional segmentation of the Baby Boomers into early and late Boomers by Pontell (http://www.generationjones.com). Pontell argues that there are different characteristics between older Boomers and the younger ‘Generation Jones’. This is in keeping with Levy et al (2005) view that “these generational labels and dates vary from source to source” (p. 6).

\textsuperscript{62} PVC is for Pro Vice Chancellor and similar refers to positions directly under the Vice Chancellor like Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC).

\textsuperscript{63} At the time of the survey these were the Australian Universities Groupings: \textbf{Australian Technology Network (ATN)}: Curtin, RMIT, Queensland University of Technology, University of Technology Sydney.
of the respondents; 27% worked at Group of Eight ‘Go8’ universities; 14% at Innovative Research Universities ‘IRU’; and 17% in New Generation Universities ‘NGU’. The remaining 25% worked in universities unaligned with these groupings and are referred to in this study as Unaligned Universities ‘UU’.

The selection of this cohort of participants has potential limitations which may impact the findings. First, 226 participants participated in this part of the study which is a very small number in relation to the 52,850 staff (DEEWR, 2010 Table 1.7) classified as ‘non-academic’ staff working in other than academic roles in the Australian university sector. The intention of qualitative analysis is to always look for meaning rather than statistical significance, but it is timely to reiterate that the findings from this research are not intended to be generalisable, rather they are intended provide an ‘evidence-based image’ (Ragin 1994) from data gathered from this particular cohort, from this particular time, using these particular theoretical constructs for analysis. Second, each person in this particular cohort has made a conscious decision to join a professional association of tertiary education managers (ATEM) and this may impact the findings as a potential bias given their commitment to professional development and to the sector that such membership suggests.

6.3 Thematic Analysis of 21st Century Leadership Literacies

The next section presents the survey findings related to each Leadership Literacy, which have been thematically analysed using the Framework qualitative data analysis method. Framework analysis accommodated the relatively large amount of data for a qualitative study by providing a matrix structure to use for data reduction and pattern matching. The matrix consisted of columns of themes and rows of cases, which in this study were the particular questions asked in the survey (Appendix 1A). Prior to launching the survey, each question was assigned to at least one of the themes or sub-themes constructed for analysis as depicted in Appendix 1B. As discussed in Chapter 2 when providing the rationale for the selection of this tool, Framework analysis allowed me to build up ‘evidence-based images’ (Ragin 1994) by ordering by category the summarised and verbatim text from the open-ended questions as well as the descriptive statistics elicited from the closed questions as a pattern matching strategy.
6.3.1 The Worldly Leadership Literacy

As described earlier, the Worldly Leadership Literacy epitomises the shifts towards more holistic accounts of leadership which better suit the conditions of the 21st century. This expansion considers leadership to be more than just about the leader, and is framed as having responsibilities within the organisation and beyond. It is closely linked to the Sustaining Leadership Literacy.

As identified in Chapter 4, a Worldly Leadership research approach emanating from the UK (Turnbull & Edwards, 2008; Turnbull, 2009; Turnbull et al, 2011) captures much of this movement and it was selected as an emerging theoretical foundation to bring into conversation with the analysis of this Leadership Literacy. Given that Worldly Leadership is still largely an emergent concept, and particularly so when the empirical data for this inquiry was collected, the Servant Leadership Behavioural Scale (SLBS) (Sendjaya et al 2008) was chosen to bring its foundational the humanist concerns of Worldly Leadership into focus. More widely, Servant Leadership (Greenleaf 1977) theory, discussed in Chapter 4, epitomises champions leadership as stewardship and encourages leadership to be shared and distributed. At the time I undertook the survey I considered the SLBS to be the best representation for a Worldly Leadership Literacy available from the established leadership theories and approaches. Considering that Worldly Leadership theory is still largely untested as this thesis draws to a conclusion in mid 2012, I stand by that decision.

Servant Leadership Theory as an Indicator of Worldly Leadership

The Servant Leadership Behavioural Scale (SLBS) was developed and tested by Sendjaya as an outcome of his PhD (Sendjaya et al, 2008). It records follower observations of leader engagement with Servant Leadership principles. The SLBS provides the means to build an image of Worldly Leadership behaviours, which I prefer to think of as stewardship in the Worldly Leadership context. The SLBS consists of six factors drawn from the 35 questions set in the ‘About Your Leader’ section of the survey. These factors, which were discussed in detail in Chapter 4 are presented in the order upon which they were found to be most agreed: Authentic Self; Covenantal Relationship; Voluntary Subordination; Responsible Morality; Transforming Influence and Transcendental Spirituality. When all questions were averaged and categorised into these factors as part of the data reduction process, the patterns in Figure 5 indicate that the leaders of these professional staff in Australian universities were observed as engaging at reasonable levels in all six servant leadership behaviour factors.

64 See Appendix One: Thematic Schedule for the factors and the specific questions that populate them. See Appendix One: Survey question 27 for the order of these questions in the survey.
Overall, these results indicate agreement (at the rate of between 58% and 77%) that leaders of these professional staff in Australian universities are exhibiting Servant Leadership behaviours. These leaders have been observed as thus favouring stewardship and other Worldly Leadership dispositions that also confirm signs of the Leadingful Leadership Literacy for the 21st century. Taking the two most highly indicated factors together as they are largely intertwined, Authentic Self and Covenantal Relationship were recorded at very high agreement levels. Both of these indicate a concern for the ‘other’ that is central to post-heroic leadership practices, including Worldly Leadership approaches. These factors highlight that other-centredness is thus a central literacy for 21st century leadership, although it is not an easy notion to define or otherwise measure. Covenantal Relationship factors, which are about developing ‘power with’ (Follett, 1925b 76) relationships with staff, are entwined with the Authentic Self. Mandy provides an example of these behaviours observed in her leader:

Mandy (Generation Jones, IRU Manager)

My immediate manager, who is a DVC65, is a good leader, I believe. She has a difficult and heavy workload and cannot always give me the time and attention I would like, but has put sufficient trust in me to become an independent and valued employee. She is probably an exception rather than the rule as a model of leadership in my university. Mandy (Generation Jones, IRU Manager)

The next most observed factor, Voluntary Subordination, is a strong indicator of stewardship and Worldly Leadership mindsets that look to long term goals and articulation of a sense of purpose. In the 21st century these responsibilities also encompass human and ecologically sound business practices. The commitment to the ‘service to legitimate need’ observed at quite robust levels is encouraging, especially in the face of pressures to do more with less, as is the case of most Australian
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65 Deputy Vice Chancellor
universities in the second decade of the 21st century, as discussed in the last chapter. Whilst these expectations are laudable, the consequences of working within scarcity models that underpin managerialist technical activities are noticeable, and Abigail’s response to the resultant ambiguity this causes is typical:

> While those at the ‘top’ have wonderful (sometimes not realistic) vision, the council committees do not/are unable to enact them due to financial and/or resources constraints. Abigail (Generation Jones, UU Administrator)

Responsible Morality was the next most agreed to factor, and this captures the exercise of authority and power at a more worldly and post-industrial understanding of organisational moral reasoning than was the case in the 20th century. Gail’s response to the moral dimensions of leadership typify other comments on this issue, and several respondents commented that a lack of moral integrity in their leaders were key reasons for their decisions to look elsewhere for work, suggesting that this intangible factor is very much noticed by staff.

> I am fortunate to have an exceptional leader as a direct manager. Having recently experienced, elsewhere, a direct manager who lacked leadership skills and moral integrity, it is a stark contrast. Gail (Generation Jones, ATN General Manager)

Further to this, Evan’s reflections on the complexities of the sector, and the work leaders are doing in trying circumstances are noteworthy:

> The nature of universities is changing rapidly with a major impact on individuals. What it is to be an academic or an administrator is less stable than it has ever been. In that context leaders are struggling to define a sense of direction that determines the way in which they lead people. Despite that many leaders have been able to bring people along with them on the journey. Evan (Generation Jones, IRU Executive)

The last two factors of Transforming Influence and Transcendental Spirituality recorded almost identical ratings of around 60% agreement. Both of these factors address the management of energies in their own way and are signifiers of higher order consciousness. In terms of the expanded hierarchy of needs model discussed in Chapter 4 these two factors are located at the top of the expanded hierarchy called ‘self-transcendence’. Therefore to have relatively low levels of disagreement and higher ambivalence rates to these factors, even if agreement rates are lower than other factors, indicates that there are leaders already operating at quite high levels of consciousness.

The rates of disagreement were relatively low across all Servant Leadership factors with the most disagreement, at 20%, shown for the Transforming Influence factor, which coincidentally was the same rate as its neutral response. Agreement levels fell below 65% in three of these factors and here it is the patterns of neutral responses as much as the rates of disagreement that stand out. This ambivalence was most
prevalent in the *Transcendental Spirituality* factor with just over one quarter of neutral responses recorded. *Responsible Morality* and *Transforming Influence* had similar rates of disagreement and neutral responses.

This element of the Worldly Leadership Literacy was explored by seeking observations and experiences of Servant Leadership theory, using the SLBS, to determine to what extent Servant Leadership behaviours were observed by the respondents. It was found that they observed that their leaders in Australian universities exhibited all six of the SLBS factor behaviours, with agreements recorded between 58% and 77%. These leaders were observed as thus favouring stewardship and other Worldly Leadership dispositions that confirm signs of this Leadership Literacy. Of note was that 62% of the respondents identified their immediate manager as the person they nominated as their ‘direct leader’, an interesting point that will be further addressed in the Relational Leadership Literacy discussion.

Leadership and human and ecological sustainability are interconnected. By making this connection explicit this signals a willingness to work with the social obligations of this broader leadership remit in ways that other leadership theories are yet to acknowledge. It is therefore timely to explore for these concerns because engagement with environmental and human sustainability and energy management are emblematic of the cognitive shifts so necessary for 21st century leadership. Smith (2002) traces the genesis for this approach back to Follett in the early part of the 20th century.

Indeed, the deepening environmental concerns is the another reason (other than human sustainability) for naming the next Leadership Literacy as ‘Sustaining’.

### 6.3.2 The Sustaining Leadership Literacy

The Worldly Leadership Literacy clearly signals the intention to bring human and ecological sustainability inside the fold of leadership concerns. In doing so, it makes the necessary space in leadership scholarship and practice for this ‘sustaining’ standpoint to be named as a Leadership Literacy. Energy management and human sustainability are part of this because, as Loehr and Schwartz (2003a) argue, “leaders are the stewards of organizational energy … [and] the skillful management of energy, individually and organizationally, makes possible…full engagement” (p. 5). Furthermore, such energy is derived from “four main wellsprings in human beings: the body, emotions, mind, and spirit” (Schwartz, 2007 p. 64) which connects to the embodied rationality, one of the guiding principles used to enact this inquiry.

To investigate this, the notion of corporate sustainability was elicited from several questions concerning ecological and human sustainability. Given that responses were asked of ‘lay’ observers who work in a broad range of areas within Australian
universities, participants were guided by definitions of Dunphy et al (2007) Corporate Sustainability Development Model (CSDM), as discussed in Chapter 3, used for analysis to track both human and ecological sustainability development indicators. Participants were asked to place their observations against the highest order indicator for both human and ecological sustainability presented in the survey instrument (and attached as part of Appendix One: Definitions of Phases of Corporate Sustainability Development). In addition, they were asked for their observations of current practice as well as for their own preferences, in terms of what they would like to see as their institution’s level of commitment to sustainability development five years hence. The CDSM, as earlier noted, contains three waves of sustainability development: resistance to the notion of sustainability is indicated as rejection or non-responsiveness in the first wave; that the issue of sustainability is a concern and traces the beginnings of engagement in terms of compliance efficiency or strategic proactivity is acknowledgement in the second wave; while high order institutional engagement at the transformative stage called ‘the sustaining corporation’ is indicative of the third wave.

Taking ecological and human domains in turn, ecological sustainability is investigated using the CSDM as well as two specific questions that elicit indications of sustainable policies, processes and governance. Attention is then turned to human sustainability, with return to the CSDM plus the addition of several further questions specifically related to human sustainability and energy management.

**Ecological Sustainability**

*Figure 6* below, provides an image of current corporate ecological sustainability development levels observed as by respondents and also where they would prefer these levels of engagement to be by 2015.
Q. From your observations, which level of corporate sustainability development BEST matches your university's highest order commitment to ECOLOGICAL sustainability? Where would you like your university to be operating at by 2015?

As indicated by these patterns, future engagement preferences for ecological sustainability levels were primarily for 'sustaining and integrated' ecologically sustainable commitments, followed by 'strategic proactivity'. Compared to where respondents identified current practice, these are clearly aspirational goals. Respondents observed that most institutions are currently engaging in second wave levels of 'compliance', 'strategic proactivity', and 'efficiency' stages of development. A small number also recorded observations of third wave 'sustaining and integrated' levels of current engagement.

Two further questions were added that sought indicators of sustainable policies, processes and governance. When asked if their workplace operates sustainably with appropriate policies and processes, a very high rate of espousal, at 93%, was recorded as well as reasonable rates of practice at 66%. This confirmed signs of institutional engagement with ecologically sustainable policies and processes. The resulting 27% gap between espousal and practice indicates that whilst ecological sustainability was on the radar, there was work to be done in Australian universities to match practice with levels of rhetoric. When asked if my organisation is committed to a triple bottom line approach to governance (i.e. financial, social and environmental matters are all seen as important) respondents reported that Australian universities were engaging with these expanded notions of governance at the rates of 80% espousal and 53% practice. Whilst the gap between espousal and practice was also the same for the previous question, the rates of observation were not quite as high as those observed for sustainable policies and process.
Greg (Gen X, Go8 General Manager) made a general observation confirming that the corporate sustainability development indicators were “quite neat and accurate descriptions of a few organisations I’m familiar with”. Two other comments were indexed for ecological sustainability. Ann (Generation Jones, Go8 Administrator) indicated that her “university and department actively seek to create an ecological sustainable environment”. Further, Gail shared her insights about sustainability gained at several universities over a 12 year period:

I have worked in my current institution for just over a year, having worked elsewhere in higher ed for about 12 years. I consider the university to be the most ethical, sustainable and progressive of all the 4 universities in which I’ve worked. My particular work unit is an exemplar of this. Gail (Generation Jones, ATN General Manager)

It was possible to explore this element of the Sustaining Leadership Literacy by seeking observations and experiences of engagement with ecological sustainability indicators. Such an overwhelming response to where respondents would like to see institutional engagement with ecological sustainability in the future. In addition they identified current engagement at mostly the second wave of sustainability development. This emphasises some engagement by Australian universities with the concept of ecological sustainability. The responses to questions about sustainable policies, processes and governance corroborate this. Given that political processes for change and attendant ideologies that colour global and local political debates about the environment are moving relatively slowly, the considerable commitment to action voiced by the respondents when asked for their future preferences signals a real appetite for change by these professional staff. That expectations for ecological sustainability to be soon operating at sustaining and integrated development or strategic proactivity levels also confirms that the notion of ‘sustainability as zeitgeist’, already argued in this thesis, is a latent force, yet to be fully realised in Australian universities. This is a key consideration for leaders of these institutions in relation to strategies to attract and retain professional staff, likely to be in issue in the next few years when Baby Boomers begin to retire.

Human Sustainability
The CSDM was also used to elicit observations of institutional engagement with human sustainability development which Dunphy et al (2007) perceive as engagement with corporate social responsibility (p. 12). The CSDM resulted from a critical review of “current models in the ecological and management literature” (p. 13) to propose a “comprehensive model of the development phases through which corporations progress towards both human and ecological sustainability” (p. 13). In addition, questions from the ‘About Your Leader’ section that related to human sustainability, together with demographic data detailing respondents’ lived experiences of work were
used to produce an image of experiences and observations of human sustainability in Australian universities. This topic sparked most of the comments shared by respondents in the open questions of the survey. Of all the comments shared by respondents, there were considerably more indexed for ‘human sustainability’ (18%) and ‘energy management’ (53%) than any other theme explored in this study.

*Figure 7* below provides an image of current corporate human sustainability development levels observed by respondents as well as preferences for where they would like levels of corporate human sustainability development to be by 2015.

**Figure 7: Corporate Human Sustainability Development Indicators**

Q. From your observations, which level of corporate sustainability development BEST matches your university’s highest order commitment to HUMAN sustainability? Where would you like your university to be operating at by 2015?

Similar to the responses concerning ecological sustainability development, the patterns of responses indicate preferences for their institution’s future human sustainability development engagement primarily at the ‘sustaining and integrated’ development stage, followed by ‘strategic proactivity’ levels of human sustainability engagement.

Compared to where respondents identified their institution’s current practice for ecological sustainability, a wider range of indicators was covered for human sustainability. This included more observations for the first wave of sustainability development for human sustainability than ecological sustainability, bringing the total of these first wave indicators to just below 13% of all responses. Like the ecological indicators, current engagement levels with corporate human sustainability development remain at the ‘compliance’ stage, followed by an equal split between ‘efficiency’ and ‘strategic proactivity’. The third wave of the ‘sustaining and integrated’ indicator then followed. More respondents indicated that their institutions were currently engaging in human sustainability at the level of ‘sustaining and integrated’ than they did for ecological sustainability. However, like ecological indicators, there was a wide gap
between current practice and where respondents would prefer their institutions to be in terms of human sustainability development by 2015.

Relating to these responses specifically to the question of leadership, an additional indicator of human sustainability were the responses to fourteen questions indexed as leader engagement with human sustainability from the ‘About Your Leader’ section of the survey. As indicated in Figure 8, the agreement levels recorded for these particular questions were at 60% or higher for ten of these fourteen questions.

**Figure 8: Indicators of Leader Engagement Concerning Human Sustainability**

Q. My leader…

Of these, my leader listens to me with intent to understand and my leader gives me the right to question his or her actions and decisions, recorded agreement levels above 75%. Much lower agreement rates were recorded for my leader helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work (45%); my leader inspires me to lead others by serving (49%); and my leader draws the best out of me (55%). These results indicate that staff identified as leaders in Australian universities are leading their staff in ways that address human sustainability and connect with energy management concerns at reasonable levels in ten of fourteen of the indicators.

The four questions where respondents indicated agreement levels below 60% also recorded the highest neutral responses. Given that Schwartz (2007) argues that human energies spring from “the body, emotions, mind, and spirit” (p. 64) the lower agreement rates and much higher neutral responses to questions such as my leader draws the best out of me, my leader minimises barriers that inhibit my success and my leader helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work, indicate that the
latent energies of professional staff are not yet drawn upon to the extent they could be. **Martin** provides a glimpse of these missed opportunities in his institution:

> There is quite a bit of espousing of senior management being open to ideas and new ways of doing things. But when opportunities arise to comment on and review processes/decisions, suggestions from staff are continually ignored by senior management, without any further effort being spent on explaining the reasons for these decisions, which might help to develop trust and open dialogue.

**Martin** (*Gen X, Go8 Manager*)

An emphasis on human sustainability suggests that it is possible to explore intangible factors underpinning the Engagement with Sustainable Practice and Energy Management elements found within the Sustaining Leadership Literacy. The results for human sustainability development were similar to the unmistakable preferences for future institutional engagement with ecological sustainability at the sustaining and integrated level. Respondents also identified current human sustainability engagement at mostly the second wave development levels, also confirms signs of human sustainability engagement by Australian universities. Based on this respondents reported observations of leader engagement with human sustainability at reasonable levels. This suggests that these leaders in Australian universities are reasonably literate in leadership understandings concerning human sustainability and the need to harness energies.

Lastly, two questions concerning respondents' lived experiences of work that address facets of energy management which closely align with human sustainability were considered. Drawing on Schwartz's (2007) wellsprings of human energies, demographic data was collected about respondents' hours of work and their motivational drivers. When asked  *how many hours did you work last week?* 91% of respondents indicated that they worked more than the hours they were paid. Of these, 35% of respondents indicated that they had worked moderately more, 18% many more and 7% significantly more. These results do not change significantly if taken as a whole or when segmented into administrative, manager, general manager or executive roles, or when sliced by gender, age group or university grouping. Furthermore, most of the general comments elicited in the open questions were indexed as human sustainability or energy management, and confirms that these results were not due to a particularly busy week at the time of the survey. There was a strong sense shared by respondents at senior levels, as well as by professionals across all levels, that more work than the hours paid is culturally accepted as the norm in the sector. This is a concern for sustainable human energy management practices when understood through the Sustaining Leadership Literacy mindset. The many responses about
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66 In question 12 of the online survey, these distinctions were given as slightly more (1-10%), moderately more (11-20%), many more (21-35%), and significantly more (+35%), in Appendix 1.
workloads confirm these entrenched patterns and apparent normalisation of these practices. For example, Gary (Gen X, Go8 General Manager) reported ‘too much to do but that is what happens at the top’, and Glenda (Generation Jones, NGU General Manager) described this as ‘a cultural expectation that you work long hours to get the job done’. Many others reported that they were working excessive hours and some like Gloria (Generation Jones, UU General Manager) felt that they ‘were doing the work of two people a lot of the time’; Glenn (Generation Jones, IRU General Manager) reported ‘too many competing demands; impossible deadlines and requests to satisfy bureaucratic accountability’ resulted in many more hours work every week than he was paid for. I did not get a sense of anger or hostility about these conditions, rather a sense of powerlessness and resignation. Michael, who reported that he worked significantly more than the hours he was paid for, epitomises the complexities underlying these issues:

It is not unreasonable to expect that staff in senior positions are required to work more than the standard working day—indeed it is necessary for the health of divisions and the overall institution. The workload at senior level, however, has extended beyond that which might be reasonably expected, and there is a tendency for this to also ‘trickle down’ to less senior levels. Staff are paid relatively well (particularly at the lower end of the HEW scale at entry level) however there are increasing stresses that may limit our ability to retain key staff.

Michael (Gen X, Go8 Manager)

Anita, Margaret, Gina and Elizabeth as representative of the four positional demographic groupings typify the several dozen comments shared. Anita (Baby Boomer, UU Administrator) indicated that there was “too much work and not enough time. Consistently work extra hours and at home. I consider myself organised and efficient, not a time waster”. Margaret (Generation Jones, UU Manager) noted that “expectations re deliverables from my job have not decreased proportionally to the budget cuts and reduced resourcing to my work area”. Gina (Gen X, UU General Manager) noted that she felt that she does “an adequate job with the resources available but ‘doing more with less’ really doesn’t work on a long term basis”. Lastly, Elizabeth (Gen X, ATN Executive) reported that “there isn’t enough time to do as much as I’d like, so prioritizing means that some things drop off the list. However, I have adequate time to continue chipping away at the task list at hand”.

Although the data revealed that as few as 9% of respondents did work their normal allocation of hours, others reported that they were content to work more than the normal hour allocation in exchange for more flexible work arrangements. Annette (Generation Jones, Go8 Administrator), while reporting that she worked moderately more hours than she was paid for commented that she ‘worked flexi-time which enables me to work longer hours to keep up with my workload and take time off
when needed'. Miriam (Generation Jones, UU Manager) reported that she worked slightly more hours than she was paid yet ‘workload is not an issue for me currently as I have a high degree of autonomy and with this comes flexibility so if I put in a few extra hours I am happy to do this in exchange for this work option’.

This raises the issue of what kinds of motivating factors bring people to work, which is the subject of the final question contributing to the image of human sustainability. These motivating drivers are framed in Figure 9 in relation to the ‘expanded hierarchy of needs’ introduced in Chapter 4 to elicit an image of these underlying sources as energy drivers. They are presented to depict the patterns of responses about the key motivating driver bringing respondents to work. The answers the participants chose from were presented as: regular and secure employment; pay and conditions; social relationships and professional communities of practice; self esteem/status; meaning making and learning opportunities; to make a difference in the world; for self-fulfilment/personal growth; and, to help others reach their potential. In addition, to bring them into conversation with energy management indicators, these answers were matched for analysis with a particular need from the hierarchy that could reasonably be addressed in the workplace67. These needs are indicated in brackets next to the answers in Figure 9 below which has also had the lines between deficiency and growth needs categories transposed.

67 The first deficiency need, Biological and Physiological, is not used in this analysis as it is expected that these ‘survival’ needs are met well before the needs that can be satisfied at work can be addressed.
When interpreting these responses, the majority of deficiency needs, themselves making up the majority of responses at 53%, fell into the most basic need to be reasonably expected in the workplace. Here, safety needs for regular and secure employment and pay and conditions account for 45% of the overall deficiency needs. When demographic differences were considered, these safety needs did not vary much when viewed by role level, gender, age range or university grouping. One of the Managers, Martha, cites regular and secure employment as her key motivation for coming to work, and articulates the pressures of her work whilst at the same time understanding the long term risks:

We seem to be working longer and longer hours—I regularly work a 50+ week and also work on the weekend. Most of my colleagues are in similar positions, this situation will increasingly take a toll on our health, work productivity and organizational sustainability. However, what can we do about it? Martha (Generation Jones, Go8 Manager)

When looking at the silences attributed to this question, it was interesting to note that neither cognitive needs nor belongingness and love needs were selected at all by executive level respondents. All other needs were indicated in all role levels. As the
responses attributed as deficiency needs account for over half of the responses for this question, it does raise concerns that professional staff at all levels, gender and institutional grouping appear to be largely motivated by deficiency needs at the time of the study. This is at the same time as growth needs indicators for motivation, i.e. the capacity and appetite for learning, aesthetics, self-actualisation and self-transcendence, are theorised as a better fit with more humanistic understandings of the world, which I have argued are better matched with the contexts associated with complex, turbulent and fast moving times.

The tracing of motivating factors of professional staff as largely attributed to deficiency needs, together with invitations that led to largely negative connotations of leadership experiences given as analogies by participants in the Scott et al (2008) report analysed in the last chapter points to the considerable work that needs to be done to meet the aspirations have for leadership, based on humanistic and critical management studies expectations, to take hold in the field of higher education, for academic and professional staff. This naturally leads me to raise these as concerns about sustaining the levels of energy needed in the uncertain times that higher education is facing in Australia if motivations given by my cohort are driven to this extent by deficiency rather than growth drivers. This is a clear message for to recommend that the dissonance identified between the rhetoric of leadership approaches that seem to be very suited to the conditions of the 21st century, given as Leadership Literacies, and the conditions for leadership that are seemingly resisting moves towards these approaches are producing such a clear dissonance between rhetoric and reality for professional staff in the field.

Now that this has been so clearly identified by even the briefest of considerations of motivations (as well as analogies in the Scott et al (2008) report) future research in this area will be a high priority for me. For example, this dissonance and its connection with adverse energy levels is a serious concern for leadership and for all who have a stake in leadership in higher education because it is the growth needs and rallying of energies that are likely to drive creativity, innovation and fast learning metabolisms required in the 21st century.

The emphasis on motivational and needs drivers is one way to explore the intangible Sustaining Leadership Literacy and the responses gathered give a broad image of how leaders of professional staff in Australian universities are addressing the “skillful management of energy, individually and organizationally” Loehr and Schwartz (2003a 5). This image was drawn by seeking observations and experiences of ecological and human sustainability indicators as well as the notion of energy management. Respondents have provided a strong message about their preferences for the
institutions they work for to develop ecological and human sustainability practices to ‘sustaining and integrated’ third wave levels by 2015. They also clearly identify the gap between these preferences and current levels of engagement with sustainability development by their institutions.

Overall, the measures for the Sustaining Leadership Literacy suggests signs of engagement with the ecological and human sustainability development indicators as well as those for energy management. They also revealed much about the complexities associated with working in Australian universities particularly through the details of the demographic data about the lived experiences of the respondents. For example, demographic data pointed to the seeming transitory nature of the work that was indicated by three quarters of respondents being in their current position for less than five years. A further 90% of respondents indicated that they worked more hours than they were paid for, and this was understood as the norm. Alongside these images respondents were still able to identify conditions and behaviours that indicated that both the Worldly and Sustaining Leadership Literacies were observable in their University. These levels of complexity, ambiguity and turbulence are regarded as business as usual in knowledge enterprises in the early part of the 21st century but they are rarely spoken of. I posit that leaders and followers are generally doing their best in trying circumstances in a sector that is reliant on doing more with less in the short term. However, these are unsustainable practices that remain hidden from view, which may well also be masking deeper structural problems in the sector. Worldly and Sustaining leadership lenses may surface these problems but unless these deeper structural problems are recognised as such could well add another layer of complexity for people already working under pressure. These issues are part of the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) terrain that Johansen (2008) highlights and an example of the intractability of super complex problems, where a possible solution to one part of a complex system sparks unintentional consequences in others.

These Worldly and Sustaining Leadership Literacies are deeply entwined and themselves provide context as well as a language to address 21st century leadership concerns, including Australian universities. With these contexts and understandings in mind, a Leadingful Leadership Literacy, grounded in understandings cognisant with these contexts, is the focus of the next part of the investigation.

6.3.3 The Leadingful Leadership Literacy

The Leadingful Leadership Literacy was explored in two ways. First specific questions from the ‘about your leader’ section that addressed the distributed and processual nature of leadership were analysed. Then, four questions about specific leadership practices and processes were added to the analysis of the notion of Leadership as
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Work. The thirteen questions from the ‘About Your Leader’ section of the survey that were indexed as indicators of leadership as work, and their results are depicted in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Leaders and the Process of Leadership Indicators

Q. My leader…

These results indicate very high levels of confidence demonstrated by leaders in delegating responsibilities, with 84% of respondents agreeing that their leader was willing to let me take control of situations when appropriate. Furthermore, 77% of respondents agreed that leaders exhibited confidence in me, even when the risks seem great. 76% of respondents also reported that they had built a level of trust enough to feel they had the right to question their leader’s actions and decisions. These are strong indicators that the work of leadership is being distributed and practised in Australian universities. Indeed, all but three of the 13 questions elicited agreement rates of between 84% and 62%, which are very good foundations for this Leadership Literacy, and Adrienne’s comments indicate:

My immediate supervisor is on a different campus to me so I am predominantly left to function on my own. While I do appreciate the belief and trust he has in me to undertake my duties, opportunity to engage a stronger business relationship and more support would be greatly appreciated. Adrienne (Generation Jones, IRU Administrator)

The rate of agreement for the remaining three questions were - 52% for my leader considers others’ needs and interests above his or her own, 49% for inspires me to lead others by serving, and 44% for helps me to generate a sense of meaning from
everyday life at work. In similar results to the Worldly Leadership indicators observed of their leaders, where there were low agreement rates, there were also high neutral responses that matched or were higher than the disagreement rates. This indicates that practice of these issues could be improved, and that effort is needed to better articulate or otherwise make these issues more visible to followers. When there are improvements in this regard, they are certainly noticed, as Matthew (Gen X, UU Manager) attests “I recently transitioned to a new manager who was a ‘breath of fresh air’ with a more balanced approach and more forward, strategic thinking”.

The results for the four specific questions that were asked in relation to the processes of leadership in their organisations are shown in Figure 11 below. Respondents were asked to report their observations in terms of practice and/or espousal of indicators of the process leadership. The statements included whether they had observed leadership as a highly centralised practice exercised primarily by one person or a small executive group; whether leadership was widely dispersed and exercised by people with a contribution to make whether or not they held formal authority; were leadership practices observed as involving people thinking together about preferred futures, current realities and the challenges of change; and, was leadership in their organisation observed as strongly hierarchical and unfolding through cascading levels of authority.

Figure 11: Leadership as Practice, Shared and Distributed Indicators

Q. Please indicate whether you have observed these indicators of the process of leadership being espoused and/or practised in your organisation
This set of indicators was the only one where some ‘practised’ rates were at higher levels than ‘espousal’ rates. This occurred in two questions, where 64% of respondents identified that leadership processes were *widely dispersed and exercised by people with a contribution to make whether or not they held formal levels of authority* practised, yet espoused by their institutions at the rate of only 26%. Similarly, 80% of respondents indicated that they had observed leadership in practice as *highly centralised and exercised primarily by one individual or a small executive group*, yet only 56% observed this outcome being espoused by their institution. These results indicate a high rate of widely dispersed leadership decisions being made in Australian universities yet conversely that formal influences of leadership are still present as the traditional heroic stance of one person (or a small executive group) seen as the ‘leader’, is indicated at a higher rate than it is espoused. What is really interesting is that despite this more heroic standpoint, respondents did not equate this directly with hierarchical and cascading levels of authority because only 38% of respondents equated the practise of *hierarchical practice unfolding via cascading levels of authority*, even though this approach was observed as being espoused at the rate of 61%. I argue that rather than disputing these claims as ‘not adding up’, these ambiguities need to be ‘lived with’ as indicators of leadership as practice and the work of leadership at a time of significant change. In this way ambiguities are recognised as part of the terrain of the times where any number of competing activities occur simultaneously as a consequence of working. Gibson68 explains this as ‘the future is here, it’s just unevenly distributed’. These ambiguities are not surprising given that Klenke and Chaharbaghi (1999) argue that:

Paradigm shifts, when viewed with the hindsight of history, seem to make sudden leaps. When we look closely, however, we find that the new paradigm has started to make its appearance before the transition occurred. The features which force a new paradigm, may be several years ahead of the actual change (p. 4).

Finally, there was an 86% rate of observation of espousal that leadership in their organisation involved people thinking together about preferred futures, current realities and the challenge of achieving change, yet only 53% of respondents observed this happening in practice producing a gap between espousal and practice of 33%.

Interestingly, Megan was able to speak of the ambiguities of leadership whereby she could make distinctions between the processes of leadership of her institution and her personal experience of leadership:

> Personally I am deeply dissatisfied because of a range of factors. However I believe our organization is quite good at the process of leadership, apart from leadership of me. *Megan (Gen X, ATN Manager)*

---

68 This aphorism is attributed to William Gibson (b. 1948), a science-fiction author.
Indications of the Leadingful Leadership Literacy identified in the analysis and interpretations of questions addressing leadingful dispositions of leaders points to understandings of the distributed and activity based nature of leadership. It was also indicated in the measures set for exploring the work of leadership in Australian universities observed by participants. Now that these are indicated, a deeper analysis of the lynchpin of this Leadership Leadership Literacy, that is relationships, is in order. Further to this, these discussions will include relationships with self, others and purpose. These are strong indicators of engagement already with leadingful practices in Australian universities.

6.3.4 The Relational Leadership Literacy

Relational Leadership Literacy takes up the challenge identified by Spillane et al (2004) to use units of analysis for leadership studies that conform to the concept that “leadership activity constituted in the interaction of leaders, followers and their situation” (p. 10). This has largely been attended to by the selection of professional staff working in Australian universities as the cohort for this research component and their implied ‘followership’ role as a means to elicit signs of all of the Leadership Literacies for this research question.

It is noteworthy to recall that 62% of respondents identified their immediate manager as their ‘direct leader’. Martin's response in nominating his manager as his ‘direct leader’ attests to the intangible relational factors and the interrelated nature, as far as followers are concerned, of leadership and management roles:

If you had asked me this about my last manager 12 months ago, it would have been a different story. I was ready to leave. That person has now been promoted to another section. I guess the message is that I have found leadership a little patchy, but I'm feeling fairly lucky at the moment—it is very good having a manager who is making a positive difference and reinforces one's esteem. **Martin** (Gen X, Go8 Manager)

This point is a timely reminder that in the moments of everyday work and indeed in leadership studies, much rests on the immediacy and quality of the relationships between followers and their immediate manager who may well also be viewed as their leader. These discoveries also reveal that these relationships in Australian universities are often transitory given the degree of movement between roles. Nevertheless these relationships are taken personally by followers, impacting on their own perceptions of the work of leadership.

The Relational Leadership Literacy is first investigated in conversation with Hock’s (1999) notion of investment of energies into working relationships. Then, explored for signs of whether the central and unifying role of purpose is observable. When Hock (1999) presciently coined the term ‘chaordic age’ to describe the turbulent conditions of
the 21st century where both chaos and order are necessary contributors to the ambiguities of the 21st century, he also advised that we look to the self to counter ensuing complexities. In what are still largely aspirational goals for the investment of energies into working relationships Hock’s distribution of time and energy is nevertheless useful for this analysis and it is shown in comparison with the data in Figure 12. Hock’s argument for this radical view of relationships rest on the privileging of relational and social processes of leadership, and the high levels of trust that underpin post-heroic notions of leadership that would be unimaginable to those with Industrial Era or Theory X mindsets. Below are the responses recorded for where respondents invested their time and energy managing relationships are depicted on the left as an image of the averaged participant responses (the pie graph on the right is for comparison with Hock’s recommendations) in Figure 12.

**Figure 12: Where do you invest your time and energy when managing relationships?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>Hock Model for comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peers</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Those I answer to</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Those I am responsible for</strong></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a cohort, investments of energies into working relationships with their peers and those they answered to responses were recorded that are close to Hock’s recommendations. These results indicate strong levels of relational acuity and collegiality, that professional staff in Australian universities invest time and energies ‘managing up’. There are also good levels indicated for managing self, not unexpected by professional staff who invest in their own careers by joining a professional association. Overall, these levels of ‘managing the self’ are not at the aspirational levels that Hock recommended due largely to the diversion of energies to those they were responsible for, which was recorded as the highest investment at 31%. There are,
however, encouraging signs that these deeper levels of understandings of the self are of interest to participants, as these comments from Margaret suggest:

> The vast majority of my time I am self-motivated and have a strong internal locus of control. I don't really need external validation of what I do. That said if there is absolutely no recognition of the value of the contribution of my immediate work area I feel that this demonstrates lack of real leadership from those I report to, and influences how my team sees themselves- ‘they don’t value us as a team’ – I think that this suggests that even if I don’t need the validation for myself personally that it is of significant value to my team. *Margaret (Generation Jones, UU Manager)*

Given Follett’s positioning of purpose as ‘the invisible leader’ (Follett, 1933 p. 172) and the changing dynamics in the 21st century regarding leader/follower/purpose relationships, purpose is central to the understanding of this Leadership Literacy’s central role. It is therefore worth delving deeper into what the notion of purpose means to respondents, and whether they are observing purpose as a rallying point for their energies. As Martin (2008) argues, Follett’s depiction of the ‘invisible leader’ goes deeper than “standard organizational mission or purpose statements written post facto…to satisfy external stakeholders” (p. 315). Rather, it is recognised in this analysis as a complex construct that speaks directly to the management of the energies of the enterprise and “reflects the true power that holds the organization together” (Martin, 2008 p. 315). Others have similarly argued that in times of flux and competing demands for their time, leaders should clearly articulate the purpose of their organisation, so that Knowledge Workers can invest in their energies in pursuit of it. Drucker (1993b) for example, argued that in a post-capitalist organisation “only a clear, focussed, and common mission can hold the organization together and enable it to produce results (p. 53). Uhl-Bien & Marion (2009) argue that their Complexity Leadership Theory framework enables the necessary learning, innovative and adaptive capacity for working with complexity within knowledge enterprises whilst recognising the ambiguities associated with doing this work at this time in still largely bureaucratic structures.

This suggests a deeper understanding of the rallying capacities of purpose to unify threads that constitute contemporary leadership concerns. In Figure 13 below three questions from the ‘About Your Leader’ section that elicited observations of leader engagement with purpose are recorded. These questions are about *shared vision, clarity of purpose and direction, and generation of a sense of meaning* observed in their leaders.
Leaders were observed as adequately articulating *shared vision that gave meaning to their followers' work* and supporting their staff in *locating their own clarity of purpose*. However leaders were less able to *help staff generate a sense of meaning from everyday life at work*, indeed disagreement or neutral responses to this question were given at a greater rate than agreement.

In *Figure 14* respondents indicated what they perceived to be *their institutions key motivational drivers*, having already disclosed their own key motivational driver that brought them to work in *Figure 9*. In *Figure 14* below, 5% of respondents answered ‘other’ to this question on institutional motivational drivers, and reasons for this were given as *being too difficult to choose just one key driver from the list* or that they were *unable to disaggregate them*. 

![Figure 13: Indicators of Purpose as a Leadership Concern](image_url)
Figure 14: Institutional Motivational Drivers

What do you perceive to be your institution’s key motivational driver?

There are very healthy signs of positive organisational energy drivers, with 47% of responses for purpose, vision or mission recorded as the perceived motivational drivers of their institutions. These motivators could also be referred to as growth need indicators using an ‘Expanded Hierarchy of Needs’ (as depicted earlier in Figure 3) when discussing respondents own motivating drivers. However, 23% of respondents perceived their institutional key driver to be at the level of budgets, which I would locate as safety/deficiency need. Marjorie articulates the consequences of such ‘deficiency needs’ thus:

I think the budget is a significant driver. The budget model for distribution of funds is not working well. As well, there isn’t enough and the VC want to spend a large amount on building works (which does need to be done) and a lot of decisions are based on budget rather than strategic—A lot of ‘whoever shouts the loudest gets the money’. Marjorie (Generation Jones, ATN Manager)

These results and the image they convey confirm that it is possible to explore this largely intangible Leadership Literacy concerned with leadership as a social practice, and at the same time check for signs of whether this Leadership Literacy is being observed in Australian universities. The discussion about where respondents invested their time and energy in working relationships, like the strong indicators for a commitment to the ‘service to legitimate need’ (observed in the SLBS indicators for Worldly Leadership), indicates that a latent robustness for this Leadership Literacy already exists and that indeed to a large extent respondents already invest in relationships and social processes with their peers and by managing ‘up’. Respondents have had less success due to the ambiguities of also doing more with less, as revealed.
in the demographic data, in nearing the aspirational levels that Hock advocates for developing the self. Nevertheless there are healthy signs that respondents are investing in their own professional development and learning. To get closer to Hock’s aspirational model for management of self and those they are responsible for, would require top down changes yet to be identified in the literature or leadership practice in Australian universities. The level that this Leadership Literacy is demonstrated by respondents and by their observations of this Leadership Literacy at work are solid foundations for contemporary leadership studies. In terms of exploring this Relational Leadership Literacy through an expanded notion of purpose, the image presented indicates that it is evident at the ‘leader’ level, as shown in the observations of their leader’s engagement with purpose in Figure 13 and also at institutional levels with strong indicators of growth need motivators such as purpose, vision and mission observed. Although separated from the discussion about energy management which was discussed in the Sustaining Leadership Literacy, it is clear that this expanded notion of purpose also has rallying capacities that connect with the wellsprings of energy and motivational drivers that bring people to work. I see this particular Leadership Literacy as well as the Learningful Leadership Literacy to be discussed next as signifiers of 21st century leadership capacity building.

6.3.5 The Learningful Leadership Literacy

The Learningful Leadership Literacy is represented by the notion of Learning Metabolism, with this Leadership Literacy marking the role of learning as central to leadership, as a means to work effectively with the turbulence and speed of change that beset the 21st century and its attendant information explosion. To be able to harness the potential that learning (including unlearning and re-learning) affords in these conditions is a key Leadership Literacy for the 21st century. It rests on strengthening and accelerating the learning metabolism of the enterprise through its people. Both Learning Metabolism and Relational Leadership Literacies are entwined in these social processes of learning, that also require deeper levels of individual reflexivity to harness these opportunities.

It is therefore timely to explore this case, Australian universities, for preparedness to engage with this capacity building Leadership Literacy. In order to test for signs of learning metabolism in Australian universities, respondents were asked for observations of practice and/or espousal of learning metabolism indicators in three statements concerning learning processes in their institution, as displayed in Figure 15. Then two further questions eliciting signs of learning metabolism, whether their institution organised forums to meet with and learn from others and whether their institution compared its performance with others, will be addressed.
Respondents reported high espousal rates by their institutions that *their rate of learning was equal to or greater than the rate of change in the environment*, yet observations of practice were at much lower rates, constituting a 27% gap between espousal and practice. Whilst the observation rates for institution’s practice of *quickly and accurately communicating new knowledge to key decision makers* is similar, there is only a 10% gap between practice and espousal rates for this statement. Nevertheless these observed practice rates of 56% and 55% respectively indicate that connection between change and learning, and the timely communication of these evident to some extent. Less encouraging are indicators that this thinking is being systematically made visible, such as, by *conducting post-audit and after action reviews*, with only a 44% rate of observation for practice and 57% for espousal.

Two further questions eliciting signs of learning metabolism were asked, whether their *institution organised forums to meet with and learn from others* and whether their *institution compared its performance with others*. There were healthy signs that institutions were making spaces available to *meet with and learn from others*, with observations that internal or external experts were drawn upon making up half of these occasions; stakeholders were next called upon (20%); then customers and clients (17%). Suppliers or ‘other’ made up just over 5% and 6% indicated that none of these were observed at all. These are very high levels of engagement that indicate a willingness to learn from an expanded pool of thinkers. The second question asked the aligned question whether institutions were *comparing their performance with others*. The majority of comparisons were made with external competitors (42%), next with
best-in-class organisations (26%); then internal competitors (22%) with 3% of the respondents recording ‘other’. Also, 6% of respondents observed that their institutions were not making any such comparisons, and Maureen (Baby Boomer, NGU, Manager equivalent), a Senior Policy Officer, reflected on this and remarked that she “felt very sad to tick none of the above”. Further, Martin (Gen X, Go8 Manager), whilst answering in the affirmative that these forums took place in his institution, also commented that “such forums are very occasionally organised, it is not a systemic part of our culture at all”, three other respondents commented that as far as they were aware their institutions did not arrange learning forums; and Adrienne (Generation Jones, IRU Administrator) commented that “only forums available are academic presentations”.

Several respondents provided insight into their own lack of learning opportunities which are important for building learning capacities and keeping up to date in fast changing times. Mary (Generation Jones, NGU Manager) reported that she had received no funding to attend any conferences or professional development for me >2 years. Amy (Gen X, Go8 Administrator) observed that more technical training would assist in doing job well/better. Budgets for some projects not adequate. In addition, Margaret provided her observations based on her professional interest in staff leadership programs:

I design and deliver components in the Staff Leadership Program in my institution. I am increasingly aware that despite being well educated, staff in my organisation have not engaged to any depth in their personal professional development especially the development of the so-called soft skills. The degree of competence interpersonally is generally poor and there is no commitment to investing in this type of development. Budgetary constraints tend to place the focus on more tangible deliverables and short term outcomes. Margaret (Generation Jones, UU Manager)

This Leadership Literacy was explored by seeking observations and experiences of institutional learning opportunities, such as forums and benchmarking, as well as observations of leader engagement with learning metabolism. Further data was provided by some respondents about their lack of learning opportunities and professional development which is also an indicator of learning metabolism capacity. I maintain that these were able to elucidate learning metabolism as a capacity building Leadership Literacy for the 21st century, despite its nascence in leadership literature at this time. The results indicate that Australian universities are engaged in practices that have been identified with improving learning metabolism, although there are gaps between practice and espousal and practice rates are not yet at sufficient levels to confirm wide engagement with this Leadership Literacy.

69 Adele (Gen X, Go8 Administrator); May (Generation Jones, UU Manager); and Abigail (Generation Jones, UU Administrator).
6.4 Conclusion

This chapter addressed the third research sub-question of what signs of engagement with the Leadership Literacies, conceptualised in Chapter 3, are observed and/or experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities. In doing so, it suggests the presence of all the Leadership Literacies. However, there was a discernible difference between responses given in relation to the demographic data, i.e. hours of work, relatively short period of time in current role, motivating drivers and the details shared by the respondents in the open and closed questions which all contributed to the accounts of their lived experiences of work in the sector. The experiences given in the demographic data point to affinities more aligned to the management practices of the Industrial Era than the space to work and lead productively in the 21st century. The analysis identified that demographic differences, for example, between types of universities, gender, job role, age etc were not sufficiently meaningful to articulate in the thesis. On the other hand, the images built up about their own practice and that of their leaders contained strong affinities with the Leadership Literacies. These ambiguities are especially evident in the data concerning respondents’ lived experiences of work that address facets of energy management in the Sustaining Leadership Literacy. Here the demographics are worrying indicators of endemic and unsustainable practice. For instance, 91% of respondents worked more than the hours they were paid for; more were motivated to come to work through ‘defensive needs’ than ‘growth needs’; and even though the cohort consisted mostly of long serving members of staff, 50% of them had been in their current position for less than two years (and 75% of them for less than five years). Furthermore, respondents articulated that at senior levels, and for other professionals at all levels, these working conditions were culturally accepted as the norm. These are meaningful discoveries, from a CMS perspective, given that these factors do not equate to sustaining workplaces, and that DePree (1989) suggests these are indeed indicators of leadership because “signs of outstanding leadership appear primarily among the followers” (p. 10).

There are also elements in the data that lead to the means to begin these conversations, and they are largely to be found in the gaps in the data. These gaps were most striking in the aspirational goals respondents had for their institutions to engage in human and ecological sustainability development; in the gaps between espoused and actual practice and where neutral responses also generally outweighed disagreements; and where we might choose to invest our time and energies in developing working relationships and the differences recommended by Hock’s aspirational model. The respondents generously provided a rich data source from which a snapshot of their lived experiences and observations of work and leadership in Australian universities during the period November 2009 to February 2010 was
recorded. This data was used to test largely intangible themes theorised as Leadership Literacies for the 21st century. In the discussions to follow in the next chapter, reflections on what this means for the Leadership Literacies and leadership in Australian universities will be discussed. This analysis led to explicating signs of engagement with the five Leadership Literacies through an exploration of observations about the lived experiences of work and leadership provided by the cohort of Professional Staff who were working in Australian Universities.
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In this final chapter I draw together discoveries made in the preceding three chapters to make an overall finding for the thesis in order to may my claims for new knowledge. Implications for this finding are then discussed in light of the aims and aspirations I had for this research. Fullan and Scott’s (2009) ‘ready, fire, aim’ approach is used to frame these reflections the process and possibilities for further research.

7.1 Findings Discussion

This thesis produced one finding, drawn from analysis of literature and data in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 that to provide an account of the inquiry into What are Leadership literacies for professional staff in universities? Chapter 4 built on a review and synthesis of three sets of literature related to leadership for the 21st century; including contexts for this work (influenced by particular mindsets, emerging complexity and cognisant sensemaking frames), critical perspectives of leadership (in particular power relations and language) and key emergent leadership theories that showed promise to undertake this work in these contexts. This led to the construction of a Leadership Literacies Framework containing the Worldly Leadership, Sustaining Leadership, Leadingful Leadership, Relational Leadership and Learningful Leadership Literacies.

Having been named, these Leadership Literacies were first explored for theoretical resonance with the site of the work of professional staff, that of Australian universities. After theoretical resonance was indicated, the Leadership Literacies were then explored for signs of observation through the sharing of lived experiences of work and leadership given by cohort of professional staff working in Australian universities.

I find that these five Leadership Literacies were theoretically congruent with practice-based theoretical research into building leadership capacities in Australian universities, particularly for leadership of teaching and learning. The focus of this research however, was on academic leadership capacity building with very little mention of the work of professional staff in these endeavours. Having been named, these Leadership literacies were then explored for theoretical resonance within the site of the work of professional staff in universities, the Australian higher education sector. After that, they were then explored for signs of observation and experience with a cohort of professional staff working in Australian universities.

I find that these five Leadership Literacies were theoretically congruent with practice-based theoretical research into building leadership capacities in Australian universities, particularly for leadership of teaching and learning. The focus of this research however, was on academic leadership capacity building with very little mention of the work of professional staff in these endeavours. When explored within the observations of lived
experiences of work and leadership given by a cohort of 226 professional staff working in Australian universities, the five Leadership Literacies were also evident.

These Leadership Literacies were drawn together based on my understanding that leadership is a socially complex and context dependant phenomenon. In support of this argument I called upon Grint’s (2005b) contention that “leadership involves the social construction of context that both legitimates a particular form of action and constitutes the world in the process…[ergo a] reintroduction of the proactive role of leadership in the construction of context” (pp. 1470-1471). This was actioned by considering the contexts for leadership, i.e. sustainability, mindsets and power relations, as foundational to the conceptualisations of the Leadership Literacies named in this thesis. This argument also resonates with my methodological assumption, borrowed from Law’s (2010) emphasis on ‘methods as social theories of practice’ (p. 6), that leadership studies in the 21st century, as well as the research design in pursuit of them, were ‘shaping and shaped by context’.

Three sub-questions were used to answer the research question:

- What are these emerging leadership literacies?
- To what extent are they being theorised in Australian universities?
- To what extent are they being experienced by professional staff working in Australian universities?

The first sub-question led to my discernment of the importance of humanist principles as a link between these five emergent Leadership Literacies and their sensemaking possibilities for leadership studies at this particular time in history. Indeed these concerns are longstanding and I began with Mary Parker Follett, who early in the last century recognised the importance of humanist concerns in the world of work which influenced the emergence of the Human Relations Movement of the 1930s (along with Chester Barnard and Elton Mayo). While this interest in humanist principles remained visible in the remainder of the 20th century, it was not particularly fashionable, and was evident in Reiser’s (1958) calls for rapprochement between humanist and scientific concerns (p. 2); McGregor’s (1960) Theory Y proposition; and, Greenleaf’s (1977) Servant Leadership theory. Indeed, this led me to identify the linkage between current leadership discourse upon a possible third wave of globalisation in which economics and energy management of people and the planet are considered inseparable. While I had earlier identified sustainability as a possible zeitgeist and context for leadership in the 21st century (along with mindsets emanating from three distinct periods; complexity, learning and sustainability as sensemaking frames; and with the critical perspectives that surface connections between power relations and language) my acknowledgement of this connection is represented in the naming of two of the Leadership Literacies as Sustaining and Learningful. I found evidence of this humanist focus in Critical
Management Studies theory [as grounded in Burrell and Morgan’s argument of ‘radical humanism’ (1979 p. 32)] and indeed in all three of the cognitive frames that underpin this inquiry, American Pragmatist philosophy, CMS and the Pragmatist Feminist guiding theoretical principles. This led my inquiry to emergent Worldly Leadership theory (Turnbull, 2009) that is engendering interest in humanist concerns for leadership studies today.

I regard the specific leadership literacies and their provenance as a deliberate act of amplification for this important body of literature, having considered them through much reflection, rehearsal of arguments at conferences and in my research blog.

Having identified these Leadership Literacies from these various activities, I return to the next sub question “to what extent are they being theorised in Australian universities?” I explained my rationale for focusing on professional staff working in this sector was due to my practice led researcher focus; because they were underrepresented in the literature; and the importance of the sector in times that see knowledge production as driver of economic growth emblematic of the times. This sub-question was addressed by focussing on the challenges and changes in the sector over the last 50 years as the ‘idea of the university’ was redefined by the adoption of more managerial approaches to governance. Based on this background of changing context, I used three principle sources to explore this sub question. First, I identified discussion in academic discourse about leadership for the sector. This was principally contained in two major writings (both of which came from Australian academics in the late 1990s [Paul Ramsden and Elaine Martin], but have had wider impact, particularly in the UK). These writings suggest that among academics, at the very least, there were attempts to theorise about leadership needs for universities. Second, I identified government reports about future directions for universities (Bradley et al 2008: Cutler 2008). These reports revealed little reference to leadership at all theories of leadership as their focus was principally on macro governance issues rather than on the practice and development of leadership. Third, I identified two significant Reports based upon the practice-focussed research into leadership approaches that aspire to build leadership capacity in learning and teaching in the sector Scott et al (2008) and Jones and Ryland (2011) reports. It was here, in the Scott et all (2008) and Jones and Ryland (2011) reports that I found significant congruence between their theorisations of leadership with those of the five Leadership Literacies.

I posited in the first pages of this thesis that I considered two key issues as emergent in the Australian higher education sector in Australia. First the extent of Australia’s preparedness to adequately support and fully engage in a global knowledge-driven economy, second, the positioning of the higher education sector as both the driver and
vehicle of Australia’s capacity building endeavours so that Australia might prosper in these times. These concerns were explored in chapter 5 and I remain concerned that if shifts towards more holistic and humane governance and leadership for the sector are not adopted, there may be a risk to Australia’s future nation building capacities. These considerations, upon reflection, were largely outside the scope of my inquiry but they will continue to drive my research endeavours. My contribution to this discourse is in the account of leadership in the higher education sector with the illumination of leadership research for the sector that were found to be congruent with the Leadership Literacies I constructed and positioned as amenable to this work with current contexts and conditions. I have found in my inquiries a latent, bottom-up capacity that has yet to be fully realised by current governance practices in Australian universities. The implications for professional development and leadership studies that my research has uncovered, whilst not the focus of this thesis either, will be considered in the report I have agreed to write, as part of my ethics agreement for the Association of Tertiary Education Management (ATEM).

In final, stage of the research I delved deeper into the empirical research for the thesis with the question. To what extent are these Leadership Literacies being experienced by professional staff in Australian universities? This shifted the focus from theory to practice and to the views of a cohort of professional staff working in universities. This involved a survey capturing an account of lived experience of 226 professional staff in universities to ascertain the extent to which I could find signs of the Leadership Literacies captured in a snapshot of time between November 2009 and February 2010. The timing referred to here is not noteworthy in itself. Rather it was the time of the data collection with the intention to record a unique dataset as a snapshot in time of this underrepresented cohort. I found significant levels of congruence with all of the Leadership Literacies. Using Framework analysis I subjected responses to specific questions to a thematic analysis that elicited their experiences of work and leadership. This was achieved by building ‘evidence-based images’ and bringing together ‘ideas’ (in this case the Leadership Literacies and their underpinning theoretical frames) into conversation with the ‘data’ based on Ragin’s (1994) analytic frame. The working model I drew upon to do this work is made transparent as Appendix 1B. The outcome was that I identified significant levels of congruence between the observations of the survey participants and the five Leadership Literacies. Therefore, I find that from the observations of work and leadership experiences given by these professional staff in Australian universities I was able to elicit suggestions of congruence with the five Leadership Literacies. There was also a disjunct between the answers to some of the questions and their accounts of the lived experiences of their work as provided in their demographic details. This was particularly evident in the analysis of the Sustaining
Leadership Literacy focus on energy management. These ambiguities highlight the complexities of the conditions of work at this time, where there are clear indications of interest in and evidence of the Leadership Literacies being observed and experienced by people. Yet the energy management indicators suggest that the system of management of this work is likely to be lagging and seemingly underpinned by assumptions more at home in the 20th century command and control era.

These analyses led to my finding that the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies were indicated as congruent with leadership approaches for professional staff working in universities.

7.1.1 New Knowledge Claims

Based on these discoveries and this finding, I now turn to knowledge claims I can make arising from this research. The first is that the five Leadership Literacies identified as Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful, contribute to leadership theory as it applies to leadership for professional staff in universities. These findings may be applicable more broadly to professional staff working in other parts of the world where staffing characteristics are similar to those in Australia.

The importance of both my choice to focus on professional staff in universities, and the findings that emerged from my research, serve to highlight a previous gap in the literature regarding Australian universities. This demonstrable gap is indicated in that while professional staff represent over 50% of all staff in universities, research into their role, much less their leadership, has been under-theorised to date, both conceptually and empirically, in broad higher education literature. It follows that this under-representation is also evident in research about leadership in the sector as well as leadership concerning professional staff in the sector.

I also claim that in purposively asking participants about their own leadership, but rather about their views about their work and leadership to elicit signs of the Leadership Literacies, my research adds significantly to the emergent focus on the work of leadership as a collective concept rather than it being situated in individual leaders as it has elicited strong signs of the work of leading, on their part as well as on the part of their leaders. In developing this unique methodological approach I drew on CMS theoretical perspectives and the Pragmatist Feminist guiding principles to take a follower perspective, rather than the more traditional leadership studies perspective of asking leaders about their leadership. This standpoint accords with Pragmatist Feminist aims to ‘measure from the margins’ and is a different but complementary lens for leadership studies for universities as supported by DePree’s (1989) argument that “signs of outstanding leadership appear primarily among the followers” (p. 10). In this
regard, how well followers are doing is itself an indicator of more general leadership performance. These all indicate leadership, as shared experiences given in the accounts of work and leadership by these professional staff, confirm that there is much to be optimistic about in terms of how closely aligned they are with the Leadership Literacies I have identified. This is a particularly relevant discovery given the nascent stage of the theorisation of these Leadership Literacies. This demonstrates a latent potential that is available, given the opportunity if it presents to engage with the work of leadership in terms of worldly, sustaining, leadingful, relational and learningful practice, no matter how it may be theorised. In addition the exploration of the relationships portrayed in leadership theory, especially within an under-theorised focus on a leader/follower/purpose trinity were captured in this study, thus contributing a baseline for comparison should this area of research continue to emerge.

Finally, while the aim of this thesis was not to contribute to leadership theory per se, I have tested a novel CMS approach, of a Pragmatist Feminist lens. This is a further claim for the Leadership Literacies as a contribution to new knowledge within the broader leadership studies field due to the disruptive capacities of the Leadership Literacies to trouble a ‘business as usual’ complacency. I regard this as a considerable threat given the complex challenges facing leadership in the 21st century. I argue that in adopting this perspective the Leadership Literacies I have developed provide the opportunity to add value, as the step before considering theory, by adding to a lexicon for looking afresh at leadership studies. In this way, further research is needed before their value can be determined for helping change mindsets so people can find more humane and sustaining ways to ‘do’ leadership in the 21st century.

My commitment, now that this inquiry is complete, is to contribute to the making of amenable spaces—of the mind and in the workplace—so that fresh approaches for leadership may be championed. My thesis has demonstrated that there is a long history and large body of literature already available to ground this work. Indeed I have discussed many of them in this thesis, however, when related specifically to leadership of, and for, professional staff in universities, the research is scant. To recap, theories underpinning the Leadership Literacies are examples of some of the existing theories attuned to this work, yet they have far to go before they are able to shift hegemonies more at home in the last century than this one. Closer to home, within the field of leadership studies in Australian universities, two viable research theorisations were identified and analysed in chapter 5. Like their counterparts in the wider leadership literature I explored in chapter 4, they are yet to be regarded as mainstream. I have discussed in this thesis the contribution that complexity theories make, with two in particular emphasised. The value of social complexity theories however emerged over the course of this inquiry and its potential, for the field of leadership studies, only
became clear to me after the collection of empirical data in 2010. However, complexity leadership theories. In particular I found the work of Cilliers, and his argument that only modest claims can ever be made for knowledge in complex situations engaging. Furthermore, it is a solid frame for my intent to amplify of the work of others in the development of the Leadership Literacies, and that this approach was indeed ‘enough’. Cilliers further argues, for what I see as another benefit for leadership studies, that “complexity theory does not provide us with exact tools to solve our complex problems, but shows us (in a rigorous way) exactly why these problems are so difficult” (2005 p. 257), indeed an excellent grounding for leadership studies today. I have mentioned the work of Mary Uhl-Bien and her colleagues and I reiterate that Complexity Leadership Theory (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009) captures addresses many of the challenges for leadership for these times and is worthy of consideration for future research concerning professional staff in university settings. Their theory is ‘of its time’ because it uses complexity theory to encourage creativity and innovation in the workplace, whilst at the same time understanding that this work, at this time, still operates in largely bureaucratic environments. Their Complexity Leadership Theory reimagines administrative functions as in the service of the purpose of the enterprise, not the other way around, which is a timely message for leadership studies amenable to the work of professional staff today. It is also a message I have raised in this thesis through the CMS warrant of this inquiry. These theories, and many more complexity-focused ideas, are amenable to work with, not contributing further to, complexities of 21st century leadership. These, like my Leadership Literacies, are intent on shifting old mindsets and status quo so that the work of looking afresh at leadership can occur.

7.2 Making Sense of the Inquiry
I take Fullan and Scott’s (2009) ‘ready, fire, aim’ scaffold, used as the descriptor of the methodological approach in this thesis, to now frame reflections about what I researched, how I went about it, and what possibilities there are for further research. The ‘ready’ reflections discuss the importance of the research design and the literatures in producing the finding for this inquiry. In the ‘fire’ reflections I discuss the moments that led to the naming of the Leadership Literacies and their theoretical underpinnings, which in turn were applied first to Australian universities, then to professional staff working in Australian universities. Lastly, in ‘now aim’, reflections on the process of undertaking this research are discussed. They include refinements and opportunities for further research. Fullan and Scott’s (2009, p. 85) approach was their response to looking afresh at leadership in times of considerable change. Such responses are echoed by others who likewise seek leadership research to look deeper and differently at leadership studies in response to contemporary times (for example, Smith & Heshusius, 1986; Wood, 2005; Sinclair, 2007b; Carroll et al, 2008; Hassard et
al, 2008; Klenke, 2008; Bolden et al, 2011; Bryman, 2011; Uhl-Bien, 2011). I restate this in framing this section, as:

… shifting the focus to strategic thinking requires a considerable change in culture. To survive and thrive in uncertain context of the 21st century, universities have to shift from a propensity to engage in ready, ready, ready (have a subcommittee, conduct a review, etc.) to ready, fire, aim—a process in which ready is a need to act, fire is to try out a potentially viable response under controlled conditions, and aim is to articulate what works best and scale this up once it has been tested and refined (Fullan & Scott 2009 p. 85).

7.2.1 Ready…

The need to act: In this thesis the research design for the emergent interpretive inquiry has been made transparent. Likewise, in chapter 3, the elicitation of largely intangible contexts for leadership in the 21st century has been explicated. This attention was part of a ‘get ready’ strategy deemed necessary in pursuit of the socially complex and context dependant nature of leadership concerns I was investigating in real time (and as it transpired in a significant period of turmoil given the Global Financial Crisis happened soon after I began this inquiry). It was important to ground this work with strong cognitive frames. My research design afforded a loose but logical framework to begin this inquiry to see how far it could take me. I was not sure just how far this might be, as is the risk of emergent interpretive inquiry. It proved to be one of the stable factors in this inquiry, along with the hard frame of time I applied to the collection of data (2008-2011) which accorded with the period of my full time scholarship. American Pragmatist philosophy, as discussed in chapter 2, is regarded as not only as a philosophy but also as a way to do philosophy (Menand, 1997), such is its regard for experiential and reflective practice. This cognitive frame also gave me the warrant to apply abductive logic (developed by Charles Sanders Peirce, a founder of American Pragmatism) which was particularly helpful in my investigation of the literatures of four separate, yet interrelated, sites of inquiry, to drawn upon as foundations for the Leadership Literacies. The Critical Management Studies theoretical lens and the five Pragmatist Feminist guiding principles emanating from it influenced my choice to look first at the contexts of leadership as well as the selection of the context about power relations and language explored in chapter 3. These cognitive frames supported the means to enact the inquiry, described throughout this thesis as act of interpretive inquiry.

Another need to act moment was in response to my disquiet in practice that led me to this research. In terms of Fullan and Scott’s work, instead of taking a ready, ready, ready approach (which in my case was waiting for someone else to ‘fix’ what I saw as a problem). In this regard, the conceptualisation of the Leadership Literacies, as challenging as this was in real time, was my response to this ‘need to act’. The process
I followed was to first make a warranted assertion (i.e. did some scoping of the issue); then do some initial testing of these assertions as part of my action learning approach; then mindfully choose ‘something’ to study (not just ‘anything’ and not relying on certainty for a ‘perfect’ set to be confirmed); prepare them as best as possible so they can be ‘fired’ into action in a timely manner. For the literature search, the impetus for this ‘something’ was the notion that ‘leaders are in the business of energy management’ which I first discovered in Kets de Vries (2003) work and this framed my inquiry. I likewise spent a long time in the literatures scoping context for the Leadership Literacies to locate some grounding for the emergent nature of the inquiry. With these points of stability, I was able to follow the argument where it led, and the inquiry was able to draw to its natural conclusion. These foundations, and sense of ‘getting ready’ led me to the construction of the Leadership Literacies Framework: naming the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies so they could be investigated for signs of congruence with leadership for professional staff in Australian universities.

7.2.2 Fire…

To try out potentially viable responses under controlled conditions: The ‘what I did’ part of the process has been explained in detail already in the discussions leading up to the naming of the findings. I will not belabour this aspect again, but instead reflect on how such an invitation to ‘fire’ buoyed my resolve for my methodological approach. My thesis rests on an interpretive act of inquiry and therefore on my standpoint as curator of the choices about what goes in, and gets left out (of the research as well as the account of it as represented in the thesis document). I understood the inherent risks of trying to do this as a doctoral student tentatively entering the occupied territory of methodological, leadership studies and discipline of management discourse. Fullan and Scott’s invitation to ‘fire’, to enact a ‘potentially viable response under controlled conditions’, gave me confidence to enact my research design. Indeed, this frame speaks to a pragmatic interest in experience and to ‘just get on with it’; as disruptor rationalist hegemony; and as an example of the ‘social model of knowledge’ which is one of my Pragmatist Feminist guiding principles.

7.2.3 Then Aim…

To articulate what works best and scale this up once it has been tested and refined: this is addressed by reflections about refinements and a sense of new research possibilities. Now having undertaken this inquiry I have had an opportunity to reflect on some of the possible refinements to my approach and for future research opportunities. Some of the Leadership Literacies had stronger theoretical underpinnings than others, to be expected in emergent interpretive inquiry. The way
that I conceptualised the Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies attest to this. Whilst they were confirmed in my finding, they were lightly sketched and more work is needed to develop and theorise them in regard to their promise for leadership studies. In particular, I have identified the ‘self-in-relation’ and having strong intra and interpersonal relationship skills as important leadership understandings for the 21st century. This is supported by Gardner's claim, that of all his ‘multiple intelligences’, he posits intra-personal intelligence “becoming more relevant every decade” (Gardner, 1999 p. 200).

The idea of learning metabolism has been a nascent research interest in the time of this study, and I expect it to emerge as a rich site of inquiry for leadership studies. This notion underpins my Learningful Leadership Literacy. Learning, up until recently, was rarely discussed as a leadership responsibility, with one of the few theorisations of it being Fletcher’s (2004) post heroic leadership typology where she argues for “leadership as learning: outcomes (pp. 647-650). The term Learning metabolism was coined, almost in passing, by Richard Hames (2007) who is now giving it more considered attention. Indeed Learning Metabolism will be more comprehensively theorised in his forthcoming book due to be published in 2013. Further research into this Leadership Literacy is warranted because of its potential to address the gap between ‘business as usual’ leadership and learning approaches still influenced by 20th century mindsets and what is needed to deal with the challenges and complexities of the 21st century, which include unlearning many 20th century assumptions. Without attention to this matter, this gap will likely remain until primary, secondary and tertiary students, currently engaging in programs based on ‘making thinking visible’ pedagogical theories, begin to enter the workforce.

Naturally, there are further research opportunities that may extend the possibilities for the research I have conducted in this thesis. These include applying this approach to different cohorts, in different locations at different times. This thesis stands as baseline of previously difficult to capture data from which to consider future comparisons. Upon reflection, I would refine this process slightly. I did not pay enough attention to who ‘their leader’ was in terms of gathering data about their leader. Next time I will at the least ask about gender (considering my Pragmatist Feminist approach this was a regrettable oversight). I would further refine the instrument to take more care about possible ambiguities in my questions concerning who their leader was and their position in the institution. There were some ambiguities apparent when analysing this
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data, which presented challenges to participants because in some cases they could have answered in terms of ‘and, and’, rather than ‘either, or’.

My contribution to the field provides a broad view of the scope, context and experiences of leadership and work of professional staff working in universities. It is a resource available to begin future conversations regarding research and policy development work in support of professional staff in universities, as well as tertiary education leadership studies more generally. My research interests now lie in unpacking these findings and working with individuals, small groups and institutions in practice, to develop leadership capacities for 21st century leadership challenges in the tertiary education sector. Indeed, the findings from this thesis have been incorporated into a large-scale professional development project to build capacity for emerging tertiary education leaders and managers, institutions and the sector and to be launched in September 2012. This is a joint project between the LH Martin Institute for Tertiary Education Leadership and Management and the Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM). It is to be offered as self-paced online professional development which is free to ATEM members. It is also designed to provide as the first formal articulation pathway from professional development into recognised award programs with credit. The first module ‘Developing and Managing the Self’ is directly influenced by the findings of this study and promotes a critically reflective professional practice for tertiary education managers.

Whilst I am comfortable about the robustness of the five leadership literacies themselves as capturing the essence of the concerns underpinning the study of leadership for professional staff in knowledge-intensive enterprises in the 21st century, I have no such attachment to all of the theoretical constructs I chose to represent them in Chapter 6. I expect that these theoretical underpinnings will be reconsidered each time new research is undertaken to directly address context and keep pace with emerging leadership studies research. For example leadership studies underpinned by social complexity theories were identified in this thesis as showing promise but were in nascent form in 2009 when the Leadership Literacies and their theoretical underpinnings were considered in this inquiry. By its end in mid 2012 this line of inquiry has developed further and it is understood that Uhl-Bien’s work with Complexity Leadership Theory, for example, is being empirically actively explored (Uhl-Bien, 2011).

7.3 Final Reflections

My final reflections I turn to three ideas emerging in unison as I contemplate putting the final full stop in this thesis. These are about amplification, the idea of ‘leadership as the
business of energy management’ and how these relate to the people I have featured in this thesis, professional staff in Australian universities.

I have spoken several times already about amplifying the considerable body of literature that is now encapsulated within the Worldly, Sustaining, Leadingful, Relational and Learningful Leadership Literacies. I feel honoured to have been in the company of these scholars and to have grasped meaning ‘set down by someone else, by people met and unmet, by people long dead, and to have felt their hand reaching out of the text to take my own’ (Hytner, 2006).

This thesis has also amplified the voices of professional staff working in universities, who as Szekeres (2004) reasoned in her search for them in higher education discourse, were ‘invisible workers’. I captured as many of these voices that wanted to be heard and they had much to say about work and leadership in universities in this early part of the 21st century. One of the key messages discerned from their accounts were concerns about energy management, having positioned this as a leadership concern within the Sustaining Leadership Literacy and therefore making it discussable.

Given the recollections in Martin’s (1999) research that were illustrated in this thesis concerning the effects of change and turbulence on academic staff, there are similarities in the responses given by professional staff, some ten years later. I gave two accounts of academics voicing their frustration and sense of despair from Martin’s research. These sentiments have been shared by my participants, and one quote, from Martha, eloquently encapsulates similar frustrations and indeed risk:

> We seem to be working longer and longer hours—I regularly work a 50+ week and also work on the weekend. Most of my colleagues are in similar positions, this situation will increasingly take a toll on our health, work productivity and organizational sustainability. However, what can we do about it?

> Martha (Generation Jones, Go8 Manager)

I regard this as a key leadership challenge in universities at this time. I am also struck again by the prescience of Mary Parker Follett, and her grasp of these concerns so long ago. She was a person ahead of her time. This leads me to ponder whether she may also be ahead of ours in light of her messages about making the connection between leadership and energy management stronger.

> Whoever connects me with the hidden springs of all life, whoever increases the sense of life in me is my leader (Follett, 1928 p. 294).
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Appendix 1: Survey Instrument and Analysis Documents

Appendix 1A: Survey Instrument (including extra details for questions 19 & 20)
Appendix 1B: Placing the questions into themes for thematic analysis

Appendix 2: Invitation to Participants

Appendix 2A: Endorsement from ATEM President
Appendix 2B: Invitation to participants, including a plain language statement
Appendix One: Survey Instrument & Analysis Documents

1.1 Survey Instrument (Including further details for participants for questions 19 & 20)

1.2 Placing the questions into themes for Thematic Analysis
Leadership Literacies for the Knowledge Era

1. Introduction and Consent

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. This is an anonymous survey and your individual responses will be completely confidential.

Before beginning this survey it is expected that you have read the Plain Language Statement which outlines the project and your rights as a participant.

The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete and is divided into four main sections: about you; about your work; leadership in your workplace, and about your leader.

Heather Davis
16 November, 2009

PS. if the 'next' button doesn’t take you to the next page it will be because a question has been missed, just scroll back up the page and the missed spot will be indicated in red.

*1. I have read the Plain Language statement and consent to participate in this research project.
   □ Yes
   □ No

*2. Are you a current member of ATEM and work in an Australian university? (If you work in a dual sector Australian university do you work in the higher education section?)
   □ Yes
   □ No

*3. Are you employed as a Higher Education Worker (HEW) or equivalent; or else hold an executive contract/salary position that is not 100% academic?
   □ Yes
   □ No

2. About You

*4. What is your gender?
   □ Female
   □ Male

*5. When were you born?
   □ Before 1921
   □ Between 1922 - 1943
   □ Between 1944 - 1953
   □ Between 1954 - 1965
   □ Between 1966 - 1980
   □ Between 1981 - 2000

*6. What is your highest educational qualification?
   □ Doctorate
   □ Masters degree
   □ Postgraduate Diploma or Certificate
   □ Undergraduate degree
   □ VCE
   □ Year 11
   □ Other
**3. About your work**

**7. What is your current position level?**
- Administrator (HEW 4-7)
- Manager (HEW 7-10)
- General Manager (HEW 10+)
- Executive Position (Executive contract or salary)
- Other (please specify)

**8. How long have you worked in the tertiary education sector?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Less than 10 months</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>16-20 years</th>
<th>21-25 years</th>
<th>26-30 years</th>
<th>31-35 years</th>
<th>36-40 years</th>
<th>41-45 years</th>
<th>46-50 years</th>
<th>51-55 years</th>
<th>56-60 years</th>
<th>61+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. I think I have adequate time, financial and material resources to do my job well.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10. How many people do you manage?**
- None
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-40
- 41-75
- 76-100
- 101+

**11. Adding up to 100%, what percent of your time and energy do you invest in managing relationships with:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Self (%)</th>
<th>Peers (%)</th>
<th>Those you are responsible to (%)</th>
<th>Those you are responsible for (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12. How many hours did you work last week (or if you were on leave then the last full week you worked)?**

- Less than the hours I was paid for
- The same as the hours I was paid for
- Slightly more than the hours I was paid for (≤ 5% more)
- Moderately more than the hours I was paid for (6-10% more)
- Many more than the hours I was paid for (11-20% more)
- Significantly more than the hours I was paid for (> 20% more)

Comments about workload welcome

**13. In percentage terms, how would you describe the breakdown of your professional time over the last 12 months (or for the period you have worked in your current role if it is less than 12 months)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work as specified in my position description (%)</th>
<th>Other work that I was not specified in my position description (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments on workload support welcome
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14. When you think about what brings you to work, what are the motivating drivers? (choose ONE for each column):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key motivational driver</th>
<th>Least motivational driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular and secure</td>
<td>c. Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pay and conditions</td>
<td>d. Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social interactions</td>
<td>e. Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Professional</td>
<td>f. Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>g. Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Practice</td>
<td>h. Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Mobility</td>
<td>i. Mutual support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Professional</td>
<td>j. Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>k. To help others reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Personal growth</td>
<td>l. Their interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. To benefit others</td>
<td>m. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. To help others reach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Their interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered 'Other' please elaborate here.

15. If any questions in this section have sparked reflection about your experiences and observations of work and you wish to comment on this, please do so here.

(A note on navigation. At the end of this section if the 'next' button doesn't take you to the next page it will be because a question has been missed. Just scroll back up the page until the missed question becomes visible as indicated by a message in red.)

Leadership in your workplace

16. What type of university do you work for? (Categories are from the Australian Education Network)

- Group of Eight (includes ANU, Monash, UNSW and the Universities of Adelaide, Melbourne, Queensland, Sydney & Western Australia)
- Innovative Research Universities (IRU) (includes Charles Darwin, Flinders, Griffith, James Cook, La Trobe, Monash & Macquarie)
- New Generation Universities (NGU) (includes ACU, Central Ost, Deakin, Grinnell, University of South Australia, Sydney, University of South Australia, Flinders, and the Universities of Tasmania, New South Wales, and Western Sydney)
- Private (includes Bond, Monash, and others)

17. What do you perceive to be your university's motivational drivers? (choose ONE for each column):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key motivational driver</th>
<th>Least motivational driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infrastructure</td>
<td>c. Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Management</td>
<td>d. Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Professional</td>
<td>e. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>f. Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Practice</td>
<td>g. Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Mobility</td>
<td>h. Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Mobility</td>
<td>i. To help others reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Mobility</td>
<td>j. Their interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Mobility</td>
<td>k. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered 'Other' please elaborate here.
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**18.** These statements relate to the process of leadership. Please indicate whether you have observed these indicators of the process of leadership being espoused and/or practiced in your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Please tick TWO answers for each row).</th>
<th>Exposed</th>
<th>Not Exposed</th>
<th>Practiced</th>
<th>Not Practiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in my organisation is openly celebrated and rewarded</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openly and frequently shared with all stakeholders, if not formally held</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in my organisation is clearly defined and it unfolds via unambiguous criteria or statement of values</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in my organisation is strongly hierarchical and it unfolds via unambiguous criteria or statement of values</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in my organisation involves people learning together about preferred futures, current realities and the challenges of achieving change</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation currently achieves sustainability with appropriate actions and resources</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation is committed to a triple bottom line approach to governance (e.g. financial, social and environmental matters are all seen as important)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area where I work is aware and embraces sustainability and environmental issues</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area where I work conducts problem-solving and/or after-action reviews</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area where I work has a state of learning that is equal to or greater than the state of learning in the organisation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19.** From your observation, which level of corporate sustainability development BEST matches your university's commitment to HUMAN sustainability? (select ONE choice for each column).

**Note:** Definitions for the terms provided can be found here and will open in a new window.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Practiced</th>
<th>Which level would you like your workplace to be operating from by 2015?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Innovation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Non-responsive</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Compliant</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Efficiency</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Strategic Priority</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining and integrated</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20.** From your observation, which level of corporate sustainability development BEST matches your university's commitment to ECOLOGICAL sustainability? (select ONE choice for each column).

**Note:** Definitions for the terms provided can be found here and will open in a new window.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Practiced</th>
<th>Which level would you like your workplace to be operating from by 2015?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Innovation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Non-responsive</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Compliant</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Efficiency</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Strategic Priority</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining and integrated</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**21. The area where I work compares its performance with that of:** (tick all that apply)

- [ ] external competitors
- [ ] external best-in-class organizations
- [ ] other
- [ ] none of the above

**22. The area where I work arranges forums with and to learn from:** (tick all that apply)

- [ ] experts
- [ ] customers
- [ ] suppliers
- [ ] stakeholders
- [ ] other
- [ ] none of the above

If you selected 'other' (please specify): [ ]

If you included 'other' (please specify): [ ]
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23. If any questions in this section have sparked reflection about your experiences and observations of the process of leadership in your workplace and you wish to comment, please do so here.

(A note on navigation. At the end of this section if the 'next' button doesn't take you to the next page it will be because a question has been missed. Just scroll back up the page until the missed question becomes visible as indicated by a message in red.)

Leadership Literacies for the Knowledge Era

5. About Your Leader

This section requires you to respond to some statements about your direct leader's leadership behaviours. Please select one person who best fits the description of your direct leader and keep this person in mind as you respond to the 35 statements in this section.

* 24. The person I have identified as my 'direct leader' is:
   - My immediate manager
   - One of my peers
   - My faculty/divisional professional leader
   - My faculty/divisional academic leader
   - A senior professional executive leader (i.e. Registrar, PVC-Admin or similar)
   - A senior academic executive leader (i.e. PVC-Academic or similar)
   - The Vice Chancellor
   - Other (please specify the position)
**Leadership Literacies for the Knowledge Era**

**25. Please evaluate your direct leader with regard to their leadership behaviors by selecting the most appropriate response on the scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors of the Leader</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Creates a shared vision and values among others in his or her team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is not decisive when confused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sees me as an individual, not just a link in the chain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is driven by a sense of higher calling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Takes a holistic view of people, processes, and products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adapts to a changing vision to give inspiration and meaning to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Uses power in service to others, not just for his or her own ends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When criticized, he or she focuses on the message not the messenger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accepts mistakes and failure as part of my learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Helps me to find clarity of purpose and direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Encourages me to think where I am right and where I am wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leads by personal example.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Has clear vision of the goals and how to achieve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Practices what he or she preaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Requires me to do what I am told, not to think for myself or take risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Empathy means putting myself in the other's shoes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Inspires me to lead others by serving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sees people without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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---
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26. If any questions in this section have sparked reflection about your experiences and observations your leader and you wish to comment, please do so here.

(A note on navigation. At the end of this section if the 'next' button doesn't take you to the next page it will be because a question has been missed. Just scroll back up the page until the missed question becomes visible as indicated by a message in red.)

27. If you wish to add additional comments or provide anecdotal material related to this survey, please do so here.
### Definitions of the phases in the development of corporate sustainability (for qs 19 & 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Human Sustainability</th>
<th>Ecological Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rejection** | - Employees are regarded as a resource to be exploited;  
- health and safety features are ignored or paid lip service to;  
- force, threats of force and abuse are used to maintain compliance and workforce subjection;  
- training costs and expenditure on personal and professional development are kept to a minimum;  
- community concerns are rejected outright. | - the environment is regarded as a 'free good' to be exploited;  
- hostility towards environmental activists and to pressures from govt and others aiming for ecological sustainability;  
- pro-environmental action is seen as a threat to the university;  
- no responsibility taken for the environmental impact of its ongoing operations;  
- does not modify operations to lessen future ecological degradation. |
| **Non-responsiveness** | - Financial and technological factors dominate business strategies to the exclusion of most aspects of HRM;  
- IR/ER strategies dominate the human agenda, with 'labour' viewed as a cost to be minimized;  
- HR strategies are directed at developing a compliant workforce;  
- any training agenda centres on technical and supervisory training;  
- broader HR strategies and issues of wider social responsibility and community concern are ignored. | - the ecological environment is not considered to be a relevant factor in strategic or operational decisions, financial and technological factors dominate business strategies to the exclusion of environmental concerns;  
- environmental resources which are free or subsidized (air, water, etc) are wasted and little regard is given to environmental degradation resulting from activities;  
- environmental risks, costs and imperatives are seen as irrelevant or are not perceived at all. |
| **Compliance** | - Financial and technological factors still dominate business strategies but senior mgt view the university as a 'decent employer';  
- emphasis is on compliance with legal requirements in IR, safety, workplace standards, etc;  
- HR functions such as training, IR, organizational development, TQM are instituted but there is little integration between them;  
- compliance is undertaken mainly as a risk-reduction exercise;  
- a policy of benevolent paternalism is pursued with an expectation of employee loyalty;  
- community concerns are addressed only in the face of risk of prosecution or negative publicity. | - financial and technological factors still dominate business strategies but senior mgt seek to comply with environmental laws and to minimize the university’s potential liabilities from actions that might have an adverse impact on the environment;  
- the most obvious environmental abuses are eliminated;  
- other environmental issues that are unlikely to attract litigation or strong community action are ignored. |
| **Efficiency** | - There is a systematic attempt to integrate HR functions into a coherent system to reduce costs and increase efficiency;  
- people are viewed as a significant source of expenditure to be used as productively as possible;  
- technical and supervisory training is augmented with interpersonal skills training;  
- there is careful calculation of cost-benefit ratios for HR expenditure to ensure efficiencies are achieved;  
- community projects are undertaken. | - poor environmental practice is seen as an important source of avoidable cost;  
- ecological issues that generate costs are systematically reviewed so as to reduce costs and increase efficiencies;  
- there may be some active involvement in a systematic approach (i.e. TQM ISO 14001);  
- environmental issues are ignored if they are not seen as generating avoidable costs or increasing efficiencies. |
where funds are available and where a cost benefit to the university can be demonstrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Proactivity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sustaining and integrated</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· the workforce skills mix and diversity are integral aspects of corporate and business strategies;</td>
<td>· the university accepts responsibility for contributing to the process of renewing and upgrading human knowledge and skills formation in the community and society generally and is a strong promoter of equal opportunity, workplace diversity and work-life balance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· intellectual and social capital used to develop strategic advantage through innovation;</td>
<td>· adopts a clearly defined corporate ethical position based on multiple stakeholder perspectives and seeks to exert influence on the key participants in the sector and society in general to pursue human welfare, equitable just social practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· recruiting best talent and developing high levels of competence in individuals and groups;</td>
<td>· people are seen as valuable in their own right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· emphasis is placed on product and service innovation and speed of response to emerging market trends;</td>
<td>· the university becomes an active promoter of ecological sustainability values and seeks to influence key participants in the sector and society in general;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· flexible workplace practices are part of the workplace culture leading to more balanced lives;</td>
<td>· environmental best practice is espoused and enacted;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· communities are taken into consideration and initiatives to address adverse impacts on them are integrated into corporate strategy;</td>
<td>· the university assists society to be ecologically sustainable and uses its entire range of products and services to this end;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the university views itself as a member of the community and contributes to it by offering resources for projects that promote community cohesion and well-being.</td>
<td>· is prepared to promote positive sustainability policies on the part of governments, the restructuring of markets and the development of community values to facilitate the emergence of a sustainable society;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· proactive environmental strategies supporting ecological sustainability are seen as a means to produce competitive advantage;</td>
<td>· nature is valued for its own sake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· product redesign is used to reduce material throughput and to recycle;</td>
<td>· the university seeks competitive leadership through spearheading environmentally friendly products and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the university seeks competitive leadership through spearheading environmentally friendly products and processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qf</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Orig Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Used In</th>
<th>Survey Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>DM01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is your age range?</td>
<td>DM02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is your highest educational qualification?</td>
<td>DM03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>What is your position level?</td>
<td>DM04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How long have you worked in this role?</td>
<td>DM05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>How long have you worked in the tertiary education sector?</td>
<td>DM06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>How many people do you manage?</td>
<td>DM07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>How many hours per week did you average in the last full week you</td>
<td>DM08</td>
<td>R18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>What type of university do you work for?</td>
<td>DM10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The person I have identified as my direct leader is</td>
<td>DM11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>What is your main motivational driver for your work?</td>
<td>DM12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>How many hours per week did you average in the last full week you</td>
<td>DM09</td>
<td>EM01</td>
<td>S09</td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have adequate time, financial and material resources to do my job well</td>
<td>EM02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership as Process</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Is willing to let me take control of situations when appropriate</td>
<td>SLB5</td>
<td>LP01</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gives me the right to question hits or her actions and decisions</td>
<td>SLB6</td>
<td>LP02</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has confidence in me, even when the risks are great</td>
<td>SLC3</td>
<td>LP05</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treats people as equal partners in the organisation</td>
<td>SLC5</td>
<td>LP06</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is willing to spend time with me to build a professional relationship</td>
<td>SLC6</td>
<td>LP07</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helps me to find a clarity of purpose and direction</td>
<td>SLE2</td>
<td>LP08</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success</td>
<td>SLE3</td>
<td>LP09</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work</td>
<td>SLE4</td>
<td>LP13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Articulates a shared vision to give inspiration and meaning to work</td>
<td>SLEF1</td>
<td>LP11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspires me to lead others by serving</td>
<td>SLE3</td>
<td>LP10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allows me to experiment and be creative without fear</td>
<td>SLE4</td>
<td>EM07</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draws the best out of me</td>
<td>SLE5</td>
<td>LP03</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimizes barriers that inhibit my success</td>
<td>SLE6</td>
<td>LP04</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership as Process

25. **Contributes to my personal and professional growth**

- Leadership in this organisation involves people thinking together about preferred futures, current realities and challenges of achieving change.
  - Leadership is widely dispersed and is exercised by people with a contribution to make whether or not they hold formal levels of authority.
  - Leadership in my organisation is highly centralised (exercised primarily by one individual or a small executive group).
  - Leadership in my organisation is strongly hierarchical and it unfolds via cascading levels of authority.

25. **Obstructs others’ needs and interests above his or her own**

25. **Uses power in service to others, not his or her own ambition**

### Learning Metabolism

25. **Enables fully engaged, participative learning teams**

25. **Perpetuates a learning culture**

### Other-Centredness

25. **Serves people without regard to their backgrounds – race, religion, etc.**

25. **Demonstrates his or her care through sincere, practical deeds**

25. **Assists me without seeking acknowledgement or compensation**

25. **Is driven by a sense of a higher calling**
| Category | QM | Question                                                                 | Org Code | Code | Used In | Survey Section |
|----------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|----------------|----------------|
| Other-Centredness | 25.16 | Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success          | SLK3     | OCC03|         | 4. About your leader |
| Purpose | 25.30 | Listens to me with intent to understand                                   | SLA6     | OCC06|         | 4. About your leader |
| Purpose | 25.22 | Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work       | SLK4     | P02  |         | 4. About your leader |
| Purpose | 25.06 | Articulates a shared vision to give inspiration and meaning to work        | SLF1     | P04  |         | 4. About your leader |
| Reflexivity/Awareness | 17.00 | What do you perceive to be your university's main motivational driver     | P03      |      |         | 3. About your workplace |
| Reflexivity/Awareness | 25.26 | Enhances my capacity for moral actions                                    | SLK5     | RA1  |         | 4. About your leader |
| Reflexivity/Awareness | 25.16 | Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success          | SLK3     | RA2  |         | 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.01 | Considers others' needs and interests above his or her own                | SLK1     | OC01 |         | 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.07 | Uses power in service to others, not of his or her own ambition           | SLK2     | OC02, R01, W02| 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.13 | Is more conscious of his or her responsibilities than rights              | SLK3     | OC04, R02, W03| 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.19 | Serves people without regard to their backgrounds - race, religion, etc.   | SLK4     |      |         | 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.25 | Demonstrates his or her care through sincere, practical deeds             | SLK5     | EM14, OC05, R03| 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.34 | Assists me without seeking acknowledgment or compensation                | SLK6     | OC07, R05 | 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.30 | Listens to me with intent to understand                                   | SLK1     | R06  |         | 4. About your leader |
| Relationship(s) | 25.08 | When criticized, he or she focuses on the message not the messenger       | SLK1     | R07  |         | 4. About your leader |

<p>| Category | QM | Question                                                                 | Org Code | Code | Used In | Survey Section |
|----------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|----------------|----------------|
| SLS. Authentic Self | 25.14 | Practices what he or she preaches                                        | SLK3     |      |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLS. Authentic Self | 25.26 | Is willing to let me take control of situations when appropriate         | SLK5     |      |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLS. Authentic Self | 25.31 | Gives me the right to question his or her actions and decisions         | SLK6     | DL02, S11 | 4. About your leader |
| SLS. Authentic Self | 25.20 | Is willing to say &quot;I was wrong&quot; to other people                           | SLK4     | R08, R09 | 4. About your leader |
| SLC. Covenantal Relationship | 25.03 | Affirms his or her trust in me                                            | SLK3     | R09  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLC. Covenantal Relationship | 25.09 | Accepts me as I am, irrespective of my failures                          | SLK2     | R10  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLC. Covenantal Relationship | 25.27 | Treats people as equal partners in the organisation                      | SLK5     | DL07, R13, S12 | 4. About your leader |
| SLC. Covenantal Relationship | 25.27 | Is willing to spend time with me to build a professional relationship    | SLK6     | DL08, R14 | 4. About your leader |
| SLD. Responsible Morality | 25.05 | Takes a resolute stand on moral principles                               | SLK1     | P03  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLD. Responsible Morality | 25.11 | Emphasizes on doing what is right rather than looking good               | SLK2     | P04  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLD. Responsible Morality | 25.26 | Employs morally justified means to achieve legitimate ends               | SLK3     | P05  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLD. Responsible Morality | 25.18 | Encourages me to engage in moral reasoning                                | SLK4     | P06  |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLK. Transcendental Spiritual | 25.04 | Is driven by a sense of a higher calling                                 | SLK1     | OC08, W015 | 4. About your leader |
| SLK. Transcendental Spiritual | 25.10 | Helps me to find a clarity of purpose and direction                      | SLK2     | DL09, EM03, L09, P08, S07, R02, S15 | 4. About your leader |
| SLK. Transcendental Spiritual | 25.16 | Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success        | SLK3     |      |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLK. Transcendental Spiritual | 25.22 | Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work      | SLK4     |      |         | 4. About your leader |
| SLF. Transforming Influence | 25.06 | Articulates a shared vision to give inspiration and meaning to work      | SLK1     | EM09, L012, P10, R05, W010 | 4. About your leader |
| SLF. Transforming Influence | 25.12 | Leads by personal example                                                | SLK2     | EM07, P11, W009 | 4. About your leader |
| SLF. Transforming Influence | 25.18 | Inspires me to lead others by serving                                    | SLK3     | DL11, EM08, L005, R16 | 4. About your leader |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>QM Question</th>
<th>Orig Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Used In</th>
<th>Survey Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLF: Transforming Influence</td>
<td>25.24 Allows me to experiment and be creative without fear</td>
<td>SLF4</td>
<td>DL12, EM09, LM07, RA6</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.20 Draws the best out of me</td>
<td>SLF5</td>
<td>DL13, EM08, R27, S04, WL10</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.33 Minimizes barriers that inhibit my success</td>
<td>SLF6</td>
<td>DL14, EM10, WL11</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.35 Contributes to my personal and professional growth</td>
<td>SLF7</td>
<td>DL15, EM11, LM06, P17, RA7, S05, WL12</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>25.31 Gives me the right to question his or her actions and decisions</td>
<td>SLB6</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.32 Demonstrates his or her care through sincere, practical deeds</td>
<td>SLAS</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.37 Treats people as equal partners in the organisation</td>
<td>SLCS</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.38 Helps me to find a clarity of purpose and direction</td>
<td>SLSE</td>
<td>S07</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S25</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.39 Leads by personal example</td>
<td>SLF2</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.40 Inspires me to lead others by serving</td>
<td>SLF3</td>
<td>S21</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.41 Allows me to experiment and be creative without fear</td>
<td>SLF4</td>
<td>S20</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.42 Draws the best out of me</td>
<td>SLF5</td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.43 Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success</td>
<td>SLF7</td>
<td>S08</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S34</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.44 Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work</td>
<td>SLF4</td>
<td>S24</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.45 Articulates a shared vision to give inspiration and meaning to work</td>
<td>SLF1</td>
<td>S23</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.46 Listens to me with intent to understand</td>
<td>SLA6</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I have adequate time, financial and material resources to do my job well</td>
<td>EM02</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>quotes only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My workplace operates sustainably with appropriate policies and processes</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>QM Question</th>
<th>Orig Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Used In</th>
<th>Survey Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>19. From your observation, where on a scale of corporate sustainability development would your university be in relation to HUMAN sustainability</td>
<td>S02</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. From your observation, where on a scale of corporate sustainability development would your university be in relation to ECOLOGICAL sustainability</td>
<td>S03</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.6 Environmental concerns with triple bottom line governance (financial, social and environmental)</td>
<td>WLO1</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. How many hours per week did you average over the last month?</td>
<td>DM10</td>
<td>S09</td>
<td>2. About your work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.14 Precisions what he or she preaches</td>
<td>SLB8</td>
<td>W104</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.07 Uses power in service to others, not of his her own ambition</td>
<td>SLA2</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.19 Serves people without regard to their backgrounds - race, religion, etc</td>
<td>SLA4</td>
<td>W109</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.04 Is driven by a sense of a higher calling</td>
<td>SLA1</td>
<td>W105</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.16 Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success</td>
<td>SLF3</td>
<td>W106</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.22 Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work</td>
<td>SLF4</td>
<td>W107</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.06 Articulates a shared vision to give inspiration and meaning to work</td>
<td>SLF1</td>
<td>W108</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.12 Leads by personal example</td>
<td>SLF2</td>
<td>W109</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.29 Draws the best out of me</td>
<td>SLF5</td>
<td>W110</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.33 Minimizes barriers that inhibit my success</td>
<td>SLF6</td>
<td>W111</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.35 Contributes to my personal and professional growth</td>
<td>SLF7</td>
<td>W112</td>
<td>4. About your leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership in this organization involves people thinking together about preferred futures, current realities and challenges of achieving change</td>
<td>LPO1</td>
<td>W114</td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area where I work competes its performance with that of: Internal competitors</td>
<td>LPO5</td>
<td>W113</td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is concerned with triple bottom line governance (financial, social and environmental)</td>
<td>WLO1</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>3. About your workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two: Invitation to Participants

2.1 Endorsement from ATEM President
2.2 Invitation to Participants and Plain Language Statement