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ABSTRACT

Leadership is the most important facet of management. The concept of leadership has evolved through centuries. It developed into its present form through the exemplary contributions of various scholars and real life leaders. There are many conceptual variations of leadership, based on context and practice. A multitude of factors contribute to a right leadership style. Since leadership is multifaceted, it becomes a complex subject of research.

Organisational success is affected by a host of factors, but leadership is one that influences it decisively. In present day business world, organisations are exposed to a far more complex and dynamic environment. They are required to interact with a host of competing factors, both internally and externally. The leader is expected to crystallize and determine the course of action to lead the organisation in the right direction and to ensure success in the dynamic business scenario. This situation demands more than ordinary leadership for ensuring organisational success.

Strategic leadership is the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change. Strategic leadership is multifunctional. It helps organizations cope with changes that seem to be increasing exponentially in today's globalized environment. All managers throughout the organisation should be strategic leaders to effectively formulate and implement business-unit and corporate-level strategies. Different models have been developed to represent various dimensions of Strategic Leadership. Available literature shows a gap of research on the effects of these dimensions on organisational success, especially in Oil & Gas Industry in general, and in United Arab Emirates in particular. The present study tries to fill this research gap.

The present study seeks to measure the relationships of two of the dimensions of strategic leadership on organisational success. These dimensions are: developing the human capital, and developing and sustaining an effective organisational culture. Team Effectiveness was assessed for the first dimension; where as Organisational
Learning was measured to assess the second. Further, the effect of three demographic variables: age, job grade, and educational qualification were also explored under the present study. Three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were considered to measure organisational success.

2. Contents of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into six chapters.

*Chapter 1* provides a conceptual framework of the study. This include concepts on leadership, including definitions, styles, and models. The chapter also presents a discussion on strategic leadership, different models and its dimensions. The chapter discusses the rationale of the present study.

*Chapter 2* contains a brief account of Abu Dhabi’s oil industry, and Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO). A brief idea on the background of ADMA – OPCO in terms of its evolution into the present state as well as its organization is given. Various aspects of human capital, health, safety and environment (HSE), production and operation in the organization are also detailed in this chapter.

*Chapter 3* presents a critical review of literature and studies already available on the subject of research. The themes covered in the chapter include leadership, strategic leadership, team effectiveness, organisational learning, and finally organisational success. Articles, journals, research papers, and other relevant documents were studied to cover the work done by other researchers in these areas. More than 200 such references were quoted. The literature reviewed by the researcher more or less confirmed that no study has been conducted to find out the effect of the two selected dimensions of Strategic Leadership: *Developing Human Capital*, and *Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture*, especially with reference to Oil and Gas Industry in United Arab Emirates. Hence the researcher could find a research gap which was tried to be filled through the present study.
Chapter 4 details out an idea on the research methodology adopted for the study. Need and objectives of the study are described. Based on the research objectives fourteen hypotheses were postulated. A conceptual construct of the study is presented showing the different variables and their possible inter relationships. Population and samples of the study are explained, along with profile of the respondents. Non probability sampling method was employed for the present study. The chapter also gives details on the two research instruments used for the study, Team Effectiveness Assessment Measure (TEAM) and Organisational Learning Diagnostics (OLD). The chapter also highlights the limitations of the study.

Chapter 5 presents results and a discussion on the results. The chapter presents data analysis and interpretation on the effects of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success. Three Key Performance Indicators (effective oil capacity, environmental protection, and people development) were studied as measures of organisational success. The chapter also provides an analysis on the effects of the three demographic variables; age, job grade and educational qualifications on team effectiveness and organisational learning. SPSS was used for data analysis. 167 valid responses were tabulated and computerised. The data entry was done as per the requirement of SPSS. Suitable charts and diagrams illustrating correlation between the variables were generated with the help of Microsoft Excel.

Chapter 6 presents a summary of the findings of the study. The chapter also provides managerial implications of the results. The chapter brings out the value added by the study in terms of contribution to the knowledge on team effectiveness, organisational learning, organisational success, and strategic leadership. The chapter also presents a brief discussion on future directions of research.

3. Research Objectives

The present study has the following objectives:

1. To examine the extent of prevalence of Strategic Leadership as assessed by two of its key dimensions namely, team effectiveness and organisational learning.
2. To examine the association of these two dimensions of strategic leadership, namely team effectiveness and organisational learning with selected demographic variables.

3. To assess the impact of strategic leadership on organisational success, as measured through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

Based on the above mentioned main objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

1. H1: Age has a positive influence on Team Effectiveness.
2. H2: Growth in Job Grade positively influences Team Effectiveness.
3. H3: Educational background influences Team Effectiveness positively.
5. H5: Team Effectiveness positively influences Environmental Protection.
6. H6: Team Effectiveness has a positive influence on Human Capital Development.
7. H7: Age has a positive influence on Organisational Learning.
14. H14: Organisational Learning has positive effect on Organisational Success.

Four types of variables were studied in the present research: demographic variables (namely, age, job grade, educational qualification), team effectiveness (measured by task clarity, cohesion, autonomy, confrontation, support, collaboration, accountability), organisational learning (measured by innovation, implementation, stabilization), and organisational success (as assessed through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) namely, effective oil capacity, oil spill, and human capital development).

Professional employees at the job grades of 13 to 16 of ADMA – OPCO, form the population of the study. The job grades for the employees are governed through a competency based assessment mechanism, but not on length of experience in the
company. Out of thirty divisions, eighteen divisions were selected for the study based on judgement. A sample of 208 professional employees from these eighteen divisions was selected on the basis of purposive sampling. This approach was taken to ensure representation to all relevant divisions, thus employing one of the non-probability sampling.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Overall Results

Effects of components of team effectiveness, as a representation of strategic leadership: team effectiveness which represented the first dimension of strategic leadership is having two main aspects: team functioning and team empowerment. Cohesion, confrontation, and collaboration are components of team functioning, whereas task clarity, autonomy, support, and accountability are the components of team empowerment. On analysis, it became evident that in the organization under study, there exist positive relationship between seven components of team effectiveness with age, job grade and educational qualifications, in general. The analysis proved an increase of these components proportionately with the growth of age, job grade and educational qualifications of the employees in the organization. However two components, Autonomy and Support, were of less significant compared to other five components.

Effects of components of organisational learning, as a representation of strategic leadership: organisational learning was measured to represent the second dimension of strategic leadership, i.e., developing and sustaining an effective organisational culture. Organisational learning has three components: innovation, implementation and stabilisation. Mean values of Potential for Organisational Learning Index (POLI) analysed with SPSS were used for the study. The study revealed positive influence of age, job grade and educational qualifications on the three components of organisational learning. An increase in the components of organisational learning was evident proportionately with the growth in age, job grade and educational qualifications of the employees. However the third component of organisational learning, Stabilisation, is less significant compared with other two components. Also,
even though the trend shows a general growth of the components with the educational qualifications, *Innovation* is proportionately less significant in employees with Post Graduation.

The overall findings supported the positive influence of strategic leadership on organisational success.

**4.2 Relationships between the selected three demographic variables on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.**

The study revealed a positive relationship between the age and team effectiveness as well as organisational learning, in general. The results of the analysis proved that, higher the age of the employee, better the values of team effectiveness and organisational learning. The mean values for team effectiveness for the age groups of 25 to 35, 35 to 45, and 46 and above were 140, 148 & 152, respectively, showing a positive influence. Mean values of Potential for Organisational Learning Index (POLI) for the same age groups were 89, 87, and 94. Though the value of POLI for the age group 36 to 45 was not proportionately high, the results shown a general trend of positive influence of age on organisational learning.

The study proved that higher the job grades of the employees, higher the team effectiveness as well as organisational learning, in general. Mean values of team effectiveness for job grades from 13 to 16 were 142, 150, 146, and 161. Though the value for the job grade 15 was proportionately low, the results shown a general trend of increase by increase in job grade. Like wise mean values of Potential for Organisational Learning Index (POLI) for the same job grades were 86, 91, 90, and 97. This result indicates a positive influence of job grade organisational learning, with an exception for job grade 15, which was less significant.

Result of the study proved a positive relationship of educational background and team effectiveness as well as organisational learning. The mean values of team effectiveness for educational qualifications of diploma, degree and post graduation were 144, 145, and 151 respectively, showing a positive influence. Mean values of Potential for Organisational Learning Index (POLI) for the above educational
qualifications were 88, 89, and 90, which proved a positive relationship of educational background and organisational learning.

Thus, the results proved that the three selected demographic variables having positive influence on team effectiveness and organisational learning.

4.3 Relationship of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning with Organisational Success

Findings of the study on the effects of team effectiveness and organisational learning on organisational success show positive influence. Three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): production capacity, environmental protection, and human capital development were measured representing organisational success.

The results of the study revealed that, higher the job grade, greater is the team effectiveness. This has very positive influence in achieving team objectives and thus the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Target KPIs for effective oil capacity for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 were studied. The Mean target KPI was 539 MBD where as the actual achievement was 542 MBD. The results show a positive influence of team effectiveness on production capacity, which is a measure of organisational success.

Mean KPI for Environmental Protection (Oil Spill) for 2007, 2008 and 2009 was Not More Than One Spill for each year. The actual was 0.33, which is lower than the allowable limit, showing an achievement. Thus the results show a positive influence of team effectiveness and environmental protection, and in turn organisational success.

Mean values of the target people development KPIs and achievement for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 were studied. Mean target value was 7.66 where as mean value of achievement was 11.5. This shows a positive influence of team effectiveness and people development, and thus organisational success.

Similarly, the study revealed positive influence of organisational learning and organisational success. Result of the study shows that higher the job grade, greater the organisational learning, in general. This shows the positive influence in achieving
team objectives and thus divisional KPIs. In general, the other two selected demographic variables, age and educational background, also have demonstrated positive influence on team effectiveness and organisational learning.

4. Recommendations and Directions for Future Research

The study revealed a positive effect of strategic leadership on organisational success. There are various managerial implications based on the findings of the study. Seven components of team effectiveness have shown a positive trend with the growth in age, job grade, and educational qualifications, in general. The result could be utilised to further strengthen the team effectiveness present in the organisation. The results would form valuable information on conceptualising, formulating and conducting team building exercises. The components that indicated low significance could be focused more when these measures are being carried out. The results also could be utilised to formulate criteria for training need analysis and to develop course contents.

Three components of organisational learning also have shown a positive relationship with the growth of age, job grade as well as educational qualifications. As organisational learning is an important factor of organisational culture and a necessary element in developing 'learning organisation' the results could be used in strengthening the systems already in place. The results would be beneficial to focus attention at different age groups, job grades and people of different educational background, in terms of organisational learning. The third component, stabilisation, requires special focus, as this was of less significance.

Though components of team effectiveness as well as organisational learning were found growing with the educational qualifications, they were found less significant for people with diploma, as their educational background. The result could be utilised to formulate measure to foster both team effectiveness and organisational learning for this segment. The results could also be used as a spring board, in educational development of employees in the organisation. On a priority basis, they could be sent for higher studies. This will facilitate organisational learning and in turn success.

Components of team effectiveness and organisational learning were found showing a positive growth with job grades, but these components for job grade 15 were found
less significant. The results could be further pursued to identify the reasons for this low values and could be rectified through appropriate measures.

The finding supports previous studies that revealed the facilitating nature of heterogeneous teams. The teams in the organisations could be better organised, so that each team will form a good mix of employees in terms of their age, job grade, educational qualifications as well as expertise. This would facilitate better team performance and learning.

The present study points towards the scope of further research on the subject. Research on the effect of more dimensions of strategic leadership could be conducted. Study involving more organizations would reveal better understanding of the subject. Study covering broader respondent base would provide more insights. Research covering both public and private sector enterprises also could be carried out. Research studies measuring more demographic variables like years of experience, culture, family type, language, nationalities etc. would reveal more insights into the area of research.

The study provides important theoretical contributions expanding on previous knowledge on the two selected dimensions of strategic leadership. For advancing the field, this work is one of its kind directly linking organisational learning and team effectiveness through a mediating effect of strategic leadership, particularly in oil & gas industry as well as in UAE. More over, methodology and results of the present study could be used as a spring board for future research.
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Leadership is the most important facet of management. The concept has evolved over a period of time from a stage of primitive theme into a present day robust concept. Concept of leadership is ever evolving and provided scope of research, all through. In present day business world, organisations are exposed to a far more complex and dynamic environment. They are required to interact with a host of competing factors, both internally as well as externally. This situation demands more than ordinary leadership for ensuring organisational to success.

Strategic Leadership is the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change. Strategic Leadership is multifunctional. It helps organizations cope with change that seems to be increasing exponentially, in today’s globalized environment. Leaders who think strategically are able to picture a range of possibilities several stages ahead of the present time. All managers throughout the organisation should be strategic leaders to effectively formulate and implement business-unit and corporate-level strategies. Different models have been developed to represent various dimensions of Strategic Leadership. Available literature shows a gap of research on the effects of these dimensions on organisational success, especially in Oil & Gas Industry in general, and in United Arab Emirates in particular.

The present study seeks to measure the relationships of two of the dimensions of Strategic Leadership on Organisational Success. These dimensions are: developing the human capital, and developing and sustaining an effective organisational culture. Team Effectiveness was assessed the first dimension, whereas Organisational Learning was measures to assessed the second. Further, the effect of three demographic variables: Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualification was also explored on the issue under study.
The thesis is divided into six chapters. A brief overview of the chapters is given below:

Chapter 1 provides a conceptual framework of the study. This includes concepts on leadership, including definitions, styles, and models. The chapter also presents a discussion on Strategic Leadership, different models and its dimensions.

Chapter 2 contains a brief account of Abu Dhabi's Oil Industry, and Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA - OPCO). Various aspects of Human Capital. Health, Safety and Environment (HSE), and Production and Operation in the organization are also detailed in this chapter.

Chapter 3 presents a critical review of literature and studies already available on the subject of research. The themes covered in the chapter include leadership, strategic leadership, team effectiveness, organisational learning, and finally organisational success.

Chapter 4 details out an idea on the research methodology adopted for the study. Details include, need and objectives of the study, research hypotheses, variables, conceptual construct of the study, population and samples, profile of the respondents, pilot study, data collection, instruments used for data collection, statistical tools employed, and limitations of the study.

Chapter 5 presents results and a discussion on those results. The chapter presents data analysis and interpretation on the effects of Team Building and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success. The chapter also provides an analysis on the effects of the three demographic variables; Age, Job Grade and Educational Qualifications on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.

Chapter 6 presents a summary of the findings of the study. The chapter also provides managerial implications of the results obtained and limitations of the study. It carries out a brief discussion on future directions of research in this area.
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1.1 Introduction

The concept of leadership has evolved through centuries. It developed in its present form through the exemplary contributions of various scholars and real life leaders. There are many conceptual variations of leadership, based on context and practice. Twenty-first century is marked by concerns of growing complexities of organisational and business environment. It offers a tough challenge for the leaders at all levels. Every successful organisation has a leader behind it. That leader is expected to crystallize and determine course of action to lead the organisation in the right direction and to ensure success in the dynamic business scenario. A multitude of factors contribute to a right leadership style. Since leadership is multifaceted, it becomes complex subject of research.

A leader is the one who exercises authority and leads making decisions in the team (Dubin, 1951). Leaders are identified and accepted by the followers. Good leadership is not to enforce it on others (Sanford, 1950). Leader functions as a change agent in the team and bring in facilitating environment for better team performance (Cattel et al, 1953). A leader initiates, organizes, clarifies, questions, motivates, summarises, and formulates conclusions (Bass, 1954) and in turn helps the team to solve its problems within (Hemphil, 1954). The leader has initiative, perseverance, integrity, humour, tact and compassion. He acts as a role model and expresses capabilities to absorb difficulties (John Adair, 1998). He has character, courage, capability for communication. Good Leadership is not possible without proper communication (Karan Kharab, 2003). Leadership and management differ from each other. Leadership is not a replacement for management (John P. Kotter, 1988). Leadership and management are realized as two distinctive and complementary systems of actions in an organisation. Both are fundamental for any organisation. As business operations become more and more complex, technological advancement alone will
not suffice for organisational success. It requires Human Capital under efficient leadership, which empowers the former to bring results (Scott Hartz, 1999). The leadership ensures free thinking, generation of innovative ideas and superior performance. This type of leadership is essential for organizational success.

Strategy referred as plan of action, is integral and indivisible attribute of leadership. Making an organisation successful is based on the strategy tactics which evidently links with leadership dimensions. Developing a shared view of what the strategy means is essential to achieve desired business outcomes, which needs to be supported by an efficient organisational culture. Senior leadership of organisation needs to align with business strategy and culture which emphasize the need of analyzing leadership at the levels of strategic dimension.

Organisational success is affected by a host of factors, but leadership is one that influences it decisively. Leadership affects employee attitudes and motivation directly. Leadership is a top driver of employee engagement and organisational effectiveness (Towers Perin). Research studies also conclude that employees continue to find their leaders' behavior and performance wanting in a number of key areas that are vital for organisational success. Virtually all studies of leadership point to the importance of two concerns which effective managers must balance and integrate (Yukel, 1998). One is about *people* - how to involve, motivate, enlighten and even inspire them to achieve organisational success. The other is on task *accomplishment* – how to structure it in order to achieve efficiency.

The present chapter is divided into three sections. First section presents an overview of concept of leadership, leadership models, and various leadership theories. Second section focuses concept on Strategic Leadership, different models as well as its dimensions. Third section deals with Organisational Success. This is followed by the summary which attempts to crystallize ideas in a nut shell.
1.2 Leadership: Concept, Models and Theories

This section of the chapter presents a discussion on concept of leadership, different leadership models and various theories on leadership.

1.2.1 Leadership: Concepts

There are varied perspectives in defining leadership. These perceptions are based on various aspects like exerting influence, motivating and inspiring, helping others to realize their potential, leading by example, selflessness and making a difference.

Leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective. It directs the organisation in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. A leader is the one who influences team activities towards goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The leader influences team actions and its decisions (Katz & Kahn, 1978). The leader make the team accept his influence voluntarily (Graham, 1988), and he sets the vision which the entire team is motivated to achieve (Nadler, D.A & M.L. Tushanan, 1990). Leaders carry out this process by applying their leadership attributes, such as beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and skills. Positioning oneself as a supervisor or manager gives the authority to accomplish certain tasks and objectives in the organisation, makes one the boss, but not necessarily a leader. Leadership differs in that it makes the followers want to achieve high goals, rather than simply bossing people around (Donclark, 2010). Good leaders are able to motivate their followers. They have profound effect on achieving organisational goals in terms of productivity (Liberson & O’Conar, 1972).

Leader is someone who has followers (Drucker, 1996). The leader should have influencing power on his followers, (Maxwell). This conceptualisation moves beyond the position the leader is occupying, in influencing others. Indirectly, it takes into account a leader’s character, since without maintaining integrity and trustworthiness, the capability to influence will not exist.
Leadership is a function of knowing oneself, having a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues, and taking effective action to realize own leadership potential (Bennis). This view focused more on the individual capability of the leader.

Action centered leadership inspires others through leader’s own enthusiasm, commitment and the ability to instill enthusiasm to other people. Different approaches to effective leadership attempts to integrate interlocking concepts of Task, Group and the Individual. The leader must have personality and character (Adair, 1998 ). The leader must posses integrity, wholeness and a moral sense.

The effectiveness of the leadership at all levels of the organisation depends on the perceptions people have of the "state of leadership". Effective leadership builds trust in followers which in turn make them engage in the work and the organization. Such leadership brings organizational changes and ensures that such transitions occur with an inclusive and collaborative perspective. Therefore various elements play vital roles in leadership. Four key factors in leadership are presented below (U.S. Military Leadership, 1983).

a) **Follower**: Different styles of leadership are required to lead people of varied nature. For example, a new hire requires more supervision than an experienced employee. A person who lacks motivation requires a different approach than one with a high degree of motivation. The leader must know his people.

b) **Leader**: The leader must have an honest understanding of who he is, what he knows, and what he can do. Also, it is the followers, not the leader who determines if a leader is successful. If they lack trust and confidence in their leader, then they will be uninspired. To be successful, he has to convince his followers, that he is worthy of being followed, but not himself or his superiors.
c) **Communication:** The leader leads through two-way communication. Much of it is nonverbal. For instance, when he "sets the example," that communicates to his people that he would not ask them to perform anything that he would not be willing to do by himself. What and how he communicates either builds or harms the relationship between the leader and his followers.

d) **Situation:** All the situations are different. What the leader does in one situation will not always work in another. He must use his judgment to choose the best course of action and the leadership style, needed at each situation. For instance, the leader may need to confront an employee for inappropriate behavior, but the results may prove ineffective, if the confrontation is too late or too early, too harsh or too weak.

Various forces affect the above mentioned factors. These forces include the relationship of the leader with his colleagues, the skill of the followers, the informal leaders within the organization, and the organisational structure.

### 1.2.2 Leadership: Models

Various models discussing the leadership in an organisation are aligned with ongoing organisational trends in which ‘leaders’ may not be ‘managers’. The models extend the application at the individuals, working at various levels of organisational levels. The models also incorporate research findings regarding leader complexity to the base level of organization, thus make it clear that every situation calls for a different approach or behavior. Two key models that attempt understanding leadership are the *Four Framework Approach* and the *Managerial Grid*.

#### 1.2.2.1 Four Framework Approach

Leaders display leadership behaviors in one of four types of frameworks, i.e, Structural, *Human Resource, Political, or Symbolic* (Bolman, 1991). The style can either be effective or ineffective, depending upon the chosen behavior in certain situations. Following is a brief description on these frameworks.
a) **Structural Framework:** according to this framework, in an effective leadership situation, the leader is a social architect whose leadership style is analysis and design. While in an ineffective leadership situation, the leader is a petty tyrant whose leadership style is devoid of details. Structural Leaders focus on structure, strategy, environment, implementation, experimentation, and adaptation.

b) **Human Resource Framework:** The leader as per this framework is a catalyst and servant whose leadership style is support, advocate, and empowerment in an effective leadership situation. While in an ineffective leadership situation, the leader is a pushover with the style of abdication and fraud. Human Resource Leaders believe in people and communicate that belief; they are visible and accessible; they empower, increase participation, support, share information, and move decision making down into the organisation.

c) **Political Framework:** In an effective leadership situation, the leader is an advocate, whose leadership style is coalition and building, according to this. While in an ineffective leadership situation, the leader is a hustler, with a style of manipulation. Political leaders clarify what they want and what they can get; they assess the distribution of power and interests; they build linkages to other stakeholders, use persuasion first, and then use negotiation and coercion only if necessary.

d) **Symbolic Framework:** as per this framework, in an effective leadership situation, the leader is a prophet, whose leadership style is inspiration. While in an ineffective leadership situation, the leader is a fanatic or fool, with a style of smoke and mirrors. Symbolic leaders view organisations as a stage or theater to play certain roles and give impressions; these leaders use symbols to capture attention; they try to frame experience by providing plausible interpretations of experiences; they discover and communicate a vision.
This model suggests that leaders can be put into any one of these four categories and there are times when one approach is appropriate and times when it would not be. Any one of these approaches alone would be inadequate, thus one should strive to be aware of all four approaches, and not to rely on one or two. For example, during a major organisation change, a structural leadership style may be more effective; while during a period when strong growth is envisaged, the visionary approach may be better. It would be beneficial to understand that each leader tends to have a preferred approach, in the mean time to be conscious of the limitations of favoring just one approach.

1.2.2.2 Managerial Grid

Leadership could be explained by plotting the ‘concerns’ of the leaders on two axis, as per Managerial Grid (Blake et.al, 1985).

"Concern for people" is plotted on the vertical axis and
"Concern for task" is along the horizontal axis.

Both the axis has a range of 0 to 9. The notion that just two dimensions can describe a managerial behavior has the attraction of simplicity. Most people fall somewhere near the middle of the two axis. However, by going to the extremes, that is, individuals who score on the far end of the scales, we come up with four types of leaders with the ranges of concerns as shown within the brackets:

- **Authoritarian** (9 on task, 1 on people)
- **Team Leader** (9 on task, 9 on people)
- **Country Club** (1 on task, 9 on people)
- **Impoverished** (1 on task, 1 on people)
These four types of leaders are briefly described below.

**Authoritarian Leader (high task, low relationship):** People who get this rating are very much task oriented and are hard on their workers (autocratic). There is little or no allowance for cooperation or collaboration. Heavily task oriented leaders display these characteristics: they are very strong on schedules; they expect people to do what they are told without question or debate; when something goes wrong they tend to focus on who is to blame rather than concentrate on exactly what is wrong and how to prevent it; they are intolerant of what they see as dissent (it may just be someone's creativity), so it is difficult for their subordinates to contribute or develop.

**Team Leader (high task, high relationship):** This type of person leads by positive example and endeavors to foster a team environment in which all team members can reach their highest potential, both as team members and as people. They encourage the team to reach team goals as effectively as possible, while also working tirelessly to strengthen the bonds among the various members. They normally form and lead some of the most productive teams.

**Country Club Leader (low task, high relationship):** These types of leaders predominantly encourage the team to accomplish its goals. Conversely, they are almost incapable of employing the more punitive coercive and legitimate powers. This inability results from fear that using such powers could jeopardize relationships with the other team members.

**Impoverished Leader (low task, low relationship):** A leader who uses a "delegate and disappear" style, as they are not committed to either task accomplishment or maintenance; they essentially allow their team to do whatever it wishes and prefer to detach themselves from the team process by allowing the team to suffer from a series of power struggles.

The most desirable place for a leader to be along the two axis at most times would be a 9 on task and a 9 on people - the *Team Leader*. However, the other three types
should not be entirely dismissed. Certain situations might call for one or the other three or combinations of them to be used.

1.2.3 Leadership: Types

Leaders inject inspiring confidence and trust in subordinates, getting maximum cooperation and guiding activities to achieve the goals of the organisation through different leadership styles. By these styles, the leader makes people to follow and to do willingly the things required to do. In general, they utilize a spectrum of no less than seven ways of leading and managing, ranging from opportunist style to the "alchemist" style of leading (Torbert, 1991).

1. **Opportunist** - Wins any way possible: Good in managing emergencies and sales.

2. **Diplomat** - Avoids overt conflict: Good in bringing people together.

3. **Expert** - Rules by logic and expertise: Good as individual contributor.

4. **Achiever** - Meets strategic goals: Good in managerial roles, action and goal oriented.

5. **Individualist** - Interweaves competing personal and company actions logics: Good in venture and consulting roles.

6. **Strategist** - Generates organisational and personal transformations: Good transformational leaders.

7. **Alchemist** - Generates social transformations: Good at leading society-wide transformations.

A compilation of different leadership styles enumerated by various research studies shows another set of leadership styles (Carlisle, 1987). These include: autocratic, democratic, exploitative, consultative, participative, production centered, and employee centered.
Charismatic leaders differ in behaviour compared to other type of leaders (Conger & Kanuango, 1988). Various styles demonstrated by such leaders include ‘envisioning’ by providing a motivating vision, ‘energising’ by creating excitement and confidence, where as leaders with ‘enabling’ style show empathy and personal support.

Situations necessitate using one or more of the above styles or even a combination of them to get the optimum or desired output from the followers.

1.2.4 Leadership: Theories

A review of the leadership literatures reveals an evolving series of 'schools of thought' from “Great Man” and “Trait” theories to “Transformational” leadership. While early theories tend to focus upon the characteristics and behaviours of successful leaders, later theories begin to consider the role of followers and the contextual nature of leadership (King, 1970)

Table 1-1 provides a comprehensive idea of various leadership theories and its evolution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Theories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Man Theories</td>
<td>Based on the belief that leaders are exceptional people, born with innate qualities, destined to lead. The use of the term 'man' was intentional since until the latter part of the twentieth century leadership was thought of as a concept which is primarily male, military and Western. This led to the next school of Trait Theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Theories</td>
<td>The lists of traits or qualities associated with leadership exist in abundance and continue to be produced. They draw on virtually all the adjectives in the dictionary which describe some positive or virtuous human attribute, from ambition to zest for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorist Theories</td>
<td>These theories concentrate on what leaders actually do rather than on their qualities. Different patterns of behaviour are observed and categorized as 'styles of leadership'. This area has probably attracted most attention from practicing managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Leadership</td>
<td>This approach sees leadership as specific to the situation in which it is being exercised. For example, whilst some situations may require an autocratic style, others may need a more participative approach. It also proposes that there may be differences in required leadership styles at different levels in the same organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Theory</td>
<td>This is a refinement of the situational viewpoint and focuses on identifying the situational variables which best predict the most appropriate or effective leadership style to fit the particular circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Theory</td>
<td>This approach emphasizes the importance of the relationship between leader and followers, focusing on the mutual benefits derived from a form of ‘contract’ through which the leader delivers such things as rewards or recognition in return for the commitment or loyalty of the followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Theory</td>
<td>The central concept here is ‘change’ and the role of leadership is envisioning and implementing the transformation of organisational performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (King, 1970)
Table 1.1 illustrates the evolution of leadership theories over a period of time, from Great Man to Transformational. These leadership theories can be summarized as a framework that based on each theory's **focus** and **approach** (Jago, 1982).

**Jago's Framework of Leadership Theories:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus On Traits</th>
<th>Focus On Behaviors</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus On Traits</td>
<td>Focus On Behaviors</td>
<td>Universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus On Traits</td>
<td>Focus On Behaviors</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Traits Theory</td>
<td>Early Behavioral Theory</td>
<td>Fiedler's Contingency Theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Jago, 1982)

"Focus" refers to whether leadership is viewed as a set of traits or as a set of actions.

**Focus on Traits:** Theories with such a focus see leaders as having certain innate or inherent personality traits that distinguish them from non-leaders. These personality traits are supposed to be relatively stable and enduring.

**Focus on Behavior:** Theories with this type of focus see leadership as observable actions of the leader instead of personality traits. "Approach" is concerned with whether a particular theory or model of leadership takes a universal or a contingent perspective.

**Universal Approach:** This approach believes that there is a universal formula of the traits or behavior for an effective leader. In other words, the universal approach assumes that there is "one best way" to lead in all situations.

**Contingent Approach:** Contrary to the universal approach, the contingent approach does not believe the "one best way" formula. It believes that effective leadership depends on the specific situation.
In an organisation where there is faith in the abilities of formal leaders, employees will look towards the leaders as role models. This is true during the time of change as well as stability. During change, employees will expect effective and sensible planning, confidence, effective decision-making, and effective communication. During the change implementation phase, employees will perceive leadership as supportive, concerned and committed to their welfare, while at the same time recognizing that tough decisions need to be made. During the period of stability, leaders need to work on conceptual levels to set still higher goals as well as organising resources for their achievements, both materials and empowered Human Capital.

Next section of the chapter provides concept on Strategic Leadership, different Strategic Leadership models and its dimensions.

1.3 Strategic Leadership

This part of the chapter describes concept on Strategic Leadership, different Strategic Leadership models and various dimensions of Strategic Leadership.

Strategic Leadership is a complex, multi-faceted capability that has many nuances and subtleties, making it difficult to easily codify. (Sorcher, 2002). A strategic leader is one who makes strategic decisions that commit the entire organization to a given course of action. Strategic leadership is about making these strategic decisions (Pelletier, 1997). Strategic leadership is the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change as necessary (Byrd, 1987).

Strategic Leadership can be described as a person’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization (Christensen, 1997). It is important to have the human element in the concept, as relationship between individuals and organizations is the driving force that facilitates actions (Hitt & Ireland, 2002).
Strategic Leadership is multifunctional, involves managing through others, and helps organizations cope with change which is increasing exponentially in today's globalized environment (Huey, 1994). It requires the ability to accommodate and integrate both external and internal environment forces, and to manage and engage in complex business situations. Firms use the strategic management process successfully through effective strategic leadership (Hitt and Keats, 1992).

The very essence of leadership is to have a vision. It's got to be a vision the leader articulate clearly and forcefully on every occasion. Leaders who can set vision, and break them down into manageable goals which would then cascaded as operational objectives are vital for the organization. Strategic leaders have the insight and focus to work out ways of achieving the vision. They are able to persuade their followers to accept these goals and objectives.

Leaders who think strategically are able to picture a range of possibilities several stages ahead of the current phase of organizational development. Like a good chess player, it was said of Napoleon's leadership, that he could envisage several steps ahead, with the various permutations of competitive responses. Strategic leaders have a great understanding of timing - have the patience to wait until the timing is right to make a major intervention, yet have the boldness to strike decisively when the moment is right. They, and their organizations, are alert and ready to seize any opportunity.

Leaders whose current work is future focused are more likely to be working strategically: who invest their time in developing people and capability for the future of the organization as well as managing the current needs of the organization. A strategic leader is willing to work with others in alliances and agreements to make significant intervention than either party would be able to make alone.

Strategic Leaders are role models for their followers. They work with the team and think not in terms of "I", but "we". They understand their job well, to make the team function. They accept responsibility and don't sidestep it, but "we", the team, gets the credit of achieving the goals (Druker 1996).
All managers throughout the organization should be strategic leaders, to some extent, to effectively formulate and implement business-unit and corporate-level strategies (Hitt, Ireland, and Hoskisson, 1995). Strategic Leadership can be practiced at all levels within an organization (Hitt and Ireland, 2002).

1.3.1 Strategic Leadership Models

Various authors dealt with Strategic Leadership from many perspectives. However, Adair and Hitt have approached the concept in the dimensions point of view. This section of the chapter describes two Strategic Leadership models, with its dimensions.

**Strategic Leadership Model - 1**

Strategic Leadership has seven different dimensions in its operation (John Adair, 2002). The Figure 1-1 shows Strategic Leadership model by Adair, with seven dimensions.

**Figure 1.1: Strategic Leadership Model 1**

Adapted from: "Effective Strategic Leadership", (Adair, 2002)
In the above model John Adair visualises seven dimensions of Strategic Leadership as follows:

1) Purpose / Vision: to provide direction for the organisation as a whole.
2) Strategic Thinking and Planning: to get strategy and policy right.
3) Operational / Administration: making it happen (overall executive responsibility).
4) Organisation Fitness to Situational Requirement: organizing or reorganizing (balance of whole and parts).
5) Energy, Morale, Confidence: releasing the corporate spirit.
6) Allies, Partners, Stakeholders, and Political: relating the organisation to other organisations and society as a whole.
7) Teaching and Leading the Learning, by Example: choosing today's leaders and developing tomorrow's leaders.

Strategic Leadership Model - 2
Figure 1.2: Strategic Leadership Model -2
Adapted from: Strategic Leadership, (Hitt, M.A, 2000)
Concept of Strategic Leadership also could be explained in a similar manner, with slightly different set of dimensions as discussed by Hitt.M.A. The model is illustrated in Figure 1.2. Strategic Leadership dimensions according to the model presented by Hitt are described below:

1. Determining Strategic Direction:

Determining strategic direction involves developing a long-term vision of the firm’s strategic intent. The strategic direction needs to project five to ten years into the future. There should be philosophy and goals. The vision needs to reflect the image and character the firm seeks to achieve. Ideally, long-term vision has two parts: a “Core ideology” and an “Envisioned future”. Together, the vision provides a clear picture on the future direction of the organisation.

2. Exploiting and Maintaining Core Competencies:

Core competencies are resources and capabilities of a firm that serve as a source of competitive advantage over its rivals. Leadership must verify that the firm’s competencies are emphasized in strategy implementation efforts. Firms must continuously develop or even change their core competencies to stay ahead of competitors.

3. Developing Human Capital:

The knowledge and skills of the firm’s entire workforce are capital resource that requires investment both in training, development and knowledge management. The organizations need to understand the importance of knowledge sharing, innovation and learning curve. They need to facilitate this process so that the Human Capital is empowered and becomes the real competitive advantage for the organisation.

4. Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture

Organisational culture is the complex set of ideologies, symbols and core values shared through the firm that influences the way business is conducted. Changing a
firm’s Organisational culture is more difficult than maintaining it. It needs constant and cautious efforts. Effective strategic leaders recognize when change in culture is needed. Shaping and reinforcing culture requires: effective communication, problem solving skills, selection of the right people, effective performance appraisals, and appropriate reward systems

5. Emphasizing Ethical Practices

Effectiveness of processes used to implement the firm’s strategies increases when based on ethical practices. Ethical practices create social capital and goodwill for the firm. There are various measures that could facilitate ethical practices. Actions that develop an ethical organisational culture include establishing and communicating specific goals to describe the firm’s ethical standards, continuously revising and updating the code of conduct, disseminating the code of conduct to all stakeholders to inform them of the firm’s ethical standards and practices, developing and implementing methods and procedures to use in achieving the firm’s ethical standards, creating and using explicit reward systems that recognize acts of courage, and creating a work environment in which all people are treated with dignity.

6. Establishing Organisational Controls

Controls are formal, information-based procedures used by managers to maintain or alter patterns in Organisational activities. Controls help strategic leaders to build credibility, demonstrate the value of strategies to the firm’s stakeholders, and to promote and support strategic change.

Balanced Scorecard could be used as a framework to verify that the firm has established both strategic and financial controls to assess its performance. This help to prevent overemphasis of financial controls at the expense of strategic controls.

Four perspectives of balanced scorecard are financial, customer, internal business processes, and learning and growth.
The models discussed on Strategic Leadership illustrate the concept on the basis of dimensions. Each dimension is important, but might vary from context to context of business environment. Effective practice of the appropriate dimensions is necessary for the organisation to become successful.

1.4 Organisational Success

Organisational success, in usual practice is the measure of profit an organisation is creating within a particular time period. Organisational success is also understood have taken place when an organisation has utilized the resources under its possession to its full potential. It also indicates that the goals determined are accomplished within the stipulated time. Though the concept is narrowed down to the above discussed levels, organisational success is a broader concept, which have more dimensions. Many times it might become difficult to measure the real success, as the attainments are both tangible as well as intangible. Again it become broader in the sense, the success the organisation achieves is by interacting with complex sets of internal as well as external factors.

Organisational success also could be viewed in relation to the targeted and achieved goals, reflecting efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency is doing things right where as effectiveness is doing the right thing. Efficiency also considers cost, process and quality. Effectiveness focuses more on human capital, organisational values, and structures (Reddin, 1987, Drucker, 1955).

Productivity and performance also could be viewed as measures of success (Partap & SK Srivastava, 1985). Success also could be function of intervening variables like motivation, morale, skills in leadership, communication, conflict resolution, decision making, problem solving and short range goals. A measure of character and the quality of the organization with appropriate indices also leads to measuring organisational success (Likert, 1958).

Organisational Productivity Model (GeorgopoJous and Tannenbaum, 1957), Goal Model (Price, 1972); Goal Optimisation model (Richard M Steers, 1976), Goal-
attainment Approach Etzioni (1960), Internal Process Maintenance Model (Bennis, 1966), System Resource Model (Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967), Organisational Interaction with Environment Model (Friedlander and Pickle, 1976), and Legitimacy Model (Miles and Cameron, 1982) are various models available to measure organisational success. Each model is based on different set of criteria of measurement. Single or a combination of them could be used as situation demands.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are the measurement tools in performance driven organizations. They also act as both guidelines to monitor performance. Key Performance Indicators, also known as Key Success Indicators (KSIs), help an organisation define and measure progress towards Organisational goals. Key Performance Indicators are quantifiable measurements, agreed to beforehand, that reflect the critical success factors of an organisation. Whatever Key Performance Indicators are selected, they must be quantifiable (measurable). Key Performance Indicators usually are long-term considerations. It is critical to limit the number of Key Performance Indicators, to those factors that are essential to the organisation reaching its goals. It is also important to keep the number of Key Performance Indicators small for focused attention on their achievement.

1.5 Summary

The concept and practice of leadership have evolved over a period of time. Various Leadership models and frameworks encapsulate the essence of this growth and suggest the leadership behavior patterns. Leadership theories illustrate the change in concept from ‘leader with innate qualities’ to the ‘change agent’ who transform an organisation by empowering.

Strategic leadership is the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change. All managers throughout the organisation should be strategic leaders to effectively formulate and implement business-unit and corporate-level strategies.
Different theories and models discussed and elaborated establish that there are various dimensions of Strategic Leadership based on unique situation of an organisation. Each dimension of Strategic Leadership plays important role in organisational success. The vision setting being the fore most important, other dimensions of Strategic Leadership would follow it. Based on the same assumption that the vision setting is already completed and in place, the author has taken two dimensions of strategic leadership. This approach helps the study more focused as well. The two selected dimensions of Strategic Leadership are deemed to be crucial for attainment of the vision that already in place, and to lead the organisation to success.

The two dimensions of Strategic Leadership selected for the present study are:

Developing the Human Capital and

Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture.

As a measure of Human Capital Development, Team Effectiveness was studied whereas for Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture, Organisational Learning was assessed.

As the organisation selected to conduct the research is a performance driven, operating company under a parent organisation, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were considered for measurement of Organisational Success. Elements of three KPIs of the selected organization were assessed.

A brief overview of Abu Dhabi’s Oil Industry and an introduction of Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO) are presented in the next chapter.
Chapter-2
Abu Dhabi’s Oil Industry and
Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company
(ADMA – OPCO)

2.1 Introduction

Oil and Gas meet major part of the energy needs of the world. Middle East region possesses a sizeable reserve of these ‘fossil fuels’. United Arab Emirates is a prominent member of Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). This chapter gives an overview of Abu Dhabi’s Oil Industry. A brief account on Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO), the focus of this study, is also presented.

2.2 Abu Dhabi’s Oil Industry

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) possesses nearly 10 per cent of the world’s total oil reserves. Oil export from UAE began in the late 1950s. Transformation of Abu Dhabi, the biggest Emirate in UAE started with the advent of increasing revenues from oil exports. Under the rule of late H.H. Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al-Nahyan, which started in 1966, UAE achieved noteworthy progress. As the capital of the nation, Abu Dhabi enjoyed special attention, setting up a wide range of infrastructure and social service institutions. As an Emirate, Abu Dhabi controls more than 85 per cent of the UAE’s oil output capacity and more than 90 per cent of its oil reserve (ADNOC home page).

In 1971, the State-owned Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) was set up, to manage all aspects of the Emirate’s oil and gas operations. Oil policy for Abu Dhabi is being decided by the Supreme Petroleum Council, which came into being in June 1988.
ADNOC controls the entire proven oil reserves in Abu Dhabi, accounting for around 97.8 billion barrels, the fourth-largest national reserves in the world behind Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Kuwait. It also controls proven reserves of 6.1 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. ADNOC, through its subsidiaries, oversees oil production of more than 2.7 million barrels a day.

ADNOC owns a range of subsidiaries in the UAE and abroad, which specialize in oil and gas exploration and production, distribution, shipping and all other related operations of the oil and gas industry. Besides ADCO, ADMA-OPCO and ZADCO, which are oil companies, ADNOC owns or has a majority shareholding in: ADNOC for Distribution (ADNOC-FOD), Abu Dhabi Drilling Chemicals and Products (ADDCAP), Abu Dhabi Gas Industries Company (GASCO), Abu Dhabi Gas Liquefaction Company (ADGAS), Abu Dhabi National Tanker Company (ADNATCO), Abu Dhabi Petroleum Ports Operating Company (ADPPOC), the Liquefied Gas Shipping Company Ltd (LGSC), the National Drilling Company (NDC), the National Marine Services Company (NMS), Natural Gas Shipping Company (NGSCO), National Petroleum Construction Company Ltd (NPCC), the Ruwais Fertilizers Industries Ltd (FERTIL), the Abu Dhabi Polymers Company Ltd (Borouge), the Abu Dhabi Oil Refining Company (TAKREER) and the Abu Dhabi Gas Company (GASCO).

In 2000, ADNOC celebrated fiftieth anniversary of drilling of the first oil well at Ra’s Sadr, north-east of Abu Dhabi. Abu Dhabi, supported by Dubai, turned the UAE into one of the major players in the international oil export industry. In 1966, when H.H. Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan became ruler, there were fewer than 20,000 people living in Abu Dhabi. At the beginning of the current century, Abu Dhabi, with a population of around 600,000, against the background of a carefully managed oil and gas industry, enjoys a high standard of living with public services and amenities matches any other similar facilities of the world.

At the initiative of H. H. Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al-Nahyan, The Petroleum Institute (P.I) was established in 2000. The objective in establishing the Petroleum
Institute was to provide Engineers to the UAE and its oil and gas as well as the broader energy industry, educated and trained to the world’s standards. The Petroleum Institute is sponsored by Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) and four of its international partners (Shell, British Petroleum, Total, and Japan Oil Development Company). ExxonMobil is also a major contributor. In 2006 first batch of graduates emerged from the Institute and started their careers within the ADNOC group of companies. Current strength of the Institute is around 1000, comprising both male and female students. In order to meet increasing demand for higher learning, the Institute has started Masters Programmes in selected disciplines, as well.

The economic endowments backed by the huge oil and gas revenues helped the Emirate to become a world class capital with most modern infrastructure. These include international airport, universities, hospitals, museums, hotels, office buildings, as well as communications and transportation facilities. The country in general and the Emirate in particular has witnessed truly spectacular progress under the present dispensation.

Next section of the chapter will give a brief account of Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO), the organisation selected to conduct this study.

2.3 Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO)

This section provides a description on the background, organisational set up, operations, Health, Safety and Environmental (HSE) aspects, Human Capital Development initiatives and performance of Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO), the flagship organisation working in Abu Dhabi’s Oil and Gas Industrial Sector.
Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA-OPCO) is a subsidiary of Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC). It is a major producer of oil and gas from offshore areas of the Emirate of Abu Dhabi. With a history of more than 45 years of oil and gas production, the company prides itself as a pioneering petroleum organisation in this part of the world.

2.3.1 ADMA – OPCO: Background

This section provides a brief idea on the background and history of Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA – OPCO).
The fore-runner of ADMA - OPCO, ‘ADMA Limited’, was formed in 1954, to operate the concession awarded to D’Arcy Exploration, a British company in 1953. In 1958, ADMA became the first company to discover oil in commercial quantities – at Umm Shaif field. The rapid pace of activity in the wake of the oil discoveries called for a permanent base to handle various operations in the off shore area. After aerial and sea reconnaissance of a number of possible sites, Das Island was chosen for this purpose. The island is situated 180 kilometers from Abu Dhabi. Large scale land development activities were carried out, followed by infrastructure development, capable of meeting even future requirements. The island now houses oil and gas processing plants, workshops, huge storage tanks, tanker berthing facilities, a harbour, an airport, paved roads, a modern hospital, office and living accommodation, complete with the necessary utilities and support services. Oil and gas operations are managed on the island by computerized monitoring and control systems. (ADMA – OPCO Profile, 2009).

Shipment of Crude oil began from Das Island in 1962 – the year when Abu Dhabi joined the family of oil exporters. This also made a beginning of rapid transformation of the Emirate. ADMA had a major breakthrough in 1965 with the discovery of the offshore Zakum oilfield. Export of oil from this field began two years later.

In 1973 Government of Abu Dhabi acquired a 25% shareholding in the oil concession area from a consortium of international oil companies made up of British Petroleum, TOTAL from France, and JODCO from Japan.

In 1974, The Government, through Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) became the owner of 60 per cent share in ADMA, thereby taking overall control. Remaining 40 percent share was offered for BP, TOTAL & JODCO. (Please see Fig. 2.2.1-1, on next page for details). On 3rd July 1977 the Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA-OPCO) was established, replacing ADMA Ltd., to take over the responsibility of operating the marine oil fields.
In 1978 a third super complex in Zakum West, was added to the assets. Zakum West Super complex lies about 98 kilometers from Abu Dhabi, and around 81 kilometers from Das Island. The distance between Zakum Complex and Umm Shaif is 55 kilometers. New facilities have been added to the Complex in the last few years such as the gas injection platform (GIP), to enhance oil recovery from the field’s reservoirs. Major projects, like the Crestal Gas Injection project, were executed for the same purpose. Zakum Central Super Complex is around 90 kilometers from Abu Dhabi, and about 89 kilometers from Das Island.

Umm Shaif Super complex, which is around 150 kilometers North West of Abu Dhabi, like the two other steel structures in Zakum field, works as a centre for gathering oil and gas from the field’s reservoirs before transferring to Das Island. Since 1994, the Complex became a major gas producer. With the execution of two major projects which kicked off in 2000 - the Offshore Khuff Gas Development Project (OGED), and the Offshore Gas Export Development Project (OGED) - the Complex became a strategic offshore gas distribution centre.

In 1986, Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC), owner of the majority shareholding in ADMA-OPCO, decided to group all drilling, well-services and logistical support in all offshore areas of Abu Dhabi under ADMA – OPCO.
2.3.2 ADMA – OPCO: Organisation

Besides acquiring latest technologies ADMA – OPCO’s management gave due importance to establishing efficient organisational structure as well. In May 2001, a new Organisational structure was introduced. ADMA-OPCO is now an asset-based organisation. The new structure has been designed and introduced to improve efficiency, provide more focus on key mission, reduce interfaces between different groups and create a ‘performance-driven organisation’. The current asset-based structure is part of the three components of a performance driven organisation. The other two being comprehensive performance management system and the performance driven organisational culture which includes key factors such as leadership, team-building, employee’s empowerment and HSE awareness.

Under the terms of the re-organisation four business units were established: the Production Business Unit, Development Business Unit, and Drilling Support Business Unit, supported by Administration Services Business Unit which provides back-up to aforementioned three Business Units. Each unit was entrusted with a clearly defined range of responsibilities. This re-structuring was completed in late 2001.

In 2007, a new Business Unit was added in order to meet the considerable challenges of increasing production capacity and consequent increase in project works. Known as Projects & Engineering Business Unit, this unit is responsible for executing all Project works in ADMA - OPCO. In 2009 one more Business Unit, Corporate Support, mainly to provide corporate professional support and advice, was established. This increased the number of Business Units in the organisation to six.

Each Business Unit in ADMA-OPCO is lead by a Senior Vice President (SVP). SVPs directly report to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The organisation chart with the business units is illustrated below in figure 2.3.1.2.
Figure 2.3.2.1: ADMA OPCO Business Units

Figure 2.3.2.2, provides a schematic representation of the offshore Super Complexes and Das Island. The Super Complexes are: Umm Shaif, Zakum Central and Zakum West. Main pipelines carrying oil and gas from the Super Complexes to Das Island also are shown.

Figure 2.3.2.2: ADMA OPCO Schematic Map

Joint Management Committee (JMC) and the Board of Directors are the highest authorities that oversee the company's operations. JMC formulates strategic policies on investment and operations whereas Board of Directors is responsible for monitoring the overall technical and financial performance of the organisation.
Main objectives of ADMA – OPCO include:

- Ensure the continued operation and development of facilities and to explore the concession area
- Produce oil and gas
- Develop a work program and budget and manage the work program at minimum cost with safe and efficient operations
- Ensure the priority is given to UAE Nationals in recruitment, training and development
- Operate in accordance with the laws and regulations of the state
- Ensure high standard of safety for personnel and installations, and to ensure the protection of the environment.

The vision statement of ADMA – OPCO is ‘to be an integrated team working effectively to produce hydrocarbons from offshore areas, aspiring to excel in all aspects of our business’, where as its mission statement focuses on ‘optimizing Oil and Gas production, recovery and reserves to maximize value in a safe, sustainable and socially responsible manner through the high performance, creativity and dedication of our teams’.

ADMA-OPCO is making significant strides in meeting future challenges by changing into a performance driven organisation. The new system has its foundation on competency, learning, empowerment, team approach, knowledge sharing and innovation. Since transformation to a performance driven organisation, ADMA-OPCO monitors its progress using a measurable set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Four sets of indicators formulated are related to Production, Health, Safety and Environment (HSE), Asset Values, and People. Under these categories, performance is measured related to production targets, safety, emission, expenditure, major projects, and people development.

Centralized direction takes care of the strategic goals, values and business behaviors that unify the company. Objectives, values and behaviors are widely shared and
understood at every level of the organisation. Decentralized implementation through team empowerment makes sure the goals are met at the operational level. This makes all the business units blend together towards achieving organisational success. The new approach is reflected in ADMA’s Vision and Mission statements as well as in the Corporate Values. ADMA’s nine Corporate Values are: People, Leadership, Innovation, Accountability, Teamwork, Excellence, Ethical conduct, Health, Safety and Environment (HSE), and Learning.

Next section provides a description on the operations and productions aspects of ADMA.

2.3.3 ADMA – OPCO: Operations and Production

ADMA-OPCO operates two major fields - Umm Shaif and Zakum. The operations are centered on producing oil and gas from these fields, and transferring the crude through a sophisticated pipeline network to Das Island for processing, storing and exporting. The collection and treatment processes of oil and gas are executed by utilizing giant structures, installed in the field, called Super Complexes. They are manned by skilled UAE and expatriate employees. The facilities on the Super Complexes include plants and platforms. They are firmly placed in the sea like man-made islands.

Drilling in the offshore areas is handled by a fleet of drilling rigs leased from National Drilling Company (NDC). The techniques used in drilling has progressed throughout the years, starting with vertical drilling, and currently using horizontal method. New concepts like “Drilling the Limit” (DTL) was introduced to reduce time and cost of drilling operations, while maintaining safe and high standards.

Logistical supports to the offshore operations are provided by the Supply Base located in Mussaffah. The supports include tools, materials and other related items. A fleet of helicopters and boats is utilized to ferry people and materials to the offshore sites.
In line with the guidelines of Organisation of Petroleum Export Countries (OPEC), quota of oil and gas production is controlled and determined by Abu Dhabi’s Supreme Petroleum Council. This quota is implemented by Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) through its subsidiaries. Currently, ADMA-OPCO’s daily oil production is around 500,000 barrels per day, while daily gas production is around one billion standard cubic feet.

ADMA – OPCO, over the period of its growth to the present status, has acquired state of the art technology available in the field of oil and gas operations. Besides the original technique of vertical drilling which is still employed, ADMA – OPCO also employs the latest horizontal drilling technique. In 2001, yet another innovation, a concept known as 'Drilling The Limit' DTL, was introduced, leading to substantial savings in time and cost. These advancements in drilling is necessitated by the need to optimize oil and gas production. Currently the company is using 12 rigs, all under contract with National Drilling Company (NDC), another member of the ADNOC Group.

Next section provides a brief account of ADMA –OPCO’s Human Capital, and various systems and initiatives established for its development in the organisation.

2.3.4 ADMA – OPCO: Human Capital

This section provides a description on the Human Capital of ADMA – OPCO. A brief account on the background of the employees, different systems and initiatives available for their development also presented.

ADMA – OPCO’s current Human Capital is around 2000 employees. Additionally, thousands of people work on contract at different project sites. ADMA’s manpower comprises of people from more than forty countries. They form the mix of cultures, languages, skills and expertise. This diversity of Human Capital is a major strength of the organisation. They work in various teams to achieve the organisational goals.

Foremost item in the list of ADMA’s nine Corporate Values is ‘People’. As the most important ‘asset’ of the organisation, ADMA’s top management gives due importance
to the development of its Human Capital, with a high priority in the case of UAE Nationals. Expertise of the team members with diverse demographic characteristics is efficiently tapped for the Human Capital development initiatives. Manpower Development Division is responsible for this vital task. This Division comprises of three teams, entrusted to the development and career growth of ADMA’s manpower. These teams are: Competency Assurance Management System (CAMS) Team, Learning and Development (L&D) Team, and Professional Ladder (P/L) Team.

The contribution of ADMA-OPCO to Abu Dhabi is evident, not only in the advancement to the petroleum industry, but in the enhancement of career opportunities for UAE Nationals. CAMS Team is responsible for the development of new recruits, especially the UAE Nationals. A limited number of graduates of other nationalities also are included in this programme. Graduates from the Petroleum Institute, UAE Universities, Higher Colleges of Technology and ADNOC Technical Institute (ATI), as well as universities abroad, are selected for this developmental scheme. Through a structured and systematic development road map, the new recruits are continuously supported in their development, both personal as well as professional aspects, until they are integrated into independent posts. Experience and expertise of employees with diverse demographic background are utilised for this developmental activities. The main functions under CAMS are distributed between Knowledge Management, Implementation, and Assessment & Verification sub-teams.

Each Trainee under the CAMS programme is assigned with a coach and a Technical Mentor to support his / her development, which is governed by a Personal Development Plan. At specific and mutually agreed time, the trainees are assessed on the progress they have achieved in terms of quantifiable competencies. These assessments are verified at a random scale for ensuring conformity to standards. In 2009, Assessment and Verification Team of the CAMS System has conducted around 1,700 such assessment and verification events. On successful completion of the training phase, these trainees are integrated into independent posts. Number of such
National employees integrated during the period from 2007 to 2009 are 96, 77 and 50 respectively (ADMA – OPCO Annual Performance Report, 2009).

Every year, a special event, Future Leaders Conference, is being organized by CAMS Team. One of the major objectives of the conference is to provide a forum to recognize the high achievers amongst the Young Professionals in ADMA, who demonstrate high standards of professional performance and personal characteristics. It is also an opportunity for them to closely interact with ADMA top management and to get an awareness of ADMA’s challenges – both current as well as those expected in the future. Senior employees who seriously take part in the developmental process of the Young Professionals also recognized during this event. The event in 2009 had a theme of ‘Journey to Excellence’. Over the years, Future Leaders Conferences have evolved as an effective Learning Tool for Manpower Development, in ADMA.

Yet another initiative, Talent Management Programme, is a Human Capital Development mechanism for high performers in the organisation. The system envisages a ‘fast track’ career progression for those with substantially high performance. The candidates selected for this programme are provided with special training, coaching and mentoring to equip them to engage in challenging future assignments or posts. They are provided with short time courses like ‘Mini MBA’ to get exposure to different management topics, including leadership. In 2008, 32 high potential National employees were selected for the first phase of Talent Management Programme.

Learning and Development Team is responsible to conceptualise, formulate, coordinate and organize internal as well as external training programmes. These training programmes include formal or informal courses, job attachments, opportunity training, and on-the-job training. The training programmes are aligned with training needs and monitored on the basis of the Personal Development Plans, developed by the trainees and agreed with the Team Leaders and Divisional Managers. Total training events conducted in the period from 2008 to 2009 are 2430 and 2046 respectively.
Professional Ladder Team is responsible for developing and maintaining the Professional Ladder System. The system is both a competency assurance mechanism as well as a career progression road map. It also acts as a motivational tool for those who demonstrate measurable capabilities in terms of competencies. These competencies are classified into Technical, Business, and Behavioural. For each job and job grade, a team of experts formulates competency profile and descriptions, expected to be demonstrated, at different levels starting from awareness to mastery.

ADMA’s top management is the custodian of the system. Each year, based on specific eligibility criteria, certain number of employees are selected for promotions to next higher grade, through this system. They are assessed by panels comprise of experts from within or outside ADMA, as appropriate. Assessment is carried out on the technical, business and behavioural competencies of the individual, governed by competency element descriptions. Therefore, promotions in ADMA – OPCO are based on competencies, but not on length of service. The Professional Ladder Team acts as a facilitator for this entire process.

‘One Team’ Concept

‘One Team’ Concept is a new initiative by the top management for enhancing ‘team building’ and overall Human Capital performance in ADMA. The term ‘One Team’ concept is used to describe collective and supportive management process that brings the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Senior Vice Presidents (SVPs), and Divisional Managers and the subordinates into a single team, working to achieve ADMA-OPCO’s ambitions in terms of development and production targets, while maintaining high HSE excellence and integrity of the facilities. This concept is monitored by a mechanism that includes Senior Management, supported by three Management Committees.

As envisaged by ‘one team’ concept, in addition to their principal line responsibilities of performance targets, the Senior Management in ADMA-OPCO has the following overall / collective role to support the performance management control process and enhance the Company’s capabilities to meet current and future business challenges:
• Take collective responsibility for the combined performance of ADMA-OPCO.

• Establish and demonstrate Business Norms and Principles

• Proactively lead, promote, and enhance High Performance Organisation (HPO) Culture.

• Set the overall performance goals and measurement criteria and agree these with Shareholders.

• Ensure that major business risks are being addressed

• Demonstrate Team Leadership to the organisation in a transparent and consistent manner.

(Profile, ADMA – OPCO, 2009)

Innovation Awards

One of the Corporate Values of the company is ‘Innovation’, which has the following descriptions (Vision, Mission and Values, ADMA –OPCO):

• ADMA-OPCO use creativity to resolve problems faster and better.

• ADMA-OPCO assesses risks and learns from mistakes to continually improve.

• ADMA-OPCO seeks to improve all aspects of business through innovation and use of enabling technologies.

ADMA – OPCO’s top management strongly supports and recognise innovation. ADMA-OPCO is trying to introduce a creative culture where everyone feels proud of helping the company become more innovative and thereby more productive. The company gives due recognition and reward for innovation in all fronts, especially that facilitating process transformation, cost optimization, technical advancement and productivity enhancement. To select the best innovative ideas, the company has implemented an enabling process, which is evidence based. The ideas are to be presented as a business case, supported by the Divisional Head.

‘Innovation Awards’ are conferred to top ten teams that formulate, implement and prove novel ideas, every performance year. The awards are viewed as a reflection of
the commitment of ADMA’s top management in supporting and developing a positive culture that allow identifying, recognizing, rewarding and implementing ideas from its Human Capital and convert these ideas into real learning and value addition for the company.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Human Capital Development include Nationalisation, Junior Integration, Recruitment, and People Development. For the present study, People Development is considered for analysis.

Next section presents a brief account of Health, Safety and Environmental (HSE) aspects in the organisation.

### 2.3.5 ADMA – OPCO: Health, Safety and Environment (HSE)

This section provides Health, Safety and Environmental aspects in ADMA – OPCO, various initiatives and measures the company implemented on HSE, and its performance on HSE aspects.

As an Operating Company functioning in Oil & Gas sector, ADMA – OPCO always give higher priority in maintaining the standards of Health, Safety and Environment (HSE). In fact HSE elements are placed as the first, in the list of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). This reveals the high risk involved in oil & gas exploration operations as well as the company’s commitment to protect the health of its Manpower, to upkeep very high safety standards, and to protect the environment. ADMA – OPCO attempts to keep these practices at par with the International Standards. This commitment of ADMA Management is also evident by placing the Division responsible for Health, Safety, Environment and Quality Assurance (HSE&Q) directly under the CEO. Basic goals on HSE are: ‘no harm to people, prevent pollution and protect the environment’ (*ADMA – OPCO Annual Performance Reports, 2007-2009*).
Due to its special care on safe handling of jobs and protecting the health of its employees, the company could make remarkable progress in reducing total recordable injuries over the years. The figures from 2006 to 2009 are 1.29, 0.76, 0.65, and 0.41 respectively. The figure in 2009 is the lowest in the history of ADMA. This is to be understood against the figures of total man hours during the same period. The figures are 21, 23, 29 and 39 million man hours respectively (ADMA – OPCO Annual Performance Reports, 2007 - 2009).

ADMA – OPCO has provided many facilities to protect health of its employees. These include medical checkup facilities, health insurance, service of health professionals, clinics and hospital, and family medical assistance programmes. The company conducts awareness programmes on general as well as special aspects of health care. The employees are given Health Club memberships on subsidised rates, facilitating healthy life style, even outside the duty time. The membership is also open to the families of the employees. These measures are in addition to a full fledged hospital run by ADNOC, the parent company.

The company makes sure that, each employee in ADMA –OPCO is aware of the basic principle of ‘Safety First’ in whatever job they do. The importance of up keeping safety standards at very high level is made clear to everybody from day one of their tenure in the company through Safety Induction Training programme, which is mandatory to all the employees to attend. This is followed by an Off-shore Survival Course for all those who are expected to travel to off-shore facilities and Das Island. This course covers necessary precautions in case of emergencies, including surviving in sea, in the event of a plane or helicopter crash.

To check preparedness of safety readiness, safety drills are carried out at specific intervals. Fire Drills both in the Head Quarters as well as on Super Complexes and Das is the best example. These exercises are conducted by involving Police and Civil Defense Authorities. The safety drills help to identify and to close any loop holes, in the preparedness for emergencies.
A ‘near – miss’ is an unplanned event that did not result in injury, illness, or damage - but had the potential to do so. Only a fortunate break in the chain of events prevented an injury, fatality or damage. Although human error is commonly an initiating event, a faulty process or system invariably permits or compounds the harm, and should be the focus of improvement (ADMA – OPCO HSE Handbook, 2009). Reporting any near miss observed is a personal responsibility of all the employees in ADMA – OPCO. These reports are formally forwarded to the concerned authorities. Actions are initiated to rectify the condition reported, and the message is distributed to all concerned as ‘lessons learnt’. In addition to the near miss reports analysis messages, HSE&QA Division also publishes ‘Safety Flashes’ covering the Safety risks or incidents that happened within and outside ADMA. This helps to improve awareness of the employees and to keep them safe from similar incidents happening. Relevant articles on Health, Safety and Environment issues for up keeping general awareness are published on a monthly basis in ADMA Bulletin. Company Intranet is also utilized as an effective tool for this awareness programme.

In addition to the regular safety measures, special precautions are taken on Super Complexes and on Das Island. This is because people working on these facilities are exposed to high risk environment. Special training programmes, safety drills, daily tool box meetings, safety audits, and safety behavioural audits are conducted to keep the safety standards high as well as to ensure the employees are free from any safety risks. Stringent disciplinary actions like termination of service are taken against those who violate safety rules, especially on off shore fields and on Das Island.

ADMA –OPCO also shows its commitment to protecting the environment. Elements of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) on Environmental Protection cover Flaring, Gas release and Spills. Regular awareness programmes are being conducted to educate the employees on the importance of environmental protection. As part of a social responsibility, ADMA – OPCO participates in all the initiatives by different Government Agencies, aimed at protecting the environment. Every year, an Environment Day is celebrated to show the corporate level commitment. This is one of the major elements of Social Responsibility of Business. These societal objectives
are very much relevant as recently an oil spill in Gulf of Mexico has caused considerable damage to the environment.

ADMA – OPCO has won six HSE awards for the year 2009, instituted by ADNOC, as a recognition for maintaining HSE aspects to International Standards, which also reflect the commitment of the management and employees towards HSE.

In the year 2009 ADMA-OPCO have successfully met the challenges in carrying out its business activities according to the shareholders and Supreme Petroleum Council (SPC) guidelines. To specify a few, these include, cost optimization initiative, meeting required quotas of production, setting new records in various phases of well life cycles, achieving a record performance (39 million man-hours) without a Loss Time Injury (LTI), recruiting over 130 UAE Nationals and integrating 48 Competency Assurance Managements System (CAMS) graduates into their target posts (ADMA-OPCO, 2009).

As expressed by the CEO in 2009 Annual review report, ADMA-OPCO has seen the fruits of “One Team” Initiative over the past few years and became integrated into the day-to-day practices of the company and now forging the next steps of ‘Journey to Excellence’.

2.4 Summary

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) possesses nearly 10 per cent of the world’s total oil reserves. Export of oil from UAE began in the late 1950s. Supreme Petroleum Council monitors the entire aspects of oil and gas operations in Abu Dhabi. Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC), through its subsidiaries make sure the Production Targets set in line with the guidelines of the Supreme Petroleum Council and OPEC are carried out. On the advent of flow of income from oil and gas export, Abu Dhabi, the Capital of UAE progressed as a world class city.

Abu Dhabi Marine Operating Company (ADMA –OPCO), a subsidiary of ADNOC, is a Performance Driven, Operating Company. It is responsible for oil and gas
production from off shore fields. With six Business Units and a Division reporting directly to the CEO, the organisation is having more than 2000 employees as its Human capital. Additionally thousands of people work on contract, in different project sites. There are various initiatives and systems available for the development of Human Capital. HSE aspects are maintained at high standards. The company won nine awards on HSE in 2009. The strategic goal for production capacity is One Million Barrel per Day by 2019. Each year Key Performance Indicators are set in agreement with ADNOC, which govern the progress of the company's performance. ADMA –OPCO has been selected to conduct the present study. Three elements of the selected Key Performance Indicators will be analysed to represent the Organisational Success.

A review of existing literature as well as studies in the area of the subject of the research is presented in the next chapter.
Chapter-3

Review of Literature

3.1 Introduction

Leadership is one of the most widely researched themes. Studies on leadership abound. They have been carried out from varied perspectives and contexts. Yet, it continues to be a fascinating topic of enquiry both because of its importance as also challenge involved.

This chapter gives details on review of available literature on this topic. The literature includes both qualitative as well as empirical studies. The review covers themes like leadership, strategic leadership, team building and team effectiveness, organisational learning, and organisational success. The chapter concludes with a summary.

3.2 Leadership

In every society and in organisation there exist Leaders at all levels. However, depending on the situation of the individual or group exercising leadership, challenges vary in scope, scale and effect. Individuals in all walks of life have strategies for achieving even the most ordinary and personal goals. These plans differ from everyday decisions in terms of expanse, time and importance.

There are numerous contributions propounding the benefits of leadership. Also, there are many definitions available for the concept. Studies on leadership predominately focus on leadership traits or styles. As Bryman (1996) concluded, the focus of the former is on what leaders actually do, and is more prevalent than the latter approach, with its focus on personal characteristics or behavioural traits.

Nivala and Hujala, (2002) have noted that traditionally leadership in the early years has been associated with individual skills characteristics and personal qualities in the leader. A more recent view of leadership is that it is not an isolated activity invested
in a single person, in fact a variety of people contribute to effective leadership. Leadership therefore is distributed.

The Great Man theory of leadership is the earliest established view. This view essentially holds that some individuals are born with potential for greatness, endowed with special personalities and abilities that destine them for leadership and success in those roles. They acquire power, wisdom, and courage naturally (Yukl, 2002). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) noted that, the Great Man theory was prevalent amongst scholars during the 19th Century and into the 20th, and may have influenced the “inherent view of leadership” that embodied much of early 20th Century thought on leadership. This was largely manifested in the trait theories that gained ground in the early decades of last century.

According to Hollander (1986), influenced by the Great Man theory, trait theorists also assumed that leaders were born; they possessed personal characteristics that were different from those of masses who, generally, were keen or needed to be led. Traits included appearance, intelligence, strength, bearing, and even status or position in society. As per Nye (2008), trait theories dominated leadership research until 1940s, but were eventually overcome by the fact that it was impossible to identify traits that explained and predicted leadership under all conditions. Hollander (1986) noted that, the assumption that Great Men and those with leadership potential are born (not bred) kept attention away from developmental aspects of leadership: what experiences and education contribute to a leader’s development? There was also an aspect of elitism in these views: as leaders are born privileged, only the privileged could become leaders. Then it is doubtful that whether such beliefs actually hindered the less advantaged or just reflected the bias inherent in society. According to Hollenbeck, McCall, and Silzer (2006), trait theories are not entirely dead, as some current competency models suggest that a set of characteristics can describe effective leadership.

Nye (2008) and Yukl (2002) have concluded that, dissatisfied with the traits centred approach, scholars turned to behavioural theories of leadership. Behavioural theories,
emphasising interactions with followers how leaders should behave — were pervasive during the period spanning the 1940s to the 1960s. Early research in this area centred on classification of leadership behaviour: which leadership behaviours were most effective across the broadest range of situations? As per Schiro, (1999), despite much research, it was difficult to identify consistently present and effective behaviour.

Focus began to shift to situational aspects of leadership in the 1960s, leadership behaviour appropriate to context or contingent on the situation (Nye, 2008; Yukl, 2002). Fiedler’s (1967) least preferred co-worker model, Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) situational leadership theory, and Wofford and Liska’s (1993) path-goal theory of leadership reflect this new approach. It was thought that leadership style in interaction with followers and the situation can determine the effectiveness of group performance. Studies by Ashour (1973), Vecchio (1977), and Fiedler (1983) have proved that different leadership styles are most effective in different types of situations.

In situational leadership theory model (SLT), leaders shift their focus on task and relationship behaviours to deal with different levels of follower readiness (ability and willingness), Hersey and Blanchard (1969). Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Nelson, (1993); Fernandez and Vecchio, (1997) have concluded that successful leadership can be achieved with the right leadership behaviour and it is influenced by the level of the follower’s readiness. The advent of behavioural and situational models and theories advanced leadership theory from something with which we are born to something we can learn, giving rise to the leadership development movement.

Transformational and transactional leadership theory was crystallised and enriched by many scholars, led by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass during the 1980s and 1990s.

Definitions of leadership encountered in both scholarly and practitioner oriented writings focus on the knowledge, skills, abilities, and traits of the leader which are presumed to be the most successful in getting followers to do what the leader wants them to do. Du Brin (1990) considered leadership as influencing people to do things through the use of power and authority. Even though Du Brin defined leadership as
the process of influencing the activities of an individual or group to achieve certain objectives in a given situation, it is clear that he was conceptualizing the “process” of leadership as a linear set of goal-oriented actions by the leader. Burns (1978) has added the process of conflict and competition also into this.

According to Hernez-Broome and Hughes (2004), leadership has moved from ‘something a man is’ (with notable exceptions, only men have been the leaders throughout history) to ‘something an individual does’. This means a way of behaving in dynamic interaction with others and within situational contexts. Greater consideration is given to the nature of followers. As per Crevani, Lindgren, and Packendorff (2007); Spillane (2005), leadership is seen as a social process, consisting of mutual influence and increasingly a distributed process. In modern times, the business environment is decentralised and highly networked. These factors demand a new kind of leadership. The leadership in the new era should not be centered on a single individual or elite minority, but on many in the organisation. This segment of followers, for the first time in history, will all have necessary access to information; they must be willing and able to use their intelligence to make time-sensitive decisions in dynamic business situations. This new situation needs Strategic Leadership.

Daily et al. (2002) note that leaders in the context of an organisation occupy a position of unique influence, serving as the locus of control and decision-making. Irrespective of firm size, leaders are responsible for a number of vital tasks. Among these are: the management of human resources (Collis, 2001), the management of the innovation process (Teece, 2000), and the management of and responsibility for attaining and sustaining growth and enhanced performance (Maccoby, 2001; Nicholls-Nixon, 2005). Dr. Muhammad et al (2009) have concluded that, from a practical viewpoint, the main task of leadership is to ensure the effective deployment of the corporate strategy.
The literature on management and leadership identifies three levels which can be broadly categorised as top, middle and lower. The features of each are summarised as follows:

*Team or tactical level:* Leadership at this level is concerned with teams or groups of varying sizes. The team works within fixed timeframe and resources and is concentrated in one or only a few locations. The leaders influence the output of the product and team members in this environment. External relationships are straightforward and simple. The main focus is cooperation with other, similar teams in the environment.

*Organisational or operational level:* This environment typically involves responsibility for a wide range of multi-disciplined groups with set of priorities and resource requirements and may be geographically dispersed. Number of team members may reach into thousands and leaders are removed from the direct control of events where leaders are unlikely to be able to intervene personally to rectify the mistakes of others but still need to work through their colleagues. Leaders at this level are able to gain sufficient information from selected personal visits as well as routine performance reports.

*Top or strategic level:* Signs of leadership challenges in the strategic environment are the larger scale of inputs and effect. Whilst there may be the capability to react to sudden opportunities or threats, many decisions will take time to effect because of the requirement to organize resources and contemporize a regional and global actions.

Leaders are removed from the activities of the organisation by several layers of management and their personal influence. Leaders need to be selective in when they seek information to find out what is going on in the territory beyond head office. External stakeholders other than customers occupy a substantial amount of attention and effort at the expense of employees. This arena is characterised by complexity and ambiguity.
According to Ireland and Hitt (1999), evidence suggests that the formulation and deployment of strategic actions by effective leaders’ results in strategic competitiveness. It is in this backdrop that, studies on Strategic Leadership may be pursued. That review is presented in the next section.

3.3 Strategic Leadership

According to Vecchio (1995), Strategic Leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organisation in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent through a process in which influence the attitudes, behaviors, and values of others. Strategic leadership is the leader's ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change as necessary. As per Christensen (1997), it is a person’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organisation. Weihrich and Koontz (1993) stated that Strategic Leadership is one in which people are influenced to achieve the organisation’s mission. Bryman (1999) observed leadership as the active promotion of values which provide shared meaning about the nature of the organisation. However the human factor has long been ignored in the strategies of organisation. In the recent times organisations began to realize that human factor is critical in creating and sustaining the competitive advantage. Many studies suggest that the human capital should be considered in the formulation level of the organisational strategy. Peck (1994), Scarpello (1994), Schuler et al (1993) have described the need to convert the human resources into a competitive advantage. These authors suggest that human factor should be equal partner in both formulation and implementation of organisation’s competitive strategy.

According to Stone (1998), formulating an organisation’s strategy requires identification, analysis and balancing of its internal strength and weaknesses and external threats and opportunities. This interpretation is about the overall strategy of organisation but many researchers agree that much attention should be given to human capital while considering internal resources.
Greer (1995) argues that human factor serves as a driving force in strategic formulation, the organisation need to build their strategies on human based capabilities for the competitive advantage. Sharma et.al (2006) describes the vitality of human factor in environmental scanning and providing information about the internal strength and weaknesses. Human capital is an important source of competitive advantage. It can augment organisation’s competitive advantage through cost leadership and differentiation. Porter (1980) believes in focusing on the innovation, quality enhancement and cost reduction in the human capital to gain competitive advantage. Terpstra & Rozell (1993) found that there were higher levels of annual profits, growth and overall performance in organisations with sound human resources practices and performance. Pfeffer (1994) identified 16 human resources practices that, in his opinion, can enhance an organisation’s competitive advantage.

Huey (1994) opined that Strategic Leadership is multifunctional that involves managing through others, and helps organisations cope with change that seems to be increasing exponentially in today's globalized environment. Hitt and Keats, (1992) elaborate that, it requires the ability to accommodate and integrate both external and internal conditions, and to manage and engage in complex information processing as the firms uses the strategic management process successfully through effective strategic leadership.

Hitt et. al.(2002) observes that, strategic leadership can be practiced at all levels within an organisation where all managers throughout the organisation should be strategic leaders. They assume strategic leadership roles when they effectively formulate and implement business-unit and corporate-level strategies. An important issue in strategic management is the need to find out the performance variance between the organisations. One possible answer to this question could be the depth of strategic leadership practiced in those organisations.

Successful strategic leaders integrate knowledge of mental models and techniques such as reflection, reframing and systems thinking into their strategic decision making, change management and personal development process. Boal and Hooijberg, (2000)
stated that, Strategic leadership makes sense of and gives meaning to environmental
turbulence and ambiguity, and provides a vision and road map that allows an
organisation to evolve and innovate.

Christensen (1997) Boal and Schultz (2007) considers strategic leaders should play an
active role in developing ideas and defining a vision, while traditional management
roles focus more on implementing structures and processes. Dess & Picken (2000)
have observed that in this competitive environment of the twenty-first century,
strategic leaders need to focus on utilizing strategic vision to motivate, inspire and
empower the workforce, at all levels. These authors argue that sharing internal
knowledge and the collection and integration of external information are key priorities
of organisational leaders. Boal and Schultz (2007) have concluded that, strategic
leaders need to promote Organisational learning and innovation to fulfill a defined
vision.

A recent study titled "A Blueprint for Strategic Leadership," by Booz Allen Hamilton
a known consulting firm, identified four critical elements necessary for leaders to
excel: commitment to the company's purpose, a top management team with
complementary skills, organisational capabilities and employee motivation, and well-
chosen strategic initiatives to move the organisation forward.

A study on strategic leadership concepts, styles and process by Stumpf &
Mullen(1991), based on personal observations of several thousand managers, in both
business and simulated business settings, four elements were identified that are
frequently associated with leadership effectiveness. These elements are: (1)
consistently and routinely applying a small number of key concepts (2) developing
skills, thinking and acting strategically (3) taking advantage of knowing one's personal
style and its impact on others, (4) understanding the non-linear and iterative nature of
strategic management processes. Research results of Hirschi & Jones demonstrates
that strategic leadership is above the operational level of management and that
strategic leaders understand their market and their resources with clarity of vision as
well as an ability to develop well attuned business goals. The characteristics and skills
of strategic leaders play a dominant role in their ability to see the big picture. Embedding these into daily business is crucial. The research shows that strategic leadership is associated with business success and a lack of strategic leadership may find companies losing focus in the long term.

Hewson R (1997), summarized the thinking and experience of thirteen practitioners and academics as given in their presentations to the 1997 US Strategic Leadership Forum. He described techniques for engendering leadership skills, the importance of definition of organisation mission and vision, and macro-strategy formation by leaders. Importance of leaders focusing on high profit areas and how leaders can stimulate innovation were stressed. Human capital was projected as an organisation's most important raw material. Elenkov et.al investigated the relationship of strategic leadership behaviors with executive innovation influence and the moderating effects of top management team tenure heterogeneity and social culture on that relationship. Using survey data from six countries comprising three social cultures, strategic leadership behaviors were found to have a strong positive relationship with executive influence on both product-market and administrative innovations.

Worden S (2005), using a positivistic approach, described how religion can enrich certain crucial elements of strategic leadership (strategic choice, values, charisma, vision, leadership ethics and leadership credibility) through, inter alia, cognition, identity, reality construction, motivation, authenticity and integrity. Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) could be cited as an unparallel example, on these and more elements of strategic leadership.

Hooijberg R (2000) explored necessity of strategic leadership in organizations. He was curious to know if it matters under what conditions, when, how and on what criteria. Vera & Crossan (2004) examined the ways in which strategic leaders influence elements of the learning system, examining the merits of transactional, as well as transformational leadership. They have presented a conceptual framework linking individual, group and organisational learning. They have suggested that organisational learning requires involvement of strategic leaders. They have shown the links of
strategic leadership with learning process. They argue that the creation of a learning culture depends how well the strategic leader can balance transactional and transformational behaviours, authoritative and participative systems and task and relationship orientations.

Hitt et.al. (1995) developed a strategic leadership model which included six critical components: (1) Determining strategic direction; (2) Exploiting and maintaining core competencies; (3) Developing human capital; (4) Developing and sustaining an effective corporate culture; (5) Emphasizing ethical practices; and (6) Establishing strategic controls.

In a situation where in Strategic Direction or Vision is already set and already is firmly in place in the organisation, two other dimensions of Strategic Leadership namely, Developing Human Capital and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Corporate Culture, are crucial to achieve the set vision. These two dimensions have been considered for assessment in the present study. It was decided to measure Team Effectiveness to represent Human Capital Development where as Organisational Learning for Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture.

Next session of the chapter provides review of available literature and studies on Team Building and Team Effectiveness.

### 3.4 Team Building and Team Effectiveness

According to Cohen et.al. (1996) and Manz (1992) teams are often introduced as a means of both improving organisational performance and enhancing worker outcomes. Niepce & Molleman (1998) and West et.al (1998) have noted that teamwork is assumed to enhance the quality of working life and to entail jobs that are attractive and intrinsically motivating.

As per Jones & George (1988), organisations are increasingly focusing on teams to increase competitive advantage by improving productivity, enhancing creativity, increasing response times, and improving decision making. A growing body of
literature on teams and work groups supports the assumption that team building is necessary for organisational success (e.g., Banker et al. (1996) and Cohen & Ledford, 1994). Studies conducted by Lawler et al. (1995) revealed that, team collaboration, self development, continuous learning, and shared access to information are a few of the benefits to a team building. In this study, 68% of Fortune 1000 companies were found to use self-managed work teams.

As team building gained popularity, firms began to look for employees who possess team skills and have the potential for being good team players. In the testing/selection process, firms may attempt to identify traits and skills that have been associated with team skills (e.g., flexibility, communication). There is a belief that participation in team sports contributes to the development of necessary skills to be an effective team member. Kirkman & Rosen (1999) have concluded that when human resources policies focus on team-based incentive, training, selection, and evaluation, team members experience more team empowerment. Boyett (1995) studied the effectiveness of training programmes. He found out training programs focus on development of team skills and behaviors, with those who work in teams expected to train others.

According to Jones & Bearley (2001), most of the globally competitive organisations and businesses are now recognizing the importance of collaborative teams in organisational success. Currently, a vast amount of attention is being paid to how teamwork may contribute in this way to the workplace. As per Armstrong and Piotrowski (2004)'s analysis of the research literature in organisation development, research trends have consistently demonstrated an ongoing emphasis and interest in team building and outcomes in team-related performance. The research focus has shifted from the functional nature of teams to the empirical measurement of team performance. According to Beckhard (1969); Bennis (1969); Büke & Homstein(1972); Schmuck & Miles (1971), integration of team building is vitally important to organisational development. Organisational development as we know is a planned, system-wide, organisation-wide, and value - based collaborative process. It applies behavioral science and self-analytic methods to the adaptive development,
improvement, reinforcement of technologies, markets, and challenges of organisational features. Such features include strategies, structures, processes, people, and cultures that lead to organisational effectiveness and improvement.

Diversity of teams in demographic attributes as gender, race and age has been studied extensively. Golembiewski (1995) argues that increasing diversity in the labor market is demographically inevitable and that managing demographic diversity in organisations is therefore one of the major management challenges for the coming decades. This was also supported by Milliken and Martins (1996). Many studies, like those conducted by Dreachslin et al. (2000); Harrison et.al. (1998); Hinds et.al. (2000); Milliken & Martins (1996); O’Reilly et.al. (1989); Pelled (1996); Tsui et.al. (1992) indicate that similarity in these attributes enhances mutual liking and team functioning, and that demographic diversity decreases both social interaction and social integration.

However, Jackson (1996) concluded that, diversity of abilities within a team offers the advantage of allowing members to learn from each other and to generate new ideas by combining or merging their qualifications. Studies by Iles and Hayers 1997 on diversity also show that creativity and motivation are greater in teams whose members differ in skills or functional background.

Baldwin & Keating (1991) suggested that there are four major concerns for the team members, and that these concerns are related to performance improvement over time. These issues are managerial support for independent decision making, role clarity, workload distribution pressures, and team social support. All four issues were significantly associated with at least one form of performance improvement, with issues of workload distribution and managerial support being particularly important.

The cooperation is the key of achieving teamwork. There are seven elements (called 7 Cs) to this team cooperation philosophy:

**Collaboration:** This describes a process of value creation that a traditional structure of communication and teamwork cannot achieve. Instead of focusing on methods of communication (such as teams with definite roles and set of operating procedures), collaboration seeks out the unplanned and unpredictable.
Commitment: Empowered teams define the tasks and prioritize areas to make breakthrough opportunities. Goals and objectives, duration, utility, complexity, expected results, and key success factors are outlined as much as possible. Management is fully committed to meeting the goals.

Communications: Effective communication is the precursor to meaningful collaboration and communication is the exchange of information, whereas the collaboration is a commitment to create a shared understanding and work together (Sullivan, 1991).

Compromise: There is compromise and input from every discipline so that simultaneous development of the product, process, and associated tooling can be achieved.

Consensus: Project team and management members may disagree, but team support on the requirements and a commitment to objectives at the very outset of a project is essential. These common objectives are reinforced throughout the life of the project.

Continuous Improvement: Product or process design teams work toward the total elimination of waste. The concept focuses on enhancing productivity and profitability through the improvement of product quality and reduction in product development cycle time.

Coordination: Coordination is the act of managing inter-dependencies between activities. Coordination involves team members performing interdependent activities that achieve goals, and its analysis includes goal decomposition, resource allocation, synchronization, group decision making, communication and the preparation of common objectives. Partnerships are formed among all disciplines involved in the project and communication links are formally established and utilized. Suppliers are involved in the early stages of the project.

According to John Fetzer (2005) the first task in team building is to create that common goal. This will, in all likelihood, take some creative people management. The goal of successfully completed project may not be enough to strongly motivate
everyone. The goal, however, can be defined differently for different people. People are driven by financial rewards, by recognition, by technical challenges to overcome, by competition with their peers, by working and reaching a common goal together, and or by many other reasons. Ali Farazmand in an article described innovation as a strategic instrument in human resource management capacity building in the age of globalization. To meet the challenges of globalization—negative as well as positive—capacity building is needed in areas of organisation, management, governance, and public administration all over the world. Viewing human resources as human capital and beyond, the article argues that without human resources nothing can be accomplished, and without well-trained, well-developed, well-appreciated, and well-managed human resources, modern organisations of government and business cannot meet the challenges in the age of globalization.

Next section of the chapter presents details on review of literature and studies on Organisational Learning.

3.5 Organisational Learning

According to Cook & Yanow, (1993) organisational learning is the acquiring, sustaining, or changing of inter-subjective meanings through the artifactual vehicles of their expression and transmission through the collective actions of the group. Shrivastava (1981) viewed organisational learning as the process by which the organisational knowledge base is developed and shaped. As per Fiol & Lyles (1985), organisational learning means the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding. Swieringa & Wierdsma (1992) have viewed the term as the changing of organisational behavior.

As per Argyris and Schon (1996) organisational learning is a process by which a firm acquires information, knowledge, understanding, know-how, techniques, and practices that lead to changes in its routines. The changes in the routines may improve the organisation’s performance of its tasks or they may simply change the way those tasks are executed. Traditionally, organisational learning is seen primarily as an internal activity, in the sense that it refers to changes that are implemented on the
organisation's routines, irrespective of the source of the stimulus or the knowledge that engendered the process. As Nelson and Winter (1982) have observed, organisational knowledge is the product of Organisational learning and is represented by the codes and routines that guide action in the firm.

In the organisation sociology literature, models of mutual organisational learning mention the development and diffusion of organisational knowledge between individuals and the organisation. This view was held by March (1991); Lane and Lubatkin (1998). A key tenet in these models is the idea that individuals modify their behaviors continuously as a consequence of their socialisation into the organisation's cultural environment. The modifications of these behaviors give rise to new routines and modes of action. According to Nonaka and Konno (1998) and Nonaka (1994), this process of knowledge creation can be described as a spiraling cycle of interactions between explicit and tacit knowledge pools across people and organisation boundaries.

According to Argyris and Schon (1978), organisational learning occurs when members of the organisation act as learning agents for the organisation, responding to changes in the internal and external environments of the organisation by detecting and correcting errors in organisational theory in use, and embedding the results of their inquiry in private images and shared maps of organisation. Lee et al. (1992) have concluded that, the organisational learning process is cyclical. Individuals' actions lead to organisational interactions with the environment, and outcomes are interpreted by individuals who learn by updating their beliefs about cause-effect relationships.

Baker and Sinkula (1999) referred organisational learning as a learning orientation and described as a set of values. Higher order learning is necessary to prioritize and act on important market information, while discarding information that has become obsolete. In this way, organisational learning creates competitive advantage by enhancing knowledge-producing behaviors with knowledge-questioning values. Liu et al., 2003; Baker and Sinkula, (1999); Sinkula et al., (1997) have identified organisational learning orientation as composed of three dimensions: shared vision and experience, commitment to learning, and open-mindedness. This was supported and
complemented by Atuahene-Gima (1996); Han et al. (1998); Hurley and Hult, (1998) adding that organisational learning sustains as a competitive advantage through innovation.

Senge, (1995) stated that real learning gets to the heart of what it means to be human. Corporations that foster learning and education allow its employees the opportunity to grow; to increase their knowledge. By learning they become better performers, decision makers and better understand the goals and objectives of the organisation.

The goal of a learning organisation from the point of view of Senge concerns all employees at individual level, group/team level and at corporate level to internalise the 'Five Disciplines' with the intent of increasing individual, group and corporate level knowledge and thereby improving efficiency. The five disciplines inherent in Senge's (1990) framework of Organisational Learning are: (1) Personal Mastery, (2) Mental Model, (3) Building Shared Vision, (4) Team Learning, and (5) Systems Thinking. Senge believes that these five "component technologies" are gradually converging to innovate learning organisation.

According to Senge (1990), creating a motivating learning environment cannot be done without commitment from the leader. Slater and Narver (1995) noted that the leader must communicate a well-crafted, motivating vision for the organisation. Such leaders have a personal, high commitment to learning. They view learning as a key ingredient in achieving competitive advantage.

**Learning and Performance**

Owing to the positive connotations of the word *learning*, organisational learning is usually associated with improvement in performance. Etheredge & Short (1983) argue that to say learning occurs, then, there should be evidence for increased intelligence and sophistication of thought. This is linked to increased effectiveness of behaviour. Similarly, according to Argyris & Schon (1978), organisational learning refers to experience-based improvement in organisational task performance.
In The Learning Edge, authors Calhoun W. Wick and Lu Stanton Leon determined the benefits of learning as below:

- Increased self-confidence when approaching new tasks or presenting new ideas.
- Persistence and toughness in pursuing goals.
- Improved stress management and problem solving.
- Refined decision-making ability.
- Enhanced work-specific capabilities.
- Openness to creative approaches and unorthodox solutions to problems.
- More in-depth product knowledge.
- Sensitivity to the needs and viewpoints of others.
- Deeper understanding of Organisational politics.
- Greater confidence in career planning.
- Better understanding of yourself.
- Improved-goal setting and time management skill.
- Enhanced team-building and negotiating skills.
- Better leadership qualities.
- Increased motivation to work.
- Greater personal satisfaction.

Organisational Learning and Dynamic Capabilities

Organisational learning is important to capabilities accumulation. According to Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995) it is not important for firms to accumulate the knowledge through static focus, but for transfer and creation of the new knowledge through dynamic focus. Dynamic capabilities mean to create, accept and implement the new ideas, processes, products or services. When a firm motivates learning, it becomes easier for it to adapt to complicated environment. Zollo & Winter (1999) found that
dynamic capabilities came from interaction among three learning mechanisms such as tacit knowledge accumulation, knowledge articulation, and knowledge codification processes. Eisenhardt & Martin (2000) also believed that learning mechanism not only guide the evolution and enhancement of dynamic capabilities. It is consist of the basis of path dependency. Subba & Narasimha (2001) found that organisational design and learning, and efficient human resources management will promote the formation of dynamic capabilities.

Organisational Learning and Organisational success

In an article, Gephart et. al refer to the American Society’s Training and Development and Learning Organization Assessment Framework. The authors purport that most learning organization models emphasize leadership and management, culture, systems for communication, information, and knowledge. They say less emphasis is placed on organizational structure and systems for facilitating change, including support systems for performance. Through a number of case studies the authors emphasize how important such support systems are for promoting organizational learning and, in turn promoting organizational success. In fact, the article provides examples of how organizations like Corning, Analog Devices, GE, and others link learning to important company performance measures.

Linking organizational learning with improved financial performance was reported, based on research at the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California. Organizational learning had a positive effect on the perceived and actual financial performance of companies in the Center's study. For individual employees, organizational learning had a significant effect on areas including continuous improvement, customer focus, employee commitment, and overall work performance. However, the authors caution that support systems are only as good as the measures they track.

Tim Boydell's case study (1992 to 1994) revealed more evidence of the desirable outcomes of fostering organizational learning, in British Insulated Callendar Cable. Outcomes of this study include the following:
• Employee productivity increased 113 percent
• Absenteeism fell 58 percent
• Scrap decreased by 50 percent
• Market share rose from 17 to 40 percent
• On-time delivery rate became the highest

The article offers a noteworthy mention of a 1992 survey of executives about the effect of organizational learning on innovation and competitiveness. The article explains that continuous improvement and knowledge acquisition enhance competitiveness. The article also provides a list of essential features of a learning organization:

• Continuous learning at the systems level
• Knowledge generation and sharing
• Critical, systems thinking
• A culture of learning
• A spirit of flexibility and experimentation
• People-centered approaches

Appelbaum et.al. (1998) have presented an overview of Strategic Organisational Change (SOC) and its managerial impact on leadership, learning, motivation and productivity. They have presented a model that explains the relationships between SOC, leadership, learning, motivation and productivity. Pam et al, in a study have demonstrated how a principal’s leadership style helped in increasing the learning capacity of a school as an organisation. Schlosser et. al have studied the effect of HR outsourcing and the effect of learning. They have found out adaptability and knowledge management, key elements of organisational learning, are critical to organisational success. They have explored how to preserve HR's strategic role in facilitating organisational learning in the new outsourcing context. The study revealed
that HR outsourcing and the growth in contingent work can result in a significant loss in learning capital.

An empirical study by Lyles (1988) on learning among joint venture sophisticated firms found that the accumulated experiences of these firms enabled them to manage their joint venture relationships more efficiently. Sinkula et. al. have presented a broad conceptual framework for concept of organisational learning and its modeling. An empirical test of this model leads the authors to conclude that a more positive learning orientation (a value-based construct) will directly result in increased market information generation and dissemination (knowledge-based constructs), which, in turn, directly affects the degree to which an organisation makes changes in its marketing strategies (a behavioral construct).

Xiaohui & Baiyin (2007) used learning organisation questionnaire to collect data from 919 employees in nine companies located in Guangdong Province, China, to explores the culture of learning organisations in Chinese business settings. Findings suggest the demographic variables, such as age and educational level, together with the types of ownership of Chinese companies, such as state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and privately-owned enterprises (POEs), influence the culture of learning organisations. Results also indicate that the learning organisation culture of a firm has strongly positive impact on employees' job satisfaction and perceived Organisational performance. One of the components in the questionnaire was 'providing strategic leadership for learning'. A study by Marianne van Woerkom and Karin Sanders explored the effects of disagreement and cohesiveness on knowledge sharing in teams, and on the performance of individual team members. Data were obtained from a survey among 1,354 employees working in 126 teams in 17 organisations. The results showed that cohesiveness has a positive effect on the exchange of advice between team members and on openness for sharing opinions, whereas disagreement has a negative effect on openness for sharing opinions. The study did confirm the importance of cohesiveness for knowledge sharing and the importance of knowledge sharing as an intermediate variable between cohesiveness on the one hand, and team performance, on the other hand.
Next section of the chapter deals with organisational success. A description on Performance Driven Organisation and details on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as measure of Organisational Success also discussed.

### 3.6 Organisational Success

Organisational success could be measured in many ways. General norm is to focus on financial return or profit an organisation accrues over a given time period. Organisational success is deemed to be in place when an organisation has performed at its best to its capacities, potentials, and goals. Most of the time, organisational success is difficult to measure on one dimension or by a single clear cut criterion. It could be viewed as a broad concept, especially as a business interact with its internal as well as external environments, and deals with a range of factors both inside as well as outside the organization. Generally, organisational success is viewed mistakenly as only internal to the organisation.

Organisational success could also be viewed as a relationship between the intended or targeted results and the actual results obtained. It directs towards the degree up to which predetermined goals are achieved, reflecting both efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency refers to the way in which resources are put to use, where as effectiveness is accomplishment of goals and objectives. Efficiency concerns with doing things right with minimum cost, by up keeping quality standards. Effectiveness concerns with doing right things. Effectiveness focuses more on human capital, organisational values, and structures, where as efficiency is concerned on technology and process. (Reddin, 1987.; Drucker, 1955).

Various models are available to measure organisational success and its sub – systems. They include Organizational Productivity Model (Georgopo Jous & Tannenbaum, 1957), the Goal Model (Price, 1972); the Goal Optimisation Model (Richard M Steers, 1976), Goal-attainment Approach (Etzioni,1960), the Internal Process Maintenance Model (Bennis,1966), the System Resource Model (Seashore & Yuchtman, 1967), Organisational Interaction with Environment Model(Friedlander & Pickle, 1976), and the Legitimacy Model (Miles & Cameron, 1982).
In a study by Swam Pratap & SK Srivastava (1985) effectiveness has been proposed to be a function of variables like, output (productivity, performance), intervening variables (motivation, morale, skills in leadership, communication, conflict resolution, decision making, problem solving) and short range goals. Likert (1958) indicated 12 indicators to measure organisational performance (effectiveness) to obtain periodic measurement of the character and the quality of the organization.

**Performance Driven Organisations**

In Performance Driven Organisations, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are determined at the beginning of each performance year, which will act as both a guideline as well as measurement of performance. Key Performance Indicators, also known as Key Success Indicators (KSIs), help an organisation define and measure progress toward organisational goals. Once an organisation has analyzed its mission, identified all its stakeholders, and defined its goals, it needs a way to measure progress toward those goals. Key Performance Indicators act as those measurements.

Key Performance Indicators are quantifiable measurements, agreed to beforehand, that reflect the critical success factors of an organisation. They will differ depending on the organisation. A business may have as one of its Key Performance Indicators the percentage of its income that comes from its customers. A school may focus its Key Performance Indicators on graduation rates of its students. A Customer Service Department may have as one of its Key Performance Indicators, in line with overall company KPIs, percentage of customer calls answered in the first minute. A Key Performance Indicator for a social service organisation might be number of clients assisted during the year.

Key Performance Indicators reflect the organisational goals. An organisation that has one of its goals "to be the most profitable company in our industry" will have Key Performance Indicators that measure profit and related fiscal measures. "Pre-tax Profit" and "Shareholder Equity" will be among them. However, for a school "Percent of Profit Contributed to Community Causes" probably will not be one of its Key Performance Indicators. On the other hand, a school is not concerned with making a
profit, so its Key Performance Indicators will be different. KPIs like "Graduation Rate" and "Success in Finding Employment after Graduation", though different, accurately reflect the school's mission and goals.

Key Performance Indicators usually are long-term considerations. The definition of what they are and how they are measured do not change often. The goals for a particular Key Performance Indicator may change as the organisation's goals change, or as it gets closer to achieving a goal.

Key Performance Indicators must be quantifiable. If a Key Performance Indicator is going to be of any value, there must be a way to accurately define and measure it. "Generate More Repeat Customers" is not so indicative as a KPI without some way to distinguish between new and repeat customers. "Be The Most Popular Company" won't work as a KPI because there is no way to measure the company's popularity or compare it to others. It is also important to define the Key Performance Indicators and stay with the same definition from year to year. For a KPI of "Increase Sales", it needs to address considerations like whether to measure by units sold or by dollar value of sales.

Key Performance Indicators must be critical for Organisational Success. In selecting Key Performance Indicators, it is critical to limit them to those factors that are essential to the organisation reaching its goals. It is also important to keep the number of Key Performance Indicators small just to keep everyone's attention focused on achieving the same KPIs. That does not mean that a company will have only three or four total KPIs in total. Rather there will be three or four Key Performance Indicators for the company and all the units within it will have three to five KPIs that support the overall company goals and can be rolled into them.

As the organisation selected to conduct the present study is a performance driven, operating company working under a parent organisation, Key Performance Indicators were considered for analysis. Three elements of the KPIs were analysed to represent Organisational Success.
3.7 Summary

Concept of Leadership was evolved over a period of time. Various theories were developed to understand leadership. The concept, centered around an individual is evolved and developed to behavioural and transformational levels. Different leadership models have encapsulated various views on leadership in comprehensive manner.

There have been a range of studies on Strategic Leadership, its dimensions, and their effects on Organisational Success. However, the review revealed a gap and lack of studies on the influence of the selected two dimensions of Strategic Leadership – Developing Human Capital as well as Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture, particularly in the geographical region of UAE and especially in Oil & Gas sector. The gap in the existing literature and the research on the topic has been attempted to be filled by this study.

Team Effectiveness was considered as a measure of Developing Human Capital where as Organisational Learning was studied for Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. Selected Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were considered to analyse Organisational Success.

Next Chapter details out key aspects of the research methodology employed in the study.
Chapter-4
Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides description of the research process that includes objectives of the study, key variables considered for the study, a conceptual model, research instrument employed for the study, and limitations of the study. The issues examined in the study include how two key dimensions of Strategic Leadership, i.e., Developing Human Capital as well as Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture, represented by Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning respectively, are related to Organisational Success. Organisational Success was assessed by three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Production Capacity (Effective Oil Capacity), Environmental Protection (Oil Spill), and People (Human Capital Development). Effect of the selected three demographic variables (Age, Job Grade, and Educational Background) was also examined in the study.

4.2 Need of the Study

Theory of Leadership and its practice has evolved over a period of time. From a primitive and crude approach, the topic has reached into a matured level of understanding. Considerable variation could be noticed on leadership styles that organisations and their leaders employ in practice. Many factors influence leadership styles of people working at different levels of an organisation.

Strategic Leadership provides the vision, direction, purpose for growth, and context for the success of the organisation. It is the ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic changes as necessary. Available literature hints at various key dimensions of Strategic Leadership. These dimensions are demonstrated in various models. One of the most important dimensions of Strategic Leadership is vision setting. Once a robust vision has been crystallized, other dimensions of strategic leadership follow. The present study has focussed on
two of these dimensions: Human Capital Development and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. These two dimensions are very crucial for the attainment of the strategic goals embedded in the vision. In the present study, Team Effectiveness was assessed for Human Capital Development where as Organisational Learning was assessed for Sustaining an Effective organisational Culture.

A review of literature has shown a gap of in-depth studies on the above two dimensions of Strategic Leadership, especially in Middle East region. This is particularly true for Oil & Gas Industry especially in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Therefore a need was felt to conduct a study on the above mentioned dimensions of Strategic Leadership.

4.3 Objectives of the Study

The present study has the following main objectives:

1. To examine the extent of prevalence of Strategic Leadership as assessed by two of its key dimensions namely, Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.

2. To examine the association of the two dimensions of Strategic Leadership, namely Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning with selected Demographic Variables.

3. To assess the impact of Strategic Leadership on Organisational Success, as measured through key Performance Indicators.

4.4 Hypotheses

Based on the above mentioned main objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated for the study:
H₀ 1 There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents of various age groups.

H₀ 2 There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents of various job grades.

H₀ 3 There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications.

H₀ 4 There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents of various age groups.

H₀ 5 There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents of various job grades.

H₀ 6 There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications.

H₀ 7 There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of various Age Groups.

H₀ 8 There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of various Job Grades.

H₀ 9 There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents having varied Educational Qualifications.
4.5 Variables

Four types of variables have been studied in the present research:

1. Demographic variables (namely, age, job grade, educational qualification)
2. Team Effectiveness (measured by cohesion, confrontation, collaboration, task clarity, autonomy, support, and accountability)
3. Organisational Learning (measured by innovation, implementation, and stabilization)
4. Organisational success was assessed through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) namely, Effective Oil Capacity, Oil Spill, and Human Resource Development.

The above variables have been divided into two categories: independent variables and dependent variables.

4.5.1 Independent Variables

In the present study, Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were assessed, representing the two key dimensions of Strategic Leadership. In addition to these, influence of three Demographic Variables was also studied.

Independent variables selected for the study, are shown in the figure 4.5.1.1, below:
Team effectiveness was assessed through, task clarity, cohesion, autonomy, confrontation, support, collaboration, and accountability. To assess Organisational Learning, innovation, implementation, and stabilization were studied. Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualification were the three Demographic variables studied.

4.5.2 Dependent Variables

Dependent variables selected for the study are shown in the figure 4.5.2.1 below:

![Figure 4.5.2.1: Dependent variables selected for the study](image)

**Organizational Success**
*(Key Performance Indicators (KPIs))*

- Production Capacity (Effective Oil Capacity)
- Environmental Protection (Oil Spill)
- People (Human Resource Development)

As an operating company ADMA –OPCO has pre-defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), set by the parent company, ADNOC. These are the indicators of Organisational Success, measured each year. The company is responsible to achieve the defined KPIs and the accountability for this is delegated to various Units with pre-specified deliverables.

The company has a five year Business Plan also which is formulated by Corporate Planning Division, in agreement with ADNOC. The Business Plan describes the strategic organisational goals of the company, which are translated to divisional level operational goals and then team level objectives. For the present study, three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were considered as the measure of Organisational
Success, namely. Effective Oil Capacity, Oil Spill, and Human Resource Development.

4.6 Conceptual Model of the Study

The conceptual model of the study is shown in the figure 4.6.1:

Figure 4.6.1: Conceptual model of the study

- **Independent Variables**
  - Strategic Leadership Dimensions
    - Team Effectiveness
      - Cohesion
      - Confrontation
      - Collaboration
      - Task clarity
      - Autonomy
      - Support
      - Accountability
  - Demographic Variables
    - Age
    - Grade
    - Education
  - Organisational Learning
    - Innovation
    - Implementation
    - Stabilization
- **Dependent variables**
  - Organisational Success
    - (Key Performance Indicators)
      - Production Capacity (Effective Oil Capacity)
      - Environmental Protection (Oil Spill)
      - People (Human Resource Development)
4.7 Population and Sample of the Study

ADMA – OPCO, a subsidiary of the Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) was selected to conduct the study. The selection was based on the fact that ADMA has a management style where elements of Strategic Leadership dimensions are visible. The company has implemented ‘One Team’ concept. Access to relevant information, which is not easily available in this part of the world, has also played a role in selection. The study had formal approval of ADMA Management.

Professional employees at the job grades of 13 to 16 of ADMA – OPCO forms the population of the study. The decision has been made on the basis that these are the employees directly involved in the selected dimensions of the study. The Job Grades for the employees are granted through a competency based assessment mechanism, not on length of experience in the company. In fact employees at the job grade from 13 to 16 are deemed to be professionals.

The company is having around 30 different operating divisions, fall under six Business Units. One division, taking care of Health, Safety, Environment and Quality Assurance is under direct control of the CEO. Each Business Unit is managed by a Senior Vice President. Each Division has Vice President or Divisional Manager as its head. Team Leaders and Section Leaders manage the divisions under the Divisional Manager.

Out of the total strength of around 2000 employees, half of them work on off-shore facilities, as oil production from off-shore areas is the responsibility of this Operating Company. In addition, thousands of employees work at various projects sites, on contract basis. Around 700 Direct Hire employees are in the job grade range of 13 to 16, working in the Head Quarters, in various Divisions. Out of six Business Units, Production, Drilling, and Administrative Support Business Units employ major part of the population under the present study.

A sample of 208 professional employees was selected on the basis of purposive sampling. This approach was taken to ensure representation to all relevant Divisions.
Uniformity and balance on selection was maintained by including a mix of Divisions of all sizes, in the mean time giving proportionate representation based on the number of professional employees in each Division.

The table 4.7.1 shows the divisional level distribution of samples.

**Table 4.7.1: Divisional level distribution of samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Units</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>No. of respondents (sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO Group</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Zakum</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umm Shaif</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Das</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>FDD (Zakum)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FDD (Umm Shaif)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Tech.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Project Support&amp;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling Support</td>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reservoir Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petroleum Eng.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Service</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Service</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manpower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 +1</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Unit wise distribution of respondents is given below in Table 4.7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Units</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling Support</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Service</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7.1: Business Unit wise distribution of respondents.

Out of 208 employees selected, a few did not return the questionnaires and a few of the responses could not be used because of incomplete data. Therefore comparable data of 167 professional employees was used for the study.
4.8 Profile of Respondents

The sample comprised 208 respondents who work in 18 divisions in the Head Quarters of ADMA –OPCO, in Abu Dhabi. They are in grade range of 13 to 16, who are directly involved in the two strategic leadership dimensions selected for the study. The 18 divisions are under six Asset Units and one Division directly report to the CEO due to its importance.

Out of 208 sample respondent selected, only 176 questionnaires were found complete in all respects. Only these 176 were used for the analysis in the study.

Distribution of Respondents by Demographic Variables

For analysis, three important demographic variables, Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualification were selected. The respondents selected for the study were of different age, grades, and educational background. Tables 4.8.1 to 4.8.3 presents summary of these demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 4.8.1: Distribution of Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.55 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49.10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8.1: Distribution of Respondents by Age
As evident from the table 4.8.1, 24.55 percent of the total respondents were in the age group of 25 to 35 years where as 49.10 percent were of 36 to 45 years and 26.35 percentage belongs to age group of 46 years and above. In numbers, as shown in Fig.4.8.1, they are 41, 82, and 44 respectively.

Table 4 .8.2 provides distribution of the respondents by Job Grade.

Table 4.8.2: Distribution of Respondents by Job Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grade</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Grade 13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Grade 14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31.74 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Grade 15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Grade 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 4.8.2, 35.92 percent of the total respondents were in Job Grade 13 where as 31.74 were in Job Grade 14, 25.15 percent in Job Grade 15 and 7.19 percentage in Job Grade 16. In numbers, they were 60, 53, 42 and 12 belonging to Job Grades from 13 to 16 respectively.
Table 4.8.3 below provides distribution of the respondents by their Educational Qualifications.

**Table 4.8.3: Distribution of Respondents by their Educational Qualifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58.88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.8.3: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualifications**

As evident from the table 4.8.3, 6.59 percent of the total respondents were Diploma holders where as 58.88 percent were Degree holders and 33.53 percent were having Post Graduation as Education Qualification. In numbers they were 11, 100 and 56 having Diploma, Degree and Post Graduation, respectively. The sample of employees selected for the study belongs to job grades from 13 to 16, who are generally professionals. Hence, the lower number of respondents with Diploma as the educational qualification.
4.9 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out in selected Divisions of the organisation. The purpose of conducting the pilot study was to ascertain whether the questions are properly understood by the respondents, so that realistic responses are obtained. The feedback from the respondents on the pilot study showed that they have understood the intent and content of the questionnaire. Minor changes were proposed in the questions assessing Team Effectiveness. Necessary changes were incorporated before the full scale study.

4.10 Data Collection

Questionnaires were distributed personally to majority of the respondents. Support of known persons was sought in a few Divisions. Respondents were briefed on the purpose of study, construct of the questions and how to fill the questionnaire. The respondents were exhorted to contact the author in case of queries. Persons who had offered a helping hand in the distribution and collection of the questionnaires were also briefed on the study. This helped them perform their roles smoothly.

It was made clear that the study was part of the Doctoral Programme, the researcher is currently pursuing and that participation in the survey was voluntary. It was also mentioned that providing the name and personal details was optional, not compulsory. However the respondents were informed of the necessity to fill the selected demographic variables (Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualification) that are required for the analysis. The respondents were motivated on the ground that their participation in the study would help in scientific analysis and further understanding of the subject of the study. Such a study on the selected Dimensions of Strategic Leadership was first of its kind in the organisation. The selected population was the professional segment of the Human Capital in ADMA – OPCO, thus facilitating easy administration of the research instruments.
4.11 Instruments for Data Collection

The primary data for the present study has been collected by survey method, using reliable questionnaire as the research instrument. Data collection through personal interview generally offers a freedom of flexibility. However, this method was avoided considering the large number of respondents covered in the study as well as the time constraint.

Two Dimensions of the Strategic Leadership were selected for the current study: Human Capital Development and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. It was decided to examine Team Effectiveness as a measure of Human Capital Development and Organisational Learning for Effective Organisational Culture. Two standard questionnaires, from Pareek (2002) were used for the purpose: first one for Team Effectiveness and the second one for Organisational Learning.

Questionnaires employed in the study:

1. Team Effectiveness: Team Effectiveness Assessment Measure (TEAM)

2. Organisational Learning: Organisational Learning Diagnostics (OLD)

Copies of both questionnaires are given in the Appendix I and Appendix II.

The first questionnaire, Team Effectiveness Assessment Measure (TEAM) measures effectiveness of a team as assessed through seven components. These seven components are Task clarity, Cohesion, Autonomy, Confrontation, Support, Collaboration, and Accountability. The seven components are grouped into two main aspects of team effectiveness: Team Functioning and Team Empowerment. Team Functioning contains three components where as Team Empowerment having four components. The questionnaire has 28 items. The respondents rate their team on a five point scale to indicate their experience and perception of the team in which they work. Description of the five point scale used: this is highly characteristic of the team or this always happens (4), this is fairly characteristic of the team or this frequently
happens (3), is slightly characteristic of the team or this sometimes happens (2), this is very little true about the team or occasionally happens (1), and this is not at all true about the team or it almost never happens (0).

Table 4.11.1 shows the seven components of the questionnaire TEAM and the items in the questionnaire representing each component of Team Effectiveness, below:

**Table 4.11.1: Components of Team Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Items in the questionnaire representing the component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task clarity</td>
<td>1,8,15,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>2,9,16,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3,10,17,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>4,11,18,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>5,12,19,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>6,13,20,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>7,14,21,28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11.2 shows the two main aspects of Team Effectiveness and their components.

**Table 4.11.2: Main dimensions of Team Effectiveness and their components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Aspects of Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Components of the Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Functioning</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Empowerment</td>
<td>Task clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samples of items in the questionnaire for Team Effectiveness are shown below in Table 4.11.3, each item representing one component of Team Effectiveness.

Table 4.11.3: Sample items in the questionnaire for Team Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Members of the team generally feel that their concerns and views are ignored by the other members.</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Members generally avoid discussing the problem facing the team.</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Members do not volunteer to help others and to take responsibility.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The goals of the team are well defined</td>
<td>Task clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The team has enough freedom to decide its way for working.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The team is given adequate resources the carry out its functions.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The sense of responsibility and accountability is pretty high amongst the team members.</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second questionnaire of Organisational Learning Diagnostics (OLD) which is also a standard questionnaire taken from Pareek (2002) has 23 items. These are grouped into three subsystems of Organisational Learning: acquiring and examining (the innovation phase), retaining and integrating (the implementation phase), and using and adapting (the stabilization phase). These subsystems are present in organisations in varying degrees. Respondents were required to rate each item on a five-point scale, for the value and frequency of the practice of each item mentioned. More the frequency of these mechanisms are practiced in the organisation, stronger is the potential for organisational learning.

Table 4.11.4 shows the sub systems of Organisational Learning and the items in the questionnaire representing each subsystem.
Table 4.11.4 Key Dimensions of Organisational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items in the questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring and examining (the Innovation phase)</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining and integrating (the Implementation phase)</td>
<td>9,10,11,12,13,14,15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using and adapting (the Stabilization phase)</td>
<td>16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11-5 provides samples of items in the questionnaire representing each subsystem of Organisational Learning.

Table 4.11-5 Sample items in the questionnaire on Organisational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sub system of Organisation Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experts and experienced creative practitioners are invited to share their ideas with members of the organisation.</td>
<td>Acquiring and examining (the Innovation phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tasks groups are created for implementing and monitoring new projects and experiments.</td>
<td>Retaining and integrating (the Implementation phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Task groups are created for data based on the innovations.</td>
<td>Using and adapting (the Stabilization phase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the five point scale used: the practice is very highly valued or is always or very frequently practiced (4), the practice is highly valued or is frequently
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done (3), the practice is valued or sometimes done (2), the practice has low value or is occasionally done (1), and the practice has very low or no value or is seldom or never done (0). Thus, the number denotes the weightage of each response. Higher the value marked in the response, higher the frequency of practice of the subsystem in the organisation. Potential for Organisational Learning Index (POLI) was determined to quantify the organisation’s potential for learning.

In the present study the three sub systems were focused as components of Organisational Learning, for analysis and interpretation.

A nine item personal details inventory given below in Table 4.11.7, was used to obtain the personal background of the respondents.

**Table 4.11.6: Personal details sought from respondents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ID Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Educational Qualification: Diploma / Degree / Post Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Years of experience in ADMA – OPCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Name of the Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Name of the Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above mentioned nine items, three most important items: age, job grade and educational qualification, were chosen as Demographical variables for further analysis. The respondents were briefed that filling the personal profile was optional, but they were requested to provide these three items, as they have definite influence on the strategic leadership dimensions included in the current study.
4.12 Data Analysis and Statistical Tools

The present study focused on the influence of two selected dimensions of Strategic Leadership i.e. Developing Human Capital and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture, on Organisational Success. Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were considered to measure each of the dimensions respectively. The approach indicates that the data could be analyzed to show a statistically significant relationship between the variables. It was decided to use SPSS for data analysis.

In the present study the three sub systems (Innovation, Implementation and Stabilisation) were focused as components of organisational learning for analysis and interpretation.

The 167 valid responses were tabulated and computerised. In questionnaire one, items No. 2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,24,26, and 28 were reversed, as per the guideline provided with the same. The data entry was done as per the requirement of SPSS. Data analysis was carried out and results were obtained. One-way ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. Suitable charts and diagrams illustrating relationship between the variables were generated with the help of Microsoft Excel.

4.13 Limitations of the Study

Any research study faces a set of limitations. This study was not an exception. The main limitations of the study identified are shown below.

- The present study focused only on ‘Strategic Leadership’. There are various other approaches and concepts dealing with leadership. Narrowing down to this particular approach might have caused missing some of important aspects of leadership, from being considered for the study for measurement.
- Only two dimensions of the Strategic Leadership were considered in the study. Though different models present many other dimensions, only two of them, i.e, Developing Human Capital and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture were studied. The first dimension, Setting a
Strategic Direction is illustrated as key dimension of Strategic Leadership. This was considered as already in place in the organisation. Out of the remaining dimensions, the selected two dimensions were expected to be the most crucial, especially to achieve the set vision. However, non inclusion of other dimensions of Strategic Leadership might have caused missing valuable insights.

- Only employees in the grade range of 13 to 16 were included as sample. This decision was taken based on the fact that, employees in these job grades are mainly responsible for and involved in the two dimensions selected for the study. However, in practice, there cannot be a strict distinction made, in terms of contribution of people across other levels.

- Only three of the demographic variables were used for the study. Age, Job Grade and Educational Qualifications were the three demographic variables analysed in the study. Though there were many other similar demographic variables collected, as part of the personal profile of the respondents, these three were considered to have clear influence on the dimensions selected for the study. However, other demographic variables also could have affected the subject under the study, in some manner.

- Only one Organization was covered under the study. The study was conducted only in ADMA – OPCO. This was mainly due to the reasons that lack of uniformity on standards available to measure organisational success, difference of operational and performance management systems, locations of similar organisations in very far geographical locations or different countries, and hesitation of the organisations’ management in providing access to the required information. Conducting the research in single organisation might have prevented getting wider insights into the subject.

- Though the instruments are of proven reliability and validity, presence of bias could not be ruled out while completing them. All possible precautions were taken to obtain accurate data from the respondents, including making them understand the objectives of the study, importance of their valuable views in conducting the study. Implications of the information provided by them in
scientifically understanding the subject of the study, also was given. The respondents also were briefed on how to complete the questionnaires and requested to contact the author in case of any doubt. However, personal bias cannot be ruled out, which might have affected the accuracy of the data.

- The author is an insider of the organisation selected for the study. This might have influenced the response of respondents during the questionnaire survey.

4.14. Summary

This chapter discussed on the various aspects of Research Methodology applied for the present study. The topics covered include need and objectives, various hypothesis, variables, conceptual construct, population, pilot study, data collection, instruments used for the study, data analysis and limitations of the study.

Next chapter presents results and discussions on the study.
Chapter-5
Results and Discussions

5.1 Introduction

The present study aimed at investigating the relationship between Strategic Leadership and Organisational Success. The two dimensions of Strategic leadership are Human Capital Development and Developing & Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were studied as measures of these dimensions, respectively. Primary data was collected through questionnaires. 167 valid responses were obtained. The data was tabulated and analyzed with the support of statistical techniques. Microsoft Excel and SPSS were used as tools. Chapter Four presented details on research methodology employed, questionnaires used, and approach on data analysis.

This Chapter deals with results and discussions. Overall analysis of Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning as well as Strategic Leadership is presented. Variations in scores of the three selected Demographic Variables across Team Effectiveness, and Organisational Learning was analysed. Effect of Strategic leadership on Organisational Success represented by three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) was also assessed. Finally, a summary is presented.

5.2 Overall Results

This section presents results of data analysis. Discussion on effects of Team Effectiveness is presented, followed by Organisational Learning. These two analyses are summated together to present prevalence of Strategic leadership in the organization under study.

5.2.1. Team Effectiveness as a measure of Strategic Leadership

Team Effectiveness which represented the first dimension of Strategic Leadership has two main aspects: Team Functioning and Team Empowerment. Team Functioning
comprises 3 components: Cohesion, Confrontation, and Collaboration. Task clarity, Autonomy, Support, and Accountability are the components of Team Empowerment.

Following section provides overall analysis of components of Team Effectiveness.

Table 5.2.1.1 Overall Analysis for Team Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task clarity</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2.1 presents the scores obtained by components of Team Effectiveness. The scores are presented in descending order to indicate the strength of each component:

- Task Clarity (mean = 4.05)
- Collaboration (mean = 3.97)
- Cohesion (mean = 3.95)
- Confrontation (mean = 3.94)
- Accountability (mean = 3.88)
- Autonomy (mean = 3.84)
- Support (mean = 3.83)
Task clarity has emerged as the most prominent component with a mean score of 4.05. Standard Deviation of this component is 0.64. The result shows the teams under study are clear on their goals and job responsibilities. This could be due to the presence of pre-planned and mutually agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the organization under study. With the result, it is evident that the vision and goals are clearly communicated to the teams throughout the organization. Thus team members are well aware of the deliverables in their area of work.

Collaboration and Cohesion are the second and third most prominent components, with mean values of 3.97 and 3.96, respectively. Comparatively high mean value for Collaboration shows that the teams are good in helping each other, sharing responsibilities and tasks, responding to request for help, and the members are competent enough to carry out the work. Similar high score on Cohesion indicates that the teams are good in sharing the concerns and views, supporting each other when required, working with strong bondage, and supporting the team decisions. Thus, one element of Team Empowerment and two elements of Team Functioning emerged as the first three components in terms of prominence. The result indicates the efficient systems prevalent in the organization to strengthen the team building as well as team work.

Fig. 5.2.1.1 Graphical representation for Team Effectiveness
Components namely Autonomy and Support with mean values of 3.84 and 3.83 have recorded comparatively lower scores among the seven components of Team Effectiveness. Though the mean values are above the theoretical medium value of 3.0, on a scale of 1 to 5, the result shows that the team members have recorded lower scores vis-à-vis other components. The Autonomy includes aspects like; freedom in the relevant areas of work, and freedom in taking decisions in vital aspects of the job. As regards Support as a measure of team effectiveness, it includes adequate Human Resource and Financial resources to carry out functions, and enough support in completing the tasks. The scores indicate that these aspects have scope for further development. Incidentally, Support has the highest standard deviation value, 0.72. This indicates that respondents differ in their responses on this factor. They record diversity in their opinion on available freedom on taking decisions as well as deciding vital aspects of the work. Though the result indicates that organization has systems and practices supporting and encouraging team work, management can initiate measures to strengthen Autonomy and Support. This shall improve the Team effectiveness in the organisation further.

**Fig. 5.2.1.2 Categorisation of respondents as per scores on Team Effectiveness**

In the present study, the respondents were classified into three groups i.e; Low scoring group (1.0 to 2.0), Mediums scoring group (2.1 to 3.0), and High scoring group (3.1 to 5.0).
Figures 5.2.1.2 helps to understand the distribution of respondents in these groups. From the Table 5.2.1.1 and Figure 5.2.1.2, it is evident that, more than 50% of the total respondents scored ‘High’ for all the components of Team Effectiveness.

The analysis indicates that the seven components are consistently contributing to Team Effectiveness. Task Clarity, Collaboration, and Cohesion with highest mean values, are the most prominent components. The results are in consistent with the studies done by Banker et. Al.(1996) and Cohen & Ledford, (1994), and Lawler et.al (1995) on Team Effectiveness. These studies revealed the positive effects of aspects like collaboration, self development, continuous learning, and shared access to information on team effectiveness. Measures may be initiated to improve the components scoring lower values, so that the team effectiveness is improved further in the organisation.

5.2.2 Overall Result for Organisational Learning

Organisational Learning representing second dimension of Strategic Leadership has three components: Innovation, Implementation, and Stabilisation. Following section provides overall analysis of scores for these components of Organisational Learning.

Table 5.2.2.1 Overall Analysis for Organisational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.632</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low: 1.0 - 2.0, Medium: 2.1 - 3.0, High: 3.1 - 5.0

Table 5.2.2.1 indicates the scores of three components of Organizational Learning. The scores in descending order are presented below:

- Innovation (mean = 3.632)
Innovation has emerged as the most prominent component of Organisational Learning, with a mean value of 3.632. The Standard deviation is 0.66. It is clear that the respondents are experiencing an environment where innovative ideas are encouraged and rewarded. The working environment encourages experimentation, sharing of new ideas and experience, and events like seminars and meetings are available for sharing the learning. This is an indication of an organisational culture in the firm under study, which motivates the team members in exploring new ways of doing things. The result indicates the presence of systems and practices which are very encouraging to learning and developing a ‘learning organisation’.

Implementation with a mean value of 3.629 is the second prominent component, influencing Organisational Learning. This shows the existence of institutions like task group for implementing innovations, periodic meetings chaired by top management to share the experience, and system to link innovations with past practices. The result indicates the existence of organisational culture which encourages adaptation to the changes. Though scoring slightly lower scores as compared to Innovation, this element is also present in substantial measure.

Fig. 5.2.2.1 Graphical representation for Organisational Learning
Stabilisation with a mean value of 3.464 is the third prominent component contributing to Organisational Learning. Comparatively, lower score on this component could be due to the limited use of tools to stabilise the learning process, limited availability of systems to review and monitor the implementation. Overall the reason could be the less than required use of follow-up mechanisms in the organization. It is important to establish systems for continuous monitoring of the process of implementation of the new ideas as well as technologies. This is also essential to ensure their continuous and proper usage. Management could initiate measures to minimize these concern areas so as to maximize Organisational Learning in the organisation.

In the present study, the respondents were categorised into three groups based on the scores: Low scoring group (1.0 to 2.0) Medium scoring group (2.1 to 3.0), and High scoring group (3.1 to 5.0). Figure 5.2.2.2 helps understand the organisational reality on this account.

**Fig. 5.2.2.2 Categorisation of respondents as per scores on Organisational Learning**

Out of 167 respondents, 12 employees (7.9%) scored low, 85 employees (50.90%) scored medium, and 70 employees (41.92%) scored high for Innovation,
respectively. For Implementation the numbers are 23 (13.77%), 119 (71.26%), and 25 (14.97%) respectively. 17 employees (10.18%) scored low, 109 (65.27%) for medium, and 41 (24.55%) high for Stabilisation. The more than medium score for all three components of Organisational Learning is indications that, majority of the respondents experience an organisational culture which encourages organisational learning, in the organization under study.

The above findings are in line with the inferences of the studies conducted by Liu et al., (2003), Baker and Sinkula, (1999); Sinkula et al., (1997), and Senge (1995) on Organisational Learning. The studies have proved positive influence of different components of Organisational Learning.

5.2.3 Overall Analysis: Strategic Leadership

The present study attempted to assess the extent of prevalence of Strategic Leadership in the organisation under study. This was carried out by measuring Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, representing the two dimensions of Strategic Leadership: Human Capital Development, and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture.

Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were assessed by using two separate instruments, but both with the same scheme of measurement.

Extent of prevalence of Strategic Leadership was analysed by summatung mean values obtained on Team Effectiveness and Organisational learning. Table 5.2.3.1 presents the overall result. As it is clear from the table, out of the ten components Task clarity is the most prominent component contributing to the Strategic Leadership, with a mean value of 4.05. Corresponding Standard deviation is 0.64. The high value indicates the fact that the team members are clear on their job responsibilities and goals. This may be due to the systems available in the organization to communicate the mutually agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The KPIs are cascaded to lower levels to various divisions and teams as goals and objectives. The result indicates the awareness of the team members on their
individual responsibilities of deliverables, means clarity on goals, which is very important for any organization to be successful

Table 5.2.3.1 Overall Analysis for Strategic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness &amp; Org. Learning</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Low N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Medium N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task clarity</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71.26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Leadership (Mean Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean values</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Low N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Medium N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low: 1.0 – 2.0, Medium: 2.1 – 3.0, High: 3.1 – 5.0

Collaboration and Cohesion are the second and third prominent components with mean values of 3.97 and 3.95. This is an indication that, the team members support each other in terms of sharing the resources, ideas and learning. This also indicates that the team members support each other in sharing their concerns and feelings.
Components of Organisational Learning have scored comparatively less vis-à-vis other components. Within three components of Organisational Learning, Innovation is at the top, with a mean value of 3.63, followed by Implementation with a mean value of 3.62. This shows the fact that, innovative ideas are encouraged and that tools are available for their implementation in the organisation under study. However, the result shows less utilization of systems for stabilizing the new ideas.

Though the mean values are of all the components are above the theoretical medium range of 2.1 to 3.0, values of components like Accountability (3.88), Autonomy (3.84) and Support (3.83) have obtained comparatively lower scores. Management may initiate measures to strengthen these components so as to improve the prevalence of Strategic leadership even further.

The result of the study indicates prevalence of Strategic Leadership at a moderately high level in the organization under study. The mean value is 3.82, on a scale of 1 to 5. This result is supported by the facts that moderately high level of components of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning are prevalent in the organization under study.
The present findings are corroborated by Boal and Schultz (2007), Stumpf & Mullen (1991), and Hewson R (1997) on Strategic Leadership, Team Effectiveness, and Organisational Learning as well. These studies proved the positive influences of components of Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership. Higher the prominence of the components of these dimensions, higher the prevalence of Strategic Leadership.

Next section presents analysis of variations in scores on Team effectiveness and Organisational learning across three demographic variables (age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualifications).

5.3 Analysis of Team Effectiveness across Demographic Variables

Three key demographic variables focused for the present study are Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualifications. The effect of these three Demographic Variables on Team Effectiveness was analyzed. This Analysis is presented in sections from 5.3.1. to 5.3.3.

5.3.1 Analysis of Team Effectiveness as per Age

Total respondents of the present study were categorized into three age groups: 25 to 35 years, 36 to 45 years, and 46 years and above. Table 5.3.1.1 shows Team Effectiveness Scores for Respondents of Different Age Groups.

F values of Cohesion and Confrontation are 4.45, 3.084, where as the corresponding p-values are 0.013 and 0.048, respectively. This indicates a significant difference of these two components amongst the respondents of different age groups. For the other components: Collaboration, Task clarity, Autonomy, Support, and Accountability the F values are 2.738, 0.264, 0.640, 2.589, and 0.841. The corresponding p-values are 0.068, 0.768, 0.529, 0.078, and 0.433. These values indicate no significant variation of these five components amongst the respondents of different age groups.
### Table 5.3.1.1 Team Effectiveness Scores across Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Age Group 1 N = 41</th>
<th>Age Group 2 N=82</th>
<th>Age Group 3 N= 44</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Group1= 25 – 35  Age Group2= 36 – 45  Age Group 3= 46 years and above

Cohesion indicates sharing of views and concerns by members of the team, supporting each other when required, functioning as a strong team, and supporting the decision made by the team. These attributes may record a positive improvement with age. People tend to be more cooperative and open for suggestions when they have grown into matured individual. They are more willing to support each other. As the individuals are demonstrating such characteristics, the team functioning automatically gets strengthened. As age advances and as team become more mature and supportive, the decisions made by the team will be accepted and backed by the team members.

Confrontation is the willingness to discuss the differences with an open mind. The team members are ready to discuss the problems faced by them individually as well as a team. The members generate alternate solution for the problems confronted by the team. At higher levels of this component, the team members experience greater
freedom in their area of work and they are matured enough to express their difference of opinion. These attributes also improve with increase in age of the team members. These elements record comparatively low scores among youngsters. In the present study, the result shows, there have been significant differences for both Cohesion as well as Confrontation amongst the respondents of different age groups.

Fig. 5.3.1.1 Graphical representation of Team Effectiveness Scores across Age Groups
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Age Group</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Table 5.3.1.2 Team Effectiveness scores across different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean values of Team Effectiveness for different age groups of 25 to 35, 36 to 45, and 46 years and above are 3.76, 3.92, and 4.01 respectively. The result indicates an influence of age on Team Effectiveness. However, the corresponding p-value is 0.133. This suggests that the difference across age is statistically insignificant.

*Based on the above results, Ho 1 stating that there has been no significant difference in components of Team Effectiveness amongst various age groups is accepted. However, scores record an improvement as age advances.*

### 5.3.2 Variation of Team Effectiveness with Job Grades

This section presents the analysis and findings on variation of Team Effectiveness with Job Grades. The respondents of the study were of four Job grades: 13, 14, 15, and 16. Table 5.3.2.1 shows the scores for Team Effectiveness for employees categorized into these Job Grades.
Table 5.3.2.1 Team Effectiveness Scores across Job Grades

N= 167

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Job Grade 13 (N=60)</th>
<th>Job Grade 14 (N=53)</th>
<th>Job Grade 15 (N=42)</th>
<th>Job Grade 16 (N=12)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.3.2.1 Graphical representation of Team Effectiveness Scores across Job Grades

[Graphical representation of Team Effectiveness Scores across Job Grades]
The F values of Cohesion and Task clarity are 2.979 and 3.590, where as the corresponding p-values are 0.033 and 0.015 respectively. These values indicate that, there has been significant variation in these two components of Team Effectiveness amongst various job grades. F values of Confrontation, Collaboration, Autonomy, Support, and Accountability are 1.810, 1.640, 2.569, 2.146, and 2.617. The corresponding p-values of these components are 0.147, 0.182, 0.056, 0.097, and 0.053 respectively. These values indicate that, there has been no significant variation in these five components of team effectiveness across various job grades.

As discussed in Section 5.3.1, Cohesion indicates sharing of views and concerns by members of the team, supporting each other when required, functioning as a strong team, and supporting the decision made by the team increase by increase of age. People tend to become willing to support each other as they advance in age. The team functioning automatically gets strengthened and the decisions made by the team are accepted and backed by all the team members.

Task clarity represent the presence of well defined goals in the team, clarity in the tasks to be undertaken, clear understanding of roles, and awareness on actions needed for goal achievement. With advancement of age, these attributes record improvement and thus the team functioning. Presence of well defined Key Performance Indicators, which are translated into goals and objectives, improves Task clarity.

Table 5.3.2.2 Team Effectiveness Scores across Job Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG 13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean values of Team Effectiveness for different Job Grades from 13 to 16 are 3.80, 3.98, and 3.84, and 4.31 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.027.

The above results support the findings of the studies conducted by Jackson (1996), and Iles & Hayers (1997) on diversity of teams and its positive effects on team functioning. The studies proved that teams with members of mixed caliber and expertise enhance sharing of knowledge and resources, and thus higher team functioning.

Based on the results, $H_0$ 2 stating there has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst various job grades is rejected. However, further research is required to understand why there is drop in scores in job grade 15 because except for this job grade, for rest of the job grade there is an improvement in scores of job grade.

5.3.3 Variation of Team Effectiveness with Educational Qualifications
The respondents of the present study are in three categories in terms of educational qualifications: people with Diploma, Degree, and Post Graduation.

This section presents analysis and discussion on the variation of Team Effectiveness across educational qualifications.

Table 5.3.3.1  Team Effectiveness Scores across Educational categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Diploma N = 11</th>
<th>Degree N = 100</th>
<th>Post Grad. N = 56</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F values of Collaboration and Support are 3.281 and 2.725, where as the corresponding p-values are 0.022 and 0.046 respectively. These values indicate that, there has been significant variation in these two components of Team Effectiveness amongst respondents having varied educational qualification. F values of Cohesion, Confrontation, Task clarity, Autonomy, and Accountability are 2.139, 1.587, 0.474, 1.469, and 2.251. The corresponding p-values of these five components are 0.097, 0.195, 0.701, 0.225, and 0.084. These values indicate that, there has been no significant variation in these five components of Team Effectiveness amongst respondents having varied educational qualification.

Collaboration indicates a willingness of sharing of ideas and resources, and supporting in completing jobs. This naturally increases with increase in education. Increase in education improves the knowledge level of the team members and thus the competencies. Combination of the power of competencies as well as willingness to share the knowledge improves team effectiveness.
Support represents willingness in sharing resources and to support each other in the team. By improving the educational background team members tend to become more open minded and non-selfish. This facilitates sharing of the available resource within and between the teams and the team effectiveness.

Table 5.3.3.2 Team Effectiveness Scores across Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.5.3.3.2 Graphical representation of Team Effectiveness scores across Educational categories

Mean values of Team Effectiveness for categories of respondents with educational qualifications of Diploma, Degree and Post Graduation are 3.81, 3.98, and 3.87, and 4.00 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.322.

Based on the results, $H_0$ 3 stating there has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications is accepted.
5.4 Analysis of Organisational Learning across Demographic Variables

Organisational learning was assessed as a representation of the second dimension (Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture) of Strategic Leadership.

Sections 5.4.1 to 5.4.3 provide analysis and discussions on effects of Demographic Variables on Organisational Learning. Three Demographic Variables: Age, Job Grade, and Educational Qualification were studied for this purpose.

5.4.1 Organisational Learning across Age

The respondents of the present study were of three age groups. Age group 1 (25 to 35), age group 2 (36 to 45), and age group 3 (45 years and above). Table 5.4.1.1 provides the scores of Organisational Learning for the respondents of these age groups.

Table 5.4.1.1 Organisational Learning Scores for Respondents of Different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Organisational Learning</th>
<th>Age Group 1 N = 41</th>
<th>Age Group 2 N=82</th>
<th>Age group 3 N= 44</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Mean 3.50 SD 0.73</td>
<td>Mean 3.59 SD 0.67</td>
<td>Mean 3.82 SD 0.52</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Mean 3.56 SD 0.74</td>
<td>Mean 3.59 SD 0.70</td>
<td>Mean 3.76 SD 0.61</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stabilisation</strong></td>
<td>Mean 3.46 SD 0.64</td>
<td>Mean 3.38 SD 0.67</td>
<td>Mean 3.63 SD 0.64</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Group 1= 25 – 35  Age Group 2= 36 – 45  Age Group 3= 46 years and above
Fig. 5.4.1.1 Graphical representation of Organisational Learning Scores Age Groups

Low Age Group = 25 – 35  Medium Age Group = 36 – 45  High Age Group = 46 years and above

F values of Innovation, Implementation and Stabilisation are 2.763, 1.074, and 1.974. The corresponding p-values are 0.066, 0.344, and 0.142. The result indicates that, there has been no significant variation in the three components of Organisational Learning amongst the respondents of various age groups.

Table 5.4.1.2 Mean Values of Organisational Learning for Respondents of Different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean values of scores on Organisational Learning for different age groups are 3.50, 3.52, and 3.73 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.126.

*Based on the results, Ho 4 stating there has been no difference variation in Organisational Learning amongst respondents of various age groups is accepted.*

### 5.4.2 Variation of Organisational Learning with Job Grades

Respondents of the present study are working in four different Job Grades. They are Job Grades 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Table 5.4.2.1 presents Organisational Learning Scores for Employees in Different Job Grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Organisational Learning</th>
<th>Job Grade 13 (N=60)</th>
<th>Job Grade 14 (N=82)</th>
<th>Job Grade 15 (N=42)</th>
<th>Job Grade 16 (N=12)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>3.50 0.67</td>
<td>3.60 0.64</td>
<td>3.77 0.62</td>
<td>3.94 0.62</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>3.52 0.73</td>
<td>3.70 0.67</td>
<td>3.62 0.60</td>
<td>3.90 0.84</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stabilisation</strong></td>
<td>3.36 0.63</td>
<td>3.58 0.61</td>
<td>3.39 0.70</td>
<td>3.75 0.81</td>
<td>1.937</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-values of Innovation, Implementation and Stabilisation are 2.403, 1.334, and 1.937. The corresponding p-values are 0.07, 0.265, and 0.126. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in these components of Organisational Learning amongst the respondents with various job grades.

The values clearly indicate that people in lower level of the hierarchy are more concerned on the implementation of the new ideas where as employees at higher grades are looking for better solutions and innovative ideas. This is very much true in case of respondents working in Job Grade 16. Stabilisation is the least important component, for respondents in all four Job Grade categories. The reason could be less utilization of mechanisms, tools, and systems in stabilizing the innovative ideas in the teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG 13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean values of Organisational Learning for respondents of different job grades are 3.46, 3.62, 3.59, and 3.86 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.159.

*Based on the results, $H_0$ stating there has been no significant difference in Organisational learning amongst respondents of various job grades is accepted.*

### 5.4.3 Organisational Learning Scores across Educational categories

Respondents of the present study were categorized into three groups based on their educational qualifications. These groups were categorised on the basis of Diploma, Degree and Post Graduation holders. Table 5.4.3.1 shows the Organisational Learning Scores for respondents of different Educational Qualifications.
Table 5.4.3.1 Organisational Learning Scores across Educational categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Organisational Learning</th>
<th>Diploma (N=11)</th>
<th>Degree (N=100)</th>
<th>Post Grad. (N=56)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F value for Innovation is 3.329 and the p-value 0.021. This indicates that, there has been significant variation in Innovation, a component of Organisational Learning amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications. F values for Implementation and Stabilisation are 1.695 and 0.756 where as the corresponding p-values are 0.170 and 0.520. This indicates that there is no significant difference in these two components of Organisational Learning amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications.
Innovation is ability to look into new ways of solving the issues and finding out novel methods of achieving objectives. Higher the educational qualifications better will be the knowledge base and in turn the capability to explore new methods.

Table 5.4.3.2 Organisational Learning Scores across Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.4.3.2 Graphical representation of Organisational Learning scores across Educational Qualifications categories

Mean values of Organisational Learning for respondents with different educational qualifications are 3.51, 3.58, and 3.58 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.950. Based on the results, Ho 6 stating there has been no significant difference in Organisational learning amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications is accepted.

5.5 Analysis of Strategic Leadership and Demographic Variables

Strategic Leadership was assessed by measuring Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, representing the selected two dimensions of Strategic Leadership. Sections 5.5.1 to 5.5.3 presented analysis and discussion covering effects of Demographic Variables on
Strategic Leadership. Three demographic Variables considered Age, Job Grade, and educational Qualification, were studied for the purpose relevant for this study were Age, Job Grade and educational qualification.

5.5.1 Strategic Leadership across Age

This section shows analysis and discussions on the effect of Age on Strategic Leadership.

Table 5.5.11 Strategic Leadership Scores with regard to Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Age Group 1 (N = 41)</th>
<th>Age Group 2 (N=82)</th>
<th>Age Group 3 (N=44)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Mean 3.73 SD 0.68</td>
<td>Mean 3.91 SD 0.67</td>
<td>Mean 4.14 SD 0.55</td>
<td>4.454</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>Mean 3.73 SD 0.79</td>
<td>Mean 3.96 SD 0.64</td>
<td>Mean 4.08 SD 0.52</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Mean 3.76 SD 0.74</td>
<td>Mean 4.04 SD 0.59</td>
<td>Mean 4.02 SD 0.66</td>
<td>2.738</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>Mean 3.99 SD 0.73</td>
<td>Mean 4.08 SD 0.66</td>
<td>Mean 4.03 SD 0.51</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Mean 3.74 SD 0.76</td>
<td>Mean 3.84 SD 0.66</td>
<td>Mean 3.91 SD 0.80</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Mean 3.65 SD 0.64</td>
<td>Mean 3.83 SD 0.74</td>
<td>Mean 3.99 SD 0.65</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Mean 3.78 SD 0.74</td>
<td>Mean 3.87 SD 0.66</td>
<td>Mean 3.97 SD 0.63</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Mean 3.50 SD 0.73</td>
<td>Mean 3.59 SD 0.67</td>
<td>Mean 3.82 SD 0.52</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Mean 3.56 SD 0.74</td>
<td>Mean 3.59 SD 0.70</td>
<td>Mean 3.76 SD 0.61</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>Mean 3.46 SD 0.64</td>
<td>Mean 3.38 SD 0.67</td>
<td>Mean 3.63 SD 0.64</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean 3.69 SD 0.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean 3.81 SD 0.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean 3.94 SD 0.61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age wise respondents of the present study were categorized into three groups, Age Group 1 (25 to 35), Age Group 2 (36 to 45), and Age Group 3 (46 years and above).
F-values of Cohesion and Confrontation are 4.454 and 3.084; whereas the corresponding p-values are 0.013 and 0.048. The result indicates that, there is significant difference on these two components of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of different age groups. It is also evident that there is no significant difference among remaining eight components of Strategic Leadership across age groups.

Table 5.5.1.2 Strategic Leadership scores across Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the analysis it is evident that advancement in age has a positive influence on Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership. The result also limits that moderately high level of Strategic Leadership is prevalent in the organisation under study.

**Fig. 5.5.1.2 Strategic Leadership scores across Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Mean Values of Strategic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35 (N=41)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 (N=82)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 46 (N=44)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values of Strategic Leadership for respondents of different Age Groups are 3.63, 3.72, and 3.87 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.115.

*Based on the results, \( H_0 \) 7 stating there has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of different Age Groups is accepted.*

### 5.5.2 Strategic Leadership across Job Grades

Job Grade is the second Demographic Variable assessed in the present study. Respondents of the present study are working in four Job Grades. They are 13, 14, 15 and 16. This section presents analysis and discussions on the variation of Strategic Leadership with Job Grades. Table 5.5.2.1 shows the result on extend of prevalence of Strategic Leadership with regard to Job Grades.
Table 5.5.2.1 Strategic Leadership Scores across Job Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Team Effectiveness &amp; Org. Learning</th>
<th>Job Grade 13 (N=60)</th>
<th>Job Grade 14 (N=53)</th>
<th>Job Grade 15 (N=42)</th>
<th>Job Grade 16 (N=12)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.80 (SD 0.69)</td>
<td>3.94 (SD 0.64)</td>
<td>3.958 (SD 0.65)</td>
<td>4.40 (SD 0.29)</td>
<td>2.979</td>
<td>0.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.81 (SD 0.84)</td>
<td>4.01 (SD 0.51)</td>
<td>3.935 (SD 0.58)</td>
<td>4.23 (SD 0.27)</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.87 (SD 0.68)</td>
<td>4.00 (SD 0.58)</td>
<td>3.96 (SD 0.77)</td>
<td>4.31 (SD 0.22)</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>3.94 (SD 0.65)</td>
<td>4.19 (SD 0.68)</td>
<td>3.91 (SD 0.57)</td>
<td>4.42 (SD 0.42)</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.71 (SD 0.76)</td>
<td>3.99 (SD 0.61)</td>
<td>3.74 (SD 0.81)</td>
<td>4.17 (SD 0.39)</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.74 (SD 0.72)</td>
<td>3.84 (SD 0.67)</td>
<td>3.82 (SD 0.72)</td>
<td>4.29 (SD 0.44)</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3.82 (SD 0.64)</td>
<td>3.93 (SD 0.74)</td>
<td>3.76 (SD 0.63)</td>
<td>4.33 (SD 0.50)</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.50 (SD 0.67)</td>
<td>3.60 (SD 0.64)</td>
<td>3.77 (SD 0.62)</td>
<td>3.94 (SD 0.62)</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.52 (SD 0.73)</td>
<td>3.70 (SD 0.67)</td>
<td>3.62 (SD 0.60)</td>
<td>3.90 (SD 0.84)</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>3.36 (SD 0.63)</td>
<td>3.58 (SD 0.61)</td>
<td>3.39 (SD 0.70)</td>
<td>3.75 (SD 0.81)</td>
<td>1.937</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grade 13 (N=60)</th>
<th>Job Grade 14 (N=53)</th>
<th>Job Grade 15 (N=42)</th>
<th>Job Grade 16 (N=12)</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.71 (SD 0.70)</td>
<td>3.88 (SD 0.64)</td>
<td>3.79 (SD 0.67)</td>
<td>4.17 (SD 0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.5.2.1 Graphical representation of Strategic Leadership Scores across Job Grades
F-values of Cohesion and task clarity are 2.979 and 3.590 where as the corresponding p-values are 0.033 and 0.015 respectively. The result indicates that, there has been significant variation of these two components of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of different Job Grades. The results also indicate that for all the remaining eight components there has been no significant variation of these two components of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of different Job Grades.

Table 5.5.2.2 Mean Values of Strategic Leadership for Respondents of Different Job Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG 13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the analysis it is evident that, growth in the Job Grade has a positive influence on Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership. The result also proves that moderately high level of Strategic Leadership is prevalent in the organisation under study.
Mean values of Strategic Leadership for respondents of different Job Grades are 3.63, 3.80, 3.72, and 4.09 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.042.

*Based on the results, H0 stating there has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of different Job Grades is rejected.*

5.5.3 Variation of Strategic Leadership with Educational Qualifications

Respondents of the present study were put to three categories based on their educational qualifications: employees with Diploma & Degree holders, and Post Graduates. This section provides analysis and discussion categories on Strategic Leadership scores across educational categories.

**Table 5.5.3.1 Strategic Leadership Scores across Educational categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Organisational Learning</th>
<th>Diploma N = 11</th>
<th>Degree N=100</th>
<th>Post Grad. N= 56</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Clarity</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-values for Collaboration, Support and Innovation are 3.28, 2.725, and 3.329 where as the p-values are 0.022, 0.046, and 0.021. This result indicates that, there is significant difference in the mean score of Strategic Leadership across Educational categories. The result also indicates that for the remaining seven components there is no significant difference on Strategic Leadership across Educational categories.

Table 5.5.3.2 Strategic Leadership scores across Educational categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the analysis it is evident that, growth in the education qualifications has a positive influence on Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership. The result also indicates that moderately high level of Strategic Leadership is prevalent in the organisation under study.

Fig. 5.5.3.2 Graphical Representation of Strategic Leadership across Educational Categories

Mean values of Strategic Leadership for respondents of different Job Grades are 3.66, 3.72, and 3.79 respectively. The corresponding p-value is 0.672.

Based on the results, $H_0$ stating there has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents having varied Educational Qualifications is accepted.

Next section presents a discussion Organisational Success in the context of scores obtained on Team effectiveness and Organisational Learning.
5.6 Effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success

This section carries a discussion on the relationships between Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success. Team Effectiveness represents one of the dimensions of Strategic Leadership, namely Human Capital Development, whereas Organisational Learning represents other dimension of Strategic Leadership, namely-Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. The organization selected for the present study is a Performance Driven Organisation. Three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were selected to represent the Organisational Success.

Team Effectiveness was studied on seven components: Task clarity, Cohesion, Autonomy, Confrontation, Support, Collaboration and Accountability. Teams with high ratings on these seven components are deemed to be more effective and in turn facilitate the organisation to become successful. As indicated in the review of literature, team building is vitally important to organisational success. Organisational success is the outcome of host of factors like; strategies, structures, processes, people, and cultures (Beckhard, 1969; Bennis. 1969; Büke & Homstein, 1972; Schmuck & Miles, 1971).

ADMA – OPCO is an Operating Company, with a ‘Performance Driven’ Business orientation. It has Key Performance Indicators to monitor its progress and to measure its success. These KPIs are set by ADNOC in agreement with ADMA, on yearly basis. In addition to this, ADMA –OPCO develops five-year Strategic Business Plan, amended each year to accommodate the current year realities. Organisational goals are cascaded downward as Divisional and Team KPIs. Different teams, under Team Leaders, work to achieve these KPIs. Therefore, Team Effectiveness is vital for Organisational Success.

In ADMA – OPCO, KPIs fall under four categories: Health, Safety & Environment (HSE), Production Capacity (Operations), Asset Value and Human Capital. Each KPI
is defined, quantified, documented and notified. These are interpreted as deliverables for each Division or Team in the organisation.

For the present study, three KPIs namely: Oil Spill representing Environmental Protection (falling under HSE), Effective Oil Capacity (representing Production Capacity) and Human Capital Development (as an indicator of KPI focussing on People) were considered as measures of Organisational Success. It has been decided to take mean values of each of these KPIs for the period from 2007 to 2009, for this study.

Remaining part of the Chapter provide analysis of the relationships of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on the selected elements of the Key Performance Indicators as measure of Organisational Success.

5.6.1 Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning with Production Capacity

Main product of ADMA – OPCO is oil, produced from off-shore areas. In addition to oil, the company also produces gas and condensate. ADNOC, the parent company sets annual Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), in agreement with each Operating Company, functioning under its umbrella. Elements of KPI on Production Capacity for ADMA include Crude Oil Production vs. Plan, Effective Oil Capacity, Operating Costs, Drilling / Well Performance, and Asset Integrity Assurance (Annual Report, ADMA – OPCO).

For the present study, one of the above elements of the KPI on Production Capacity, i.e., Effective Oil Capacity has been selected for analysis. Effective Oil Capacity is the measure of Production Capacity, which in turn a measure of Organisational Success. Over the years, the company achieved an increase in its capacity to produce oil and gas from off-shore areas. The new strategic goal for Production Capacity is One Million Barrel Per Day (MMBD), to be achieved by 2019.
As mentioned above, for this study the mean value of Production Capacity for the years 2007 to 2009 is considered. For Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, influence of Job Grades on these two dimensions is considered. The analysis and interpretation of relationship between Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Effective Oil Capacity as a measure of Organisational Success is given below.

**Table 5.6.1-1: Effective Oil Capacity Achievement 2007 – 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Oil Capacity</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (MBD)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (MBD)</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ADMA-OPOC Annual Reports: 2007 – 09.  MBD: Mille Barrels per Day*

**Figure 5.6.1-1: Achievement of Effective Oil Capacity Mean Values of 2007 – 2009**

Table 5.6.1-1 shows the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Effective Oil Capacity for 2007, 2008 and 2009. The target KPIs were 500, 551 and 565 (Mille Barrels per Day (MBD)) for 2007, 2008 and 2009 respectively. Actual achievements for this period were 511, 571 and 543 MBD, respectively. A drop in the capacity in
2009 occurred, mainly due to closing down of wells, unplanned shutdown, and unplanned maintenance. (ADMA – OPCO Annual Plan, 2009).

Figure 5.6.1-1 illustrates the achievement of Production Capacity KPI (Effective Oil Capacity) higher than the target level. The Mean target KPI for the years 2007 to 2009 was 539 MBD where as the actual achievement was 542 MBD. Thus the achievement was above the target level, in spite of a reduction in 2009.

Figure 5.6.1.2: Mean Values on Team Effectiveness (across Job Grades)

In ADMA –OPCO, employees are assigned to various Job Grades. Employees in Job Grades 13 to 16 are professionals working in various teams, who are directly responsible for the achievement of KPIs. The respondents selected for the present study belongs to these Job Grades. Figure 5.6.1-2 shows the relationship between Job Grade and Team Effectiveness. From the figure it is evident that, higher the job grades from 13 to 16, greater the Team Effectiveness, in general. This is particularly true for the employees in Job Grade 16.
Figure 5.6.1-3: Mean Values on Organisational Learning (across Job Grades)

![Mean Values of Organisational Learning Among Respondents of Different Job Grades](image)
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Figure 5.6.1-3, shows the relationship between Job Grades and Organisational Learning. From the figure it is evident that, higher the job grades from 13 to 16, greater the Organisational Learning, in general. This is very evident in the case of the employees in Job Grade 16. Therefore, this positive influence of job grades on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning has direct relationship on achieving KPIs at the divisional as well as organisational levels.

The above analysis indicates a positive effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Production Capacity (Effective Oil Capacity). This in turn indicates a positive influence of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success.

5.6.2 Relationship of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Health, Safety and Environment (HSE)

As an Operating Company functioning in Oil & Gas sector, ADMA - OPCO maintain high standards of Health, Safety and Environment (HSE). ADMA - OPCO has won six ADNOC HSE awards for the year 2009 as recognition for maintaining HSE aspects to International Standards, which also reflect the commitment of the management and employees towards HSE.
For the present study, out of three elements on HSE, one element namely, Environmental Protection was selected. Sub – elements of KPI on Environmental Protection include Flaring, Gas Release and Oil Spill. Oil Spill was selected the present study. Mean value of Oil Spill for the years from 2007 to 2009 was considered. The analysis and interpretation of relationship of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Environmental Protection as a measure of Organisational Success is presented below.

Table 5.6.2-1: Achievement of Control of Oil Spill
(Environmental Protection KPI): 2007 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Oil Spill</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target (not more than)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5.6.2.1: Achievement of Control of Oil Spill
Mean values of 2007 - 2009

Table 5.6.2-1 shows the target KPIs for Control of Oil Spill (Environmental Protection) for 2007 to 2009 and the corresponding achievements in the same period. The KPI was Not More Than One Oil Spill for each year. The achievement in 2007 and 2009 was Zero Spill where as in 2008 one spill.
Figure 5.6.2-1 illustrates the achievement of KPIs for Control of Oil Spill (Environmental Protection) is higher than the target level. The Mean target KPI for the years 2007 to 2009 was not more than one Oil Spill where as the actual achievement was 0.33 Oil Spill, which is lower than the permissible limit, showing an achievement. Thus the achievement was above the target level. It is learnt that one spill occurred in 2008. The reason for the spill was studied and corrective measures were taken. This initiative combined with team work of the employees resulted in achieving zero spills in 2009.

In ADMA –OPCO, employees in Job Grades 13 to 16 are professionals working in various teams, are directly responsible for the achievement of KPIs. The respondents selected for the present study belongs to these Job Grades. Figure 5.6.1-2, and 5.6.1.3 in section 5.6.1, shows the positive relationship between Job Grades on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. From the figures it is evident that, higher the job grades from 13 to 16, greater the Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, in general. This is particularly true for the employees in Job Grade 16. As employees in higher job grades are more responsible in maintaining high standards of HSE, the positive influence of job grades on Team Effectiveness has direct relationship on achieving KPI in this area.

The above analysis indicates a positive effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on HSE (Environmental Protection). This in turn proves the positive influence of Team Effectiveness on the Organisational Success.

5.6.3 Relationship of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning to Human Resource Development

ADMA’s manpower includes employees representing more than forty nationalities. They form the mix of cultures, languages, skills and expertise, working in various teams to achieve the Organisational goals. This is evident from the list of core values in the organisation. First item in the list of ADMA’s core values is ‘People’. The top management gives importance to the development of its Human Capital. Manpower Development Division, with three different teams namely Competency Assurance
Management System (CAMS), learning and Development (L&D), and Professional Ladder (P/L) Teams under, is responsible for the task of Human Resource Development.

CAMS Team is responsible for the development of new recruits. Through a structured and systematic development road map, the new recruits are continuously supported in their development, until they are integrated into independent posts. Each Trainee under the CAMS programme is assigned with a coach and a Technical Mentor to support the development and governed by a Personal Development Plan. Employees at higher Job Grades play an important role in this process of Human Resource Development.

Talent Management Programme is a Human Capital Development mechanism for high performers. The system offers a ‘fast track’ career progression for those who are substantially high in their performance. 32 Young Nationals were selected in 2008 in the first phase of this programme. In this process also employees at higher job grades are involved heavily, facilitating the ‘knowledge transfer’ to the new generation.

Learning and Development Team coordinate and organize internal as well as external training programmes. These training programmes include formal or informal courses, job attachments, opportunity training, and on-the-job training. The training programmes are aligned with training needs and monitored on the basis of the Personal Development Plans, developed by the trainee and approved by the Team Leader as well as Divisional Manager. The team has conducted 2430 total training events in 2008, where as in 2009 there were 2046 such events. Internal training programmes, especially attachments, opportunity training, and on-the-job training are coordinated and managed by employees working in higher grades.

Professional Ladder Team is responsible for Professional Ladder System. The system is both a competency assurance mechanism as well as career progression road map. Employees selected for promotions to next higher grade are assessed by a panel of experts, based on competency elements descriptions developed by experts in the field. The assessment is done on the technical, business and behavioural competencies of
the individual. Therefore, promotions in ADMA are based on competencies, but not on length of service. Employees at higher grades facilitate the preparation of their subordinates for this process.

Each Year, ADNOC sets Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for People Development, in agreement with ADMA. These KPIs include Nationalisation, Junior Integration, Recruitment, and People Development. People Development for the years from 2007 to 2009 is taken for the present study, as a measure of Organisational Success. The target for this element is marked as Milestones, which represent CAMS Implementation, Management of Progress of Graduates, Planning and Delivery of Quality Training Programmes, Implementation of Competency Assurance System for Operators and Technicians, and Training and Development of Non-CAMS Personnel.

The analysis and interpretation of relationship between Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Human Resource Development as a measure of Organisational Success is shown below.

Table 5.6.3-1: Achievement of Human Resource Development 
(KPI on Human Capital) 
2007 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Development</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6.3-1 shows the KPIs on People Development for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 - both the targets as well as achievements. Target KPIs, representing 'Number of Milestones Completed', for the time period from 2007 to 2009 are 8, 8, and 7 whereas the achievements are 12, 12 and 10.5 respectively. Figure 5.6.3-1 illustrates that ADMA's achievement of People Development KPI is higher than the targeted level. The mean value for the period from 2007 to 2009 was 7.66 whereas that for the achievement was 11.5.

Employees in Job Grades 13 to 16 are professionals working in various teams, who are directly responsible for the achievement of KPIs in the organisation selected for the study. Figures 5.6.1-2, and 5.6.1.3 in section 5.6.1, shows the relationship of Job Grades on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. From the figures it is evident that, higher the job grades from 13 to 16, greater the Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, in general. This is particularly evident in the case of employees working in Job Grade 16. Employees in higher job grades are more responsible in Human Resource Development process. Their work involves in coordination, coaching and training. Therefore, the positive influence of job grades on Team Effectiveness has direct relationship on achieving KPI in this area.
This support the observation made in Senge's (1990) framework of Organisational Learning, the five disciplines inherent, which are: (1) Personal Mastery, (2) Mental Model, (3) Building Shared Vision, (4) Team Learning, and (5) Systems Thinking. The findings also support Senge’s belief that these five "component technologies" are gradually converging to innovate learning organisation. Further, Senges view of creating conducive learning environment cannot be done without commitment from the top also is evident from the findings. The result also supports Slater and Narver’s view of importance of communicating well-crafted and motivating vision by the leaders, who have a personal, high commitment to learning. They view learning as a key ingredient in achieving competitive advantage.

The above analysis indicates a positive effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Human Resource Development (KPI on People Development). This in turn proves the positive influence of Team Effectiveness on the Organisational Success.

5.7 Conclusion: Relationship of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success

Analysis on the influence of the Age, Job Grade and Educational Qualification on the Team Effectiveness in the organization selected for the present study proves that, higher Age, Job Grade and Educational Qualification lead to higher Team Effectiveness. Also this is been supported by the review of literature. Studies on diversity show that creativity and motivation are greater in teams whose members differ according to age, skill or functional background (Iles and Hayers 1997; Jackson 1996).

In ADMA – OPCO, Human Capital is a mix of people of more than forty nationalities. They differ in Culture, Age, Languages, Job Grades, and their Educational background. The employees work in various Teams under more than thirty Divisions in six Business Units.
Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning represent two dimensions of Strategic Leadership namely Human Capital Development Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture. They were studied in terms of their effect on Organisational Success. As an Operating Company ADMA -OPCO is functioning based on Performance Driven Philosophy. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are being set by the parent company, ADNOC, in agreement with ADMA. Out of four main KPIs, three sub-elements were taken as measure of Organisational Success. They are Effective Oil Capacity, representing Production Capacity, Oil Spill representing Environmental Protection under Health, Safety and Environment (HSE), and People Development representing KPI on People.

The study indicates the positive influence of Team Effectiveness and Organisational learning on the above three selected measures of Organisational Success. Mean values of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were found generally increasing with the Job Grades, except in one. This general trend of higher Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning with the growth of Job Grades shows a positive influence on achievement of KPIs on Production Capacity, HSE and People Development.

Other demographic variables, namely Age and Educational Qualification also were found influencing the Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning positively. The study indicates that higher the age and educational qualifications of the employees, greater the value of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. Therefore similar relationship as in the case of Job Grades also could be established in the case of age and educational qualifications.

The study proves the positive effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success. As these represent two important dimensions of Strategic leadership, it could also be concluded that, a positive influence of Strategic Leadership on Organisational Success is prevalent in the organisation selected for the study.
Chapter-6
Summary of Findings, Recommendations
And Directions for Future Research

6.1 Introduction

This study attempted to assess the effects of Strategic Leadership Dimensions on Organisational Success. Strategic Leadership was assessed through Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. Team Effectiveness represented one of the dimensions of Strategic Leadership selected i.e, Human Capital Development, whereas Organisational Learning represented the other dimension, i.e. developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture.

This chapter provides a summary of findings of the present study. The findings associated with the selected three demographic variables as well as the two dimensions of Strategic Leadership are summarized. The chapter also highlights the managerial implications of the study. Limitations of the study and indications for future research are presented at the end of the chapter.

6.2 Overall Result

The study revealed a positive effect of Strategic Leadership on Organisational Success. Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning were assessed representing the two dimensions, Human Capital Development and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture.

Team Functioning and Team Empowerment are the two aspects of Team Effectiveness. Together they possess seven components namely, Cohesion, Confrontation, Collaboration, Task clarity, Autonomy, support, and Accountability. Organisational Learning has three components i.e, Innovation, Implementation, and
Stabilisation. These ten components were assessed in the present study. The results showed a positive influence of all the components, in general.

The overall findings indicated the prevalence of Strategic Leadership and its positive influence on Organisational Success.

Next section presents brief discussion on the summary of the findings on the effects of Demographic variables.

6.3 Results of Effect of Demographic Variables

This section provides a summary of findings on relationships between the selected three demographic variables on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.

6.3.1 Age

The study revealed a positive relationship between the Age and Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning, in general. The results of the analysis proved that, higher the age of the employee, better the values of Team Effectiveness and organisational Learning. The mean values for Team Effectiveness for the age groups of 25 to 35, 35 to 45, and 46 and above were 3.76, 3.92, and 4.01, respectively. Mean values of Organisational Learning for the same age groups were 3.50, 3.52, and 3.73. The results indicate moderately high values of both Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational learning. This also limits at the positive influence of Age on both Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.

6.3.2 Job Grade

The study proved that the higher the Job Grade of the employees, higher are the Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning, in general. Mean values of Team Effectiveness for Job Grades from 13 to 16 were 3.80, 3.98, 3.84, and 4.31. Though the value for the Job Grade 15 was proportionately low, the results shown a general trend of increase in Team Effectiveness with job grade. Likewise mean values of Organisational Learning for the same Job Grades were 3.46, 3.62, 3.59, and 3.86. This
result also indicates moderately high values of Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning. The results also shows the general tendency of growth in Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning, with the increase of Job Grades, though the value for Job Grade 15 is not proportionately increasing.

6.3.3 Educational Background

Result of the study indicated a positive influence of Educational background with Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning. The mean values of Team Effectiveness for Educational Qualifications of Diploma, Degree and Post Graduation were 3.81, 3.87, and 4.00 respectively. Mean values of Organisational Learning for the respondents with the same educational qualifications were 3.51, 3.58, and 3.58. These values are showing moderately high presence of both Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. The results also prove the positive relationship of educational background on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning.

6.4 Results of Effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success

This section of the chapter provides a summary of findings of the study on the effects of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success. Three Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Production Capacity, Environmental Protection, and Human Resource Development were measured representing Organisational Success. Sections 6.3.1 to 6.3.3 provide the summary of results on these variables.

6.4.1 Effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Production Capacity

The results of the study revealed that, higher the Job Grade, greater is the Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. The results show presence of both these aspects at moderately high level. This has very positive influence in achieving team objectives and thus the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Target KPIs for Effective Oil Capacity for 2007, 2008 and 2009 were 500, 557 and 565 (MBD) respectively.
Actual achievements for this period were 511, 571 and 543 MBD, respectively. The mean target KPI was 539 MBD where as the actual achievement was 542 MBD. The achievement was above the target level, showing a positive influence of Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning on Production Capacity, in turn the Organisational Success.

6.4.2 Effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Environmental protection

KPIs for Environmental Protection (Oil Spill) for 2007, 2008 and 2009 was Not More Than One Spill for each year. The achievement was Zero Spill in 2007 and 2009 where as in 2008 there was a single spill. Though the mean value of target for the three years, from 2007 to 2009 is not more than one spill in terms of Environmental Protection KPI, the actual was only 0.33, which is lower than the allowable limit, showing an achievement. The results of the study proved that higher the Job Grade, greater the Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. This has very positive influence in achieving team objectives and thus Divisional KPIs. Thus the results show a positive influence of team work and Environmental Protection, and in turn the Organisational Success.

6.4.3 Effect of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Human Resource Development

The Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning facilitate the process of People Development in any organisation. For the organisation under study, Target KPIs on People Development for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 were 8, 8, and 7 respectively. The corresponding achievements for the same period were 12, 12 and 10.5 respectively. For the study, mean values of the target as well as achievements were taken. The mean value for the period from 2007 to 2009 was 7.66 where as that for the achievement was 11.5. The process of Human Resource Development is mainly coordinated and managed by employees at higher levels. Respondents of the present study belong to these job grades. The present study shows a positive influence of Job
Grades on Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning, which have direct influence on Human Resource Development process in the organisation, and ion achieving the KPI. Thus the study proves a positive influence of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Human Resource Development, and thus Organisational Success.

6.5. Results of Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H01</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents of various age groups.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H02</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents of various job grades.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H03</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Team Effectiveness amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H04</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents of various age groups.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H05</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents of various job grades.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H06</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference in Organisational Learning amongst respondents having varied educational qualifications.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H07</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of various Age Groups.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H08</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents of various Job Grades.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H09</td>
<td>There has been no significant difference of Strategic Leadership amongst respondents having varied Educational Qualifications.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the analysis, interpretations and findings, out of nine Null Hypotheses, seven were accepted. The findings indicate a general tendency of positive influence on relationships between the variables analysed.

6.6 Findings and Managerial Implications of the Study

This study attempted to assess the prevalence of Strategic Leadership in the organisation selected for the study. Intention of the study was to provide a clearer understanding of the relationship of the two selected dimensions of Strategic Leadership namely, Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning on Organisational Success, which reflects the effect of the Strategic Leadership itself. The study provides important theoretical contributions expanding on previous knowledge and literature of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. For advancing the field theoretically, this work is one of the first known studies to directly link Organisational Learning and Team Effectiveness as the two most important dimensions of Strategic Leadership.

This study helps Top Management to identify key components that may be more critical in a dynamic business environment, and to lead the organisation towards success. The results could be utilized in fostering greater Team Effectiveness within and between the teams. Findings with respect to demographic variables need to be used more effectively for building better bonds in the teams. The diversity of the work force is to be considered as a real strength of the organisation. Team cohesiveness, interpersonal relationships, and communication could be further strengthened among members of the team and with other teams. Various team building exercises also could be carried out based on the findings.

Managers could effectively manage and utilize the components of Organisational Learning, including systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer and integration. Sub – systems of Organisational Learning, i.e, Innovation, Implementation and Stabilisation need to be clearly understood and imparted to the teams so that the process of learning is enhanced. The diverse mix of
the Human Capital, if motivated properly would act as better facilitating factor for learning and knowledge transfer.

Results of the study could be utilized to integrate the key components of Organisational Learning and Team Effectiveness. The study revealed the relationships of these components in employees of different age groups, job grades, and educational backgrounds. These key aspects have significant relationship in the organisation. Therefore, if strengthened, these would support to develop and sustain competitive advantage.

The findings could be utilized for training need analysis, formulating training courses and developing evaluation criteria. These criteria could be utilized before, during and after the training or developmental programmes. Various Leadership Development Programmes also could be organised out based on the research findings. To maximize the benefits of Organisational learning, managers and team leaders should provide other resources to support its effectiveness and create new opportunities.

**Major findings of the study along with recommendations are presented in the Table 6.6.1.**

### Table 6.6.1: Major findings and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Team Effective Components: Seven components of Team Effectiveness (cohesion, confrontation, collaboration, task clarity, autonomy, support, and accountability) have exhibited a positive trend with the growth in age, job grade, and educational qualifications. However, two components, support and autonomy were not proportionately significant</td>
<td>The findings could be utilized in training need analysis. The results would form valuable information on conceptualising, formulating and conducting team building exercises. It would be advisable to develop a learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as others.</td>
<td>environment to strengthen the less significant components like Support and Autonomy in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organisational Learning Components: <em>(innovation, implementation, and stabilisation)</em> have shown a positive relationship: they have shown a trend of growth with the increase in age, job grade as well as educational qualifications. However, the third component, stabilisation was less significant in certain levels and situations.</td>
<td>The result could be utilized in integrating different models in learning design. <em>Stabilisation</em> could be strengthened through various review and monitoring mechanisms. Pre and post assessment techniques for learning could be used to assess the progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Components of both Team Functioning and Team Empowerment demonstrated a positive growth with age. However these were less significant for the age group of 25 to 35 years.</td>
<td>Future research with large samples to measure the components of both Team Functioning and Team Empowerment at the age group of 25 to 35 in components is recommended. The results could be incorporated in the remedial measures taken to integrate this age group into the mainstream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Components of Team Effectiveness were found showing a positive growth with increase in job grades, but these for job grade 15 were found less significant.</td>
<td>Enhancing the skills further through leadership and talent programs for the particular segment could help boost up the existing climate, thus minimizing the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Components of Team Effectiveness as well as Organisational Learning were found increasing with the increase in educational qualifications. However, the values were found less significant for people with Diploma, as their educational background.</td>
<td>The existing Competency Development programs should focus on improving the team effectiveness and organizational learning elements in the development framework to this group with lower educational background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Autonomy is a component of team effectiveness. Though the values of the component have indicated a positive trend of increase with growth in Job Grade, the value was low for respondents in Job Grade 16.</td>
<td>The respondents in this Job Grade are more experienced and with high educational background. Measures to ensure guaranteeing better involvement of this segment of employees in decision making, setting priorities and freedom in selecting solutions are recommended. In the meantime, importance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Components of Organisational Learning were found showing a positive trend of growth with increase in job grades. However, increase of these components between the age groups 25-35 and 36 – 45 was very marginal.</td>
<td>While sustaining the existing conditions, better motivational measures are recommended to enhance the learning and application attitudes. The available system of rewarding best innovation could be strengthened further and implemented into a wider circle to encourage learning and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Organisational Learning, demonstrated a positive growth with job grades. However, for respondents in job grade 15, the values for two components namely <em>implementation</em> and <em>stabilisation</em>, were less significant compare to the employees of other four job grades studied.</td>
<td><em>Stabilisation</em> could be strengthened through various review and monitoring mechanisms. Pre and post assessment techniques for learning could be used to assess the progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational qualifications were found showing a positive influence on Organisational Learning.</td>
<td>Spearheading educational development of employees in the organization as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The values are high for respondents with higher educational background.</td>
<td>initiative is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The existing study leave process could be further enhanced. The current Master Degree Sponsorship program could be offered to a wider population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These measures would facilitate Organisational Learning and in turn Organisational Success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Demographic Variables were found positively affecting both the team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. This supports previous studies that revealed the facilitating nature of heterogeneous teams.</td>
<td>Adopting an integrative approach like creating a right cultural mix and capabilities will enhance the already proven team functioning. This will facilitate better learning and team effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning positively influence achievement of KPIs.</td>
<td>Communicating results and recognizing achievements through awards and rewards will enhance the existing environment so that the performance is further improved and results are enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership influences Organisational Success positively.</td>
<td>Further strengthening the systems, initiatives and measures to improve the dimensions of Strategic Leadership, including Human Capital Development and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture is recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Directions for Future Research

The present study points towards the scope of further research considering the following suggestions:

- Research on the effect of more dimensions of Strategic Leadership could be conducted. Only two dimensions of the Strategic Leadership, Developing Human Capital and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture, were selected in the present study. Further research involving more dimensions like building competitive advantages, fostering ethical practice, and establishing management controls, would reveal more insights into the subject area.

- Study involving more organizations would reveal better understanding of the subject. The present study was conducted in one organisation, due to many reasons, explained earlier. Further research by covering respondents of more organisations would provide better insights.

- Research covering more geographical regions would provide wider perspective on the subject. Scope of the present study was confined to United
Arab Emirates. More study covering wider geographical areas would give better perspectives.

- Study covering broader respondent base. Employees of one organisation working in Job Grades from 13 to 16 only were covered in the present study. Future research by involving wider and larger sample size would provide more insights into the subject.

- This study finds that job grade at a particular range (Grade 15) does not show significant effects on Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. Future research is needed to conceptualize the measurement of Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership commitment to understand the aspect.

- The present study revealed a particular age group (36 to 45 years) not showing significant influence on Organisational Learning, as other age group did. This also could be studied in further studies.

- Research covering both public and private sector enterprises also would be beneficial. Management and leadership styles vary in private and public sector enterprises. More studies involving both of these sectors would yield different perspectives on the subject area.

- Only three demographic variables, Age, Job Grade, and educational Qualification were studied in the present study. Research studies measuring more dimensions like years of experience, culture, family type, language, nationalities etc. would reveal more insights into the area of research.

6.8 Summary

The study revealed a positive influence of the two dimensions of Strategic Leadership namely, Developing Human Capital and Developing and Sustaining an Effective Organisational Culture on Organisational Success. The result proves that Strategic Leadership influences Organisational Success.
The research study has helped gain deeper understanding on the relationships of Team Effectiveness and Organisational Learning. The results of the study could be utilized for developing strategies to strengthen the system which would lead to higher success rates of the organisation. The findings would be valuable inputs in training need analysis, developing concepts, objectives and criteria for training and development aspects, and formulating training course contents. They could be used for developing various Leadership Development initiatives and Team Building exercises.

Insights revealed as a result of the study on Organisational Learning could be utilized for further strengthening the teams in the organisation and in turn encouraging the knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer platforms, creating and maintaining knowledge based organisation as well as knowledge society.

The study provides important theoretical contributions expanding on previous knowledge and literature on Team Effectiveness, Organisational Learning, and Strategic Leadership. For advancing the field, this work is one of its kind directly linking Organisational Learning and Team Effectiveness through a mediating effect of Strategic Leadership, particularly in Oil & Gas Industry as well as in UAE. Moreover, methodology and results of the present study could be used as a spring board for future research.
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Appendix-1

A Study on the Effect of Strategic Leadership Dimensions on Organizational Success
Survey Questionnaire

The purpose of this instrument is to collect data on how your organization is perceived by its significant members. Please read each item and tick mark the item to indicate how much the statement is true about your organization.

**Part I** Please rate your team/group on the following 28 items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Always Happens</th>
<th>Frequently happens</th>
<th>Sometimes happens</th>
<th>Occasionally Happens</th>
<th>Almost never happens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goals of the team are well defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Members of the team generally feel that their concerns and views are ignored by the other members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The team has enough freedom to decide its way for working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Members generally avoid discussing the problem facing the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The team is given adequate resources the carry out is functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members do not volunteer to help others and to take responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The sense of responsibility and accountability is pretty high amongst the team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is confusion amongst members of the team about its main tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Members support each other when required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The team only carries out the tasks given to it; it cannot decide its own priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The team generates alternative solutions for a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The team does not get adequate support needed to perform its tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In the group the tasks divided into small teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No one cares to assess true extent of achievement of the goals of the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Each member knows what its / her role in the team is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This team does not function as a strong team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The members of the team have enough freedom in their own areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>There is lot of hesitation in taking hard decision in this team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The team has enough competent persons needed for his work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Members in this team hesitate to ask for others' help when they need help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The team uses appropriate ways of assessing its accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Members of this team are not clear how to work towards the team goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Members back the decisions taken by the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The team does not have autonomy in vital aspects of its working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Members in this group do not hesitate to express their differences with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There is lack of various of resources (human and financial) required by the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Members respond positively to the help requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The team does not have internal mechanism of accessing its progress in achieving its tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix-2

Part II Please rate your organization on the following 23 items on organizational learning.

Please tick mark in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Always done</th>
<th>Frequently done</th>
<th>Sometimes done</th>
<th>Occasionally done</th>
<th>Never done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experts and experienced creative practitioners are invited to share their ideas with members of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to attend external programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experiences and concerns of the organization are shared with other organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to experiment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Innovations are rewarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Periodic meetings are held for sharing results of experiments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Periodic meetings are held for sharing on-going experiments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Employees seminars on new developments are organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tasks groups are created for implementing and monitoring new projects and experiments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Detailed plans reflecting contingency approaches are prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tasks groups are created to examine common elements between old practices and innovations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Newly proposed practices are linked with known practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Records of experiences are maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Periodic meetings, chaired by top or senior management are held to review innovations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Relevant existing skills are utilized in implementing change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Task groups are created for data based on the innovations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Periodic meetings are held to review and share experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Task groups are created to evaluate and report on plus- and minus aspects of innovations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tasks groups are created to follow up on experiments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wide spread debates are held on experiences of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Realistic appraisals are made of the support needed for continued use of innovations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Implementation plans are modified when experience indicates that modification is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Various groups are encouraged to prepare alternative forms of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide your personal details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification: Diploma / Degree / Post Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your time and support for filling this questionnaire.