



A POSITION PAPER

A Not Knowing: Gaining an Understanding of the Future of Management

Ademola, E.O.

Professor & Chairperson
Centre for Citizenship and Leadership Galaxy
United Kingdom
E-mail: ojo_ademola@hotmail.co.uk

ABSTRACT

Leaders are known to be most contented and assertive when issues are within the caption of their competence. It is most discouraging to leaders when they have much of uncharted waters to navigate and especially when those waters spread beyond the edge of their ability. This paper attempts to present a picture of how the future of management may unfold. It considers the current trend as it impacts current managing and leadership. It offers a view of how to turn the unprecedentedly unknown to an opportunity in the field of managerial learning and development.

Keywords: uncertainty, future trend, globalization, development, opportunity

iSTEAMS MINTT Proceedings Reference Format

Ademola, E.O. (2016): A Not Knowing: Gaining An Understanding Of The Future Of Management. Proceedings of the iSTEAMS MINTT Conference, Sept 27-29, 2016, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria. Pp 225-230

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a danger associated with 'not knowing' what the future holds regarding any subject. According to D'Souza and Renner (2014), the iconic phrase "knowledge is power" apparently does not front citing. The experience of knowing somethings provides many opportunities in life. People go to school to know, and individuals who know attract dignity and fitting status in society. It appears that little evidence of knowledge could confer appropriate dignity and demand human attention. In present days, people think and make predictions for a living.

This paper is an attempt to develop a knowledge fill for the future of managing by extracting the knowledge gained literatures on the reference list. The knowledge gained through the elucidation of organizational culture and the making of evolving environment for sharing of knowledge, according to Alrawi, Hamdan, Al-Taie, and Ibrahim (2011), could afford scholar-practitioner commitment to further their understanding and create a prospect for further research. Individual as an organization development (OD) practitioner-scholar, according to Bartunek (2008), can contribute to the database of organizational theory and afford professional managers and management scholars platforms to collaborate.

In space and time for managerial roles, there exist numerous management models to provide a manager with a choice of executing his or her ideas. (Birkinshaw & Goddard, 2009) Apparently, the theories and thoughts on different administrative activities; humanism, social theory, entrepreneurial challenge, the modern management paradigm, post-modern organization; and others make new ideas available in management thinking. (Dunn, Lafferty, & Alford, 2012; Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010; Grant, 2012; Hamel, 2009; Ocker, Huang, Benbunan-Fich, & Hiltz, 2011; Bartunek, 2008) Nonetheless, one could argue a slowdown in the pace of evolving thoughts on the current management idea but the scholarly views for further theorizing, contextualizing of OD, innovation, global leadership paradigm, scholar-practitioner collaborative research agenda, and the likes, give a confiding hope that there exist a navigation path to future of management. (Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002; Schys, Kiefer, Kerschreiter, & Tymon, 2011)



2. THE CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP

According to Schys, Kiefer, Kerschreiter, and Tymon (2011), implicit leadership theories (ILTs) in practice, provide a direction. It makes the teaching of leadership a more of exclusively and socially decided topics, but does not mean, leadership exists in isolation. In leadership development, ILTs provide knowledge platforms where the outcomes could contribute to developing leaders and managers. Practically, it progresses the idea that self- and social awareness for contextualizing could in a way help leadership to develop.

For trends and pace of evolution in management to attract further attention, scholar-practitioners must give due consideration to the circumstances under which a leader function in actioning a particular leadership theory. Nonetheless, according to Osborn, Hunt, and Jauch (2002), there are four contexts for leadership development; stability, crisis, dynamic balance, and edge of chaos. Furthermore, different models of leadership fit different circumstances. There are implications to determine the appropriate managerial style or form for the future; (Osborn et al., 2002) indicated that business needs to understand that in practice, there is no individual leadership that fits in entirety to the holistic needs of leaders. In other words, leaders must frequently make the decision to determine which models fit for which purpose. It means leaders must be agile to lead any organizational change by efficiently mapping out different models for the changing environment. (Alrawi et al., 2011; Osborn et al., 2002; Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010)

3. THE PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCE

According to Hamel (2007), managers' working atmosphere is frequently changing. The working environment appears to be more multifarious, unstable, and unpredictable. Seemingly, the skill set requirement for leadership is ever changing due to a different work situation. The core of leadership competency is not dynamic enough to adequately unravel the unknown of today's extraordinary complexity. It appears competence is not evolving, as the situation becomes more involving, adaptive thinking abilities of leaders should be improving. It seems leadership existing models are not changing at the pace the environment does; methodologies in carrying out managerial roles are not changing along with the impulsive context of the circumstances (Hamel, 2009; Osborn et al., 2002). Almost the same tools available to professional managers since the advent of management is still prevailing. Mostly, managers are developing from the hands-on experiential paradigm, training, coaching or mentoring. While these are all of the contributing values, the pace of leadership development are retarding and not able to create sufficient space for development; as if the creation of knowledge is stagnating or humans just remain motionless in knowing. (D'Souza & Renner, 2014) Nonetheless, it appears there is a limited venture on research findings for the academic and little collaborations exist between academic and practitioners in an everyday attempt at leadership development.

4. THE ENCOUNTER FORWARD

According to D'Souza and Renner (2014), in the past few decades, economies shifted variously and continued to change. For instance, in developed and developing states economies, there is a noticeable shift away from agriculture and manufacturing to oil and gas. Also, it could be to move inexorably to favor services provision. In today's trend, it is no longer just a leadership challenge or what real leadership looks like or what model is more fitting to fix the problem. It is a development challenge; it is about how adaptive are today's managers. The process of how to become roomy to adapt sufficiently and adequately to lead in a digital age of this globalizing world is a globally driven shift. In fact, management is developing fast in providing answers to the questions of "what" of leadership, but, sadly, there are increasing evidence that today's managers are apprentices in answering the questions pose by the "how" of management and organizational development. (Wilson, 2015)



5. GLOBAL TRENDS FOR THE FUTURE OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

In development, individuals could continue to assert the essential dignity, and worth accrue over the ages. One should avoid the use of the word, 'new' according to Dixon (2004), "how new is new?" For instance, humanism characterizes a leadership style in Spain, and perhaps, a major factor in most of the today's family business or cooperatives. In another example, social theory suggests four critical perspectives on global forms of organizing: objectivist, subjectivist, radical humanist and radical structuralist. In practice, there exist several challenges at the outlook of today's trends. As noted in earlier paragraphs, management thinkings of the future must effectively not draw on the traditional or antique basis of assumptions that are managerially deficient for succeeding applications. According to Hamel (2007), real trendsetters "are never bound by what is; instead, they dream of what could be." In fact, there are challenges to conventional thinking that are hindering the provision for the future of management. (Dixon, 2004; Hamel, 2007)

Notably, according to Dixon (2004), there are four trends regularly underscored in literature. Nonetheless, according to Mintzberg (2008), innovative organizing, which appropriate in adhocracy could be what is next in Hamel's (2007) idea of management innovation. First, the imminence of OD should embrace vertical development. If leadership competency attracts future attention, then development stages that characterize vertical approach should attract more attention. Lots of time expounding on leadership skills, but little time spends on the dynamic mapping of changing steps. According to Petrie (2014), the techniques for achieving horizontal and vertical development are very different. For a parallel development, it is floating in design, and it is transmitting from experts viewpoint, but vertical development must be a transforming experience for individuals. Possibly, vertical development could provide evidence in practice, the distinctiveness that exists in the usage of the terms of leadership and management as globalization keeps impacting. (Wiltshire, 2012; Maznevski & Dhanaraj, 2014; Hamel, 2007)

Secondly, there must be an exchange in leadership approach to vertical development, and that must permit individuals the ownership of their progress. Individual should be able to own the formative possession of their development glaringly. Interestingly, an individual should grow intuitively, at the speediest possible to developing leadership for the future. According to Hamel (2009), associates should feel a sense of belonging as being in charge of their advancement. The present model urges individuals to trust that another person is responsible for their development; human assets, their administrator, coaches or superiors. It is time to change the managerial approach, from organizational development; that is too strict to adapt, to one, that creatively fit the essentials of the changing environment. Individuals should be in charge of their development, setting out goals for maximum achievement within the global team.

Thirdly, greater focus should be on collectiveness rather than individual leadership development. Leadership has come to a point of being too individually targeted and elitist on coping with the unprecedented complexity of the global economy. There is a move trendy from the old worldview in which resourcefulness in a human could transfer to another one where management is a comprehensive procedure, which is spreading all through systems of individuals in an organization. The inquest will change from, "who are the leaders?" to "what are the fulfilling conditions for an idea to prosper in a system?" Seemingly, it will be an attempt at providing a solution to managerial problems center on how to spread authority within the limit of what is working throughout the business and democratize organizational functions for enhanced outcomes. In this way, leadership would awaken possibility in individuals; considering that most organizations remain over managed and at the same time less led. (Wilson, 2015)

Lastly, the prominent spotlight should center on advancement, in the power of improvement strategies. There are no straightforward, existing prototypes or schemes that will be adequate to build up the levels of aggregate management required to meet an inexorably complex future. Rather, a time of quick expansion will be needed in which business will try different things with new practices that combine mixed thoughts in new ways and offer these with an alternative. Innovation and the web will both give the framework the push for change as well as enabling the change. A business that grips the movements will manage transformation efficiently, over another that restrict the moves. (Hamel, 2007; Petrie, 2014) In other words, there will be a flow of engagement, motivation, performance, and results; as the innovation outcomes would play to the strengths of individuals within the group, identifying talents and get the most out of associates. (Roarty & Toogood, 2014; Dunn et al., 2012)

If the leadership of the future could concentrate on the four underlined trends, there would be a noticeable outlook in global economic outlook in the very long term. For example, organizational forms of colocating and outsourcing will converge drastically into a global team efficiency. According to Hamel (2007), some companies are all ready to creating a working platform where everybody puts forth a valiant effort. However, some companies like Marks & Spencer- a British retail outfit and Apple that have tremendously benefited from outsourcing; also, are globalizing. However, the more globalization has taken turns, the more un-globalizing domestic outfits would be depreciating; and, the more the efficiently globalizing firms will be thriving. Additionally, as nations like India and China benefiting from global trade; the government might learn towards promoting legislation that makes business to be socially responsible.

6. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP EXEMPLARY

Global leadership model looks more like the model for the future of leadership and management. According to Dunn et al. (2012), four models converge into global leadership paradigm. The converged theories are transactional, transformational, conscious and transpersonal. In global leadership framework, the converging models will work to embrace vertical development for innovating organizational outcomes. The leaders who emerge as an aftermath of implementing global leadership results would operate within the leadership domains of task, relationship, awareness and purpose. Notably, there exist a similar level of consistency between transactional leadership and task, transformational leadership and relationship, conscious leadership and awareness, and, transpersonal leadership and purpose.

In practice, a combinational effect of this could be a paradigm shift in the making of leaders. Apparently, for the critical mass making of global leaders, the influx of exceptional, innovative thoughts will not originate from situations in which managers control and micromanage workers. Apparently, innovation could garishly flourish in groups where individuals are boldly free thinkers, and, could transparently convey the outcomes of individuals engagement. Notably, a working situation, where individuals can unreservedly redefine existing conditions through the conduct of their leaders.

Notwithstanding, some literature contains evidence-based approach into the focus of transactional and transformational theories (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1990; Dunn et al., 2012), there are limits to the levels of intelligence provided; as evident in the exploration of cognitive and emotional levels (Goleman, 1995). The addition of cultural intelligence (CQ) came as an element of emotional leadership proficiency and, according to Dunn et al. (2012), it is a development that explicates five additional levels of intelligence. As a proponent, a global leader must be a six-levels intelligent individual as globalization continues in an evolving digital age.

The levels are intellectual (IQ), emotional (EQ), cultural (CQ), metacognitive (MtQ), existential (XQ), and moral (MQ). IQ will help a leader in a rapidly changing task demand from associates and consumers. EQ will enable superiors to manage the emotion of self and associates in a time of change. CQ will provide leaders with the skill to handle the diverse cultures; even that, which transcends the national borders. MtQ will enable a manager with the competence to handgrip he- or herself comprehensively. XQ helps to encapsulate the essence of human existence as MQ will contribute enormously to help a leader to be ethical. In principle, global leadership, managers, must exhibit an unparallel capacity to operate with a global intelligence (GQ). GQ will empower leaders to bring together experiential values with current knowledge to provide directions to the future of his or her organization. To an energetic global leader, vertical development values will coexist with the values that resulted from management innovation.

In practice, these levels of intelligence could help in measurement of value creation and scaling of individual contributions to the pool of organizational performance, a view that is consistent with Hamel's (2007) agenda for management innovation. However, leadership models are converging and theoretically unifying in global leadership exemplary. Nevertheless, as globalization continues to counterweights isomorphism across pre-existing cultures and countries, expectedly, the implication could be an evolution of some management models on the sideway, given an indication that with innovation, there might be evolutionary based managerial models for the future of leadership and management. (Solari, 2012)

Going forward, as global leadership model, in practice, continue to permeate; there would be a seemingly evolutionary-based approach to management progress. On the optimistic view, as globalization endures, companies will innovate, embrace a global team of organizing; the government of nations will legislate for the global economy, managers would correspondingly evolve to meet the demand of the marketplace. However, on the pessimistic view, as leaders continue to lack in global competence, lack of vertical development, deficient in ethical behavior, and coupled with the unprecedented complexity of working environment; there could be a perpetuating danger. Essentially, if the government of nations legislates to disadvantage the free market benefits; managers could struggle on the global marketplace, and thus, a leader; rather than be agile, could draw towards a failing managing style. Nonetheless, in a digital age, an alternative to management innovation could be costly and grossly diminish effective administration and leadership; and ultimately, this could lead to the death of managing for the future.



7. CONCLUSION

Having discussed the context of leadership in light of further contextualizing of existing management models, an attempt to promote an optimistic view of global leadership model might suffice. Probably, it could be a paradigm shift when pooled with an implementation that is consistent with the way of exploring GQ competence. Alluding to the expected outcome of implementing a global leadership model with GQ capability, one can envisage that the future of management would turn the unparalleled difficulties of today to an opportunity for further research and collaborations between scholars and practitioners. In practice, researchers would continue to explore further possibilities for global leaders to engage thoroughly with possible implications of micro- and macro managing into the far future; while professional managers would engage with the marketplace to understanding the core continuing values for the future of management and leadership. As the environment is changing, leaders must develop globally and conduct their business and self ethically; through positive social change activism.

REFERENCES

- 1) Alrawi, K., Hamdan, Y., Al-Taie, W., & Ibrahim, M. (2011). Organizational culture and the creation of a dynamic environment for knowledge sharing. *American Journal of Social and Management Science*, 2(3), 258-264. doi:10.5251/ajsms.2011.2.3.258.264
- 2) Bartunek, J. M. (2008). You're an organization development practitioner-scholar: Can you contribute to organizational theory? *Organization Management Journal*, 5(1), 6-16. doi:10.1057/omj.2008.3
- 3) Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-32. Retrieved from http://discoverthought.com/Leadership/References_files/Bass%20leadership%201990.pdf
- 4) Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- 5) Birkinshaw, J., & Goddard, J. (2009). What is your management model? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 50(2), 81-90.
- 6) Dixon, R. (2004). *The management task* (3rd ed.). Oxford, England: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- 7) D'Souza, S. & Renner, D. (2014). *Not knowing: The art of turning uncertainty into opportunity*. London, England: LID Publishing Ltd
- 8) Dunn, T. E., Lafferty, C. L., & Alford, K. L. (2012). Global leadership: A new framework for a changing world. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 77(2), 4-14.
- 9) Glynn, M., & Raffaelli, R. (2010). Uncovering mechanisms of theory development in an academic field: Lessons from leadership research. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 359-401. doi:10.1080/19416520.2010.495530
- 10) Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Book.
- 11) Grant, A. (2012). Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2), 458-476. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.0588
- 12) Hamel, G. (2007). *The future of management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press
- 13) Hamel, G. (2009). Moon shots for management. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(2), 91-98. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2009/02/moon-shots-for-management>
- 14) Maznevski, M. & Dhanaraj, C. (2014). Global leadership and global teams. *IMD*, 37, 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.imd.org/research/publications/upload/37-Global-leadership-and-global-teams-26-06-14.pdf>
- 15) Mintzberg, H. (2008). *Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- 16) Ocker, R., Huang, H., Benbunan-Fich, R., & Hiltz, S. (2011). Leadership dynamics in partially distributed teams: An exploratory study of the effects of configuration and distance. *Group Decision & Negotiation*, 20(3), 273-292. doi:10.1007/s10726-009-9180-z
- 17) [Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. \(2002\). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13\(6\), 797-837. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00154-6](#)
- 18) Petrie, N. (2014). *Future Trends in Leadership Development*. Colorado Springs, CO: Center for Creative Leadership. Retrieved from <http://insights.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/futureTrends.pdf>
- 19) Roarty, M. & Toogood, K. (2014). *The strengths-focused guide to leadership*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- 20) Schys, B., Kiefer, T., Kerschreiter, R., & Tymon, A. (2011). Teaching implicit leadership theories to develop leaders and leadership: How and why it can make a difference. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 397-408. doi:10.5465/amle.2010.0015
- 21) Solari, L. (2012). Globalization will make us all more different. *People and Strategy*, 35(2), 30-35.
- 22) Wilson, G. (2015). *Leadership laid bare! The naked truth of great leadership*. Chester, England: Success Online.
- 23) Wiltshire, E. D. (2012). Transformational leadership: What's your motivation? *Leadership Advance Online*, 23, 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue_22/3Wiltshire_motivation_lao_22.pdf