

University of Chester



**This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester’s
online research repository**

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Linda Lee-Davies

Title: Collaborative leadership skills: The contribution of a shared leadership model
in sustaining leadership longevity

Date: June 2013

Originally published as: University of Chester PhD thesis by publication

Example citation: Lee-Davies, L. (2013). *Collaborative leadership skills: The
contribution of a shared leadership model in sustaining leadership longevity*.
(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Chester, United Kingdom.

Version of item: Submitted version

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/311021>

**Collaborative Leadership Skills:
The Contribution of a Shared Leadership
Model in Sustaining Leadership Longevity**

**Supporting document submitted in accordance with the requirements
of**

The University of Chester

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by publication

by

Linda Lee-Davies

June 2013

Acknowledgements

My wholehearted thanks to:

Professor Caroline Rowland who guided me to channel my published research with clear direction. Professor Rowland's no nonsense advice and detailed knowledge in the field was mixed with an approachable elegance which made this research journey enjoyable.

Professor Nada Kakabadse who started me on my research journey and introduced me to a new world of philosophical expression and discovery. Nada motivated me with her dedication and passion for leadership and its application in the real world.

Contents

Abstract	
Introduction - Personal Context	p5
Research Context	p7
Research Design and Methodology	p11
Model Development	p15
Pre 2007 Publications	p16
Publications	p20
Some Additional Thoughts on the Research Questions that Inform the Published Papers	p33
Conclusion	p41
Limitations of Research	p43
Evidence of Impact and Contribution	p43
Further Areas of Exploration	p46
References	p47

Appendices

Appendix 1	Peer Review of Conference Paper
Appendix 2	Statements of Contribution

Abstract

This is the supporting documentation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by publication. The research explores shared leadership and investigates its component parts in terms of leader and organizational longevity. A collection of the presented papers represent separate published research projects culminating in a 6D framework. Leadership – Default, Discretion, Dilemma, Deliberative Inquiry, Dialogue and Direction. The framework is equally divided into Individual and Corporate focus. It presents a collection of skills sets and attitudes which enable the modern leader to achieve more sustainable personal and organizational success.

The methodology uses a balance of empirical and conceptual approaches which included a mix of primary interview and survey with a leaning towards qualitative data extraction. In depth semi-structured interviews from diagonal samples were used. These came from both local and international sources. An applied research approach was maintained for most relevance to leaders and the provided comment formed an inductive route on which to derive new theory. The results were analysed with an interpretivist approach.

The research findings and conclusions show that developing a distinct awareness of leadership self and reactions contributes highly to the ability to serve the organizational need. Additionally, the research showed that considered approaches to achieve higher quality information from staff contributed to a better level of strategic alignment.

The published shared leadership concepts and models benefitted from peer review in the academic community, in journals and at conference. These resulted in more robust contributions to modern opinions on distributed/collaborative leadership. The 6D framework, along with other original models from the author, have been used extensively with business people at different levels of leadership. Their use has contributed to the leadership impact and further understanding during times of great economic pressure, social and technological change.

Introduction – Personal Context

My interest in leadership was first cultivated by childhood triggers including Brownies, Guides, church and school activities such as House Captain. Then, as a girl in a traditional working class household where there were limited expectations of study, I was channelled into nursing where the journey of becoming a Staff nurse brought many leadership issues and skills to my door.

I left nursing and entered into the business world – learning sales at the hard end in dealing with many types of company learned how their structures worked. My next move into the hard selling world of recruitment then put me in branch manager positions which highlighted many of the operational management aspects I now refer to when dealing with more strategic matters. At this point I signed up for a first degree and completed it as well as funded it myself while working full time. This was to influence the way I wrote in academia and the way I taught. I progressed in recruitment to run a large section of the UK for a major firm building up leadership and business running skills which now took me into remote leadership as well as leading technical change at the time of the internet changing the face of how we worked.

Some years later, I signed up for an MBA at Henley and found this focused my thinking. As a mature student, I benefitted from the discussions and being allowed to think for myself and create opinionated pieces of work. The MBA, which I completed at 40, refined how I focused my approaches and ideas but it wasn't until I met up with Professor Nada Kakabadse that my real academic journey began. The papers that make up this journey are included in this submission. In writing them I have found engaging areas of study that apply to my working life and have been developed in my thinking and practises. I have been able to put the research straight back into the business community as I have remained active in that and in turn this ensures my ideas and practice continue to be current when teaching, researching and writing.

I am keen to complete a PhD in a field I am fully engaged with, and where I feel I have an academic and business contribution to make for some time to come. I attained my

first degree at 30, an MBA at 40 and now I am working for a PhD at 50 so believe that I can truly offer business and academia a different approach.

On reflection, this research journey has had a large impact on how I see the world. The evolutionary changes in my thinking during the process have actually been revolutionary in final result. Prior to learning such research techniques and being stimulated by analysing data with high level thinkers with energetic, academic arguments different to my own, my view of matters was limited and my opinions stemmed from much narrower data sets, often with conclusions already formed from my commercial experience and often with generalisations. Objectivity, though I perhaps would not have admitted it at the time, was limited and greatly improved through the research journey. This work and this journey furnished a greater democracy and equalism in my thinking as well as unveiling an ability to be innovative and creative with ideas. This, with my experience in the business world gave me the confidence that my contribution to research in this field could be valuable.

Research Context

This research journey set out to embrace the many views of how leadership is evolving in the second decade of the 21st century within one rounded concept which assists the modern leader in auditing their own leadership skills portfolio. By exploring the hard and soft skills of leadership facilitation (Bass, 1985) and respecting its application in the real world as the study progresses, an accurate picture of executive need can emerge and a model devised which may be of practical use.

This journey highlights the necessity for proactive, adaptable and rounded leadership service from the key figureheads to ensure business success for the present time but also forms useful pointers as to where leadership is heading and therefore what current leaders need to consider now to shape themselves up for that future (Pearce, 2007).

Fast changing times mean leaders who rely on administrative or character strengths and traits alone will be left behind along with the companies or institutions for which they hold responsibility (Bolden, 2011). The inevitable natural selection in a world where international business is now at the 'qwerty' fingertip presents the necessity for leaders to acquire a portfolio of skills which can be interchanged easily and rapidly for present and predicted situations. Equally, the more sophisticated and better educated employee with access to more information than ever before expects a more individual leadership service to fulfil their needs at work as well as the basic material ones (Gordon, 2010). This renders the leader who had relied on blanket instruction and punitive inspection obsolete in the fresh modern environment of service to the internal customer as well as the external customer.

With this in mind, the research aims of this submission are focused on the study and data capture of the personal skills the leader must now have to shape up for and to this internal and external environment as well as the corporate mechanisms – hard and soft – which enable the leader to secure the right data themselves to make the right tactical and strategic decisions for their organization (Parnell, 2011). The research aims gave equal

value to both the personal and corporate qualities necessary for adaptability and therefore future success in terms of leadership longevity borne of a shared leadership approach.

The academic investigation and discussion is also geared to contribute to executive education and learning. The robust underpinning is translated into a useable model which prompts Socratic thinking and encourages the leaders to refine their service to the follower and to their company. The research, discussion and resulting thinking is also of high value to the author who wishes to contribute in a practical way to the wider business community as well as enrich academic delivery to executive students. The emphasis on top management in the study is deliberate to investigate how a shared approach comes from the leader in their methods, manner and make-up rather than focus the contribution on the already well covered ground of follower perspective and division of responsibility.


Overall Research Aim

To explore the component parts of Shared Leadership and develop a new shared leadership model which incorporates them

The above overall vision of the study contains six individual research projects aimed to:

1. explore the individual aspects of leadership character and *default*
2. investigate how leaders used their *discretionary* power
3. test how leaders faced temptation/*dilemma*
4. observe and comment on how leaders find out what they need to know to make the best decisions – *deliberative inquiry*
5. discuss how leaders can effect better communication networks and systems – *dialogue*
6. argue the advantages and disadvantages of creating the future vision – *direction*

The Original 6D Framework Working Concept



Aims 1-6 were all subsequently tested by peer review, by published paper and conference presentation. The six explorations above provided a rounded range of areas to study both individual and corporate aspects of leadership. This research culminated in a structured model. This model was presented at The European Conference for Management, Governance and Leadership with a peer reviewed paper in October 2011. This was well received with excellent standards noted for, inter alia, contribution to academic debate.

The six specific research aims work with each other and align to form the overall purpose of the paper in terms of forming a shared leadership model with each component part carefully researched in order to strengthen both the overall study and the model developed from that study.

In addition to these specific studies and their subsequent published papers, context for collaborative approaches which render the leader greater longevity is provided by a range of similarly themed papers which draw on technological leadership dilemmas, social leadership obligations and international leadership comparatives. These studies were deliberately chosen to complement the inward research into shared leadership skills set and demonstrate the awareness of a number of external influences.

This document sets out to provide an in depth view of the component parts of shared leadership and thus provide a vehicle for that understanding as well as a Socratic stimulus for the executive to continually look out for ways for their own leadership development.

Research Design and Methodology

A new and original model of shared leadership is formed from six previous publications by the same authors as well as selected leadership literature reviews resulting in interesting and novel propositions. These were underpinned by empirical studies as well as conceptual argument. Four of the publications are empirical in nature with dedicated research studies sourcing relevant qualitative data alongside relevant literary argument and these are complemented by two conceptual papers which explore the ideas further through appropriate literature review. This mix will marry both theory and practice (Tranfield & Starkey 1998) to produce academic rigour with practical relevance (Hodgkinson et al., 2001).

Overall, the research methodology reflects an inductive route allowing theory to develop as factors emerge (Creswell, 1994) and interpretivist approach (Bryman and Bell, 2003), as context was considered in interpretation and rigidity avoided by allowing evolution of approach as understanding of the meanings of the qualitative data brought new light to the study (Easterby-Smith et al. 2008). This lies within phenomenological patterns (Collis and Hussey, 2003) given the nature of the research process which evolves theory from analysis as opposed to applying theory up front in a more mechanistic way and the nature of which is difficult to quantify (Collis & Hussey, 2003). It is recognized that the subsequent data collected is then subject to the interpretative abilities and biases of the authors as well as the axiology of the participants.

Also, in terms of ontological and epistemological assumptions each studied individual had their own sense of reality and indeed there are multiple realities (Collis and Hussey, 2009) as well as individual and multiple experiences feeding that knowledge of the environment in which they sit and observe with or without influencing it (Ghauri and Gronhaug, 2010; McNeil, 2005). The methodology incorporates semi-structured interviews but a positivist influence was not intended at the outset.

However, in the sense that structured measures were taken to ensure the data collection and that research meetings translating that data involved several independent opinions

merging to collate themes, it would be fair to acknowledge that positivist generalizations were present (Remenyi et al, 1998) though Comptian exactness was never expected (Pickering, 2009). On reflection, the neutral methods of data collection used where the researchers remained independent of the social actors, do fit with positivism and every care was taken to ensure that influence from the researchers was minimal at this stage. Though the aim was interpretivist, and indeed this proved the case when the generalizations or themes were extracted from the data in that, inevitably, the author's background, and that of fellow researchers, did influence interpretation of the data, it is clear that the research methods used had a positivist start. Further, though starting with a value free and objective approach, and the axiology evolving into interpretivism in the research discussion group, some degree of pragmatism was also evident on reflection. Translation of the data collected, despite attempts to be objective, clearly contained subjective views of the author and fellow researchers. The author's overall method then could be held to be 'Popperist' in nature sitting inside post positivism (Philips and Burbules, 2000). This approach also contains aspects of positive illumination as new ideas and angles emerged during the research processes (McNiff & Whitehead 2000).

To appeal to practitioners and be of most relevance to leaders in organizations an applied research approach was maintained throughout the studies (Saunders et al 2009). This all thus triangulated to get a fuller and richer picture of the experiences collected (Ghauri and Gronhaug,2010; Hussey and Hussey, 1997)nourishes the overall argument. The ontological position of the participants and the authors (Jankowicz, 2007) will also impact on the interpretivist outcomes and the perception of the reality.

Research Context

The four empirical studies in four of the chosen papers do contain research that was at the time of capture gained in context to the organizational environment – both internal and external. The retrospective triangulation of all of these studies can also then be considered in even more strategic context in terms of being future led and therefore advisory for that new competitive environment.

Research Design

The literature review was designed to underpin the area of shared leadership in broad academic terms as well as triage a more focused understanding through the six component parts of the developed leadership model. The six peer reviewed papers, four of which are formal PhD submissions for this exercise, which directly formed the model contained an even mix of empirical and conceptual approaches. The further eight peer reviewed papers, six of which are formal PhD submission for this exercise, and the two book chapters and two books, furnished literature and research which both penetrated deeper into the chosen leadership components and provided broader environmental context eg. Technological and international elements influencing the argument.

Within the published papers some case study work was deliberately used so a number of depths of research existed within the overall offering and to give a more personal and real flavour of the research in context to actual events in business (Cresswell 1994; Maylor and Blackmon, 2005). Though some would argue that case studies do not augment the scientific argument (Kennedy, 1976), others outline how they complement contemporary approaches linked to work (Yin, 2009)

A mixed, primary research methodology of interview and survey is threaded through the published papers with a leaning towards qualitative data extraction. Samples were also chosen through the papers to represent different levels of leader in different fields of business such as public sector, commerce etc. This assisted the limitation of any research bias (Maylor & Blackmon 2005).

With generous access to multiple data sources, the mixed methodology approach arising from the themed study by publication gave rise to more strategic triangulation analyses. Primary data was not collected by formal questionnaire given the less precise and more cognitive nature of the skills investigated. It was accepted they may have added some basic quantitative elements but such closed collection gathers only what is directly asked (Partington, 2002) so answers would not have been in depth enough to explore more holistic areas of the leadership skills mix.

The benefits of the research were fully explained to participants at all levels with clarification of the rights and protection of the respondents to obtain their informed consent (Cooper and Schindler, 2003)

The interview methodology across a number of the empirical papers was a semi-structured approach used to facilitate a more intimate comparative analysis. The subsequent qualitative data was pattern matched to link to the overall direction of the linear and cumulative research. The degree of axiology was limited by a more flexible approach to the data collections and the assurance of anonymity where necessary. The semi-structured interview approach was also intended to enrich the ethnographic nature of the research (Blumberg et al., 2008).

The Research Issue

Collaborative Leadership Skills: assessing the contribution of a Shared Leadership Model in sustaining leadership longevity.

By building up a model from peer reviewed papers which focus on different elements of the leadership portfolio and underpinned by similarly themed peer reviewed papers which put the assessment in global and technological context, a greater robustness of approach is offered to leaders – not just for the present economic climes but as an adaptable approach to those ahead.

The examination presented through these data sets and ranges show that shared leadership skills need to be embedded in every day practice and shared at every strategic level in order to provide necessary strength and yet be flexible enough to adapt to survive in differing environments. These push the modern leader into developing softer skills to really get to know themselves and their company in a more holistic manner with the purpose of increasing the long range planning and survival of both.

This leadership through collaboration requires a different approach from developing self to acquiring and sharing critical organisational information for more informed decision making through a deliberative inquiry approach, before aligning all effort towards the organisational vision.

Model Development

As the research journey progressed the author visualized the usefulness of the individual papers in the working environment. Also, two early papers set a natural frame within which to work from the outset, in that one focused on the individual leader's natural style –Default and the other was more strategic in the corporate impact terms of visioning – Direction. Although a model was not created at this stage or the terms Default and Direction used, they influenced the forward path of the subsequent research.

Particular focus on shared leadership was then made through a discussion paper exploring the benefits of the 'Polylogue' which would furnish a shared environment. This corporate Dialogue, as it was later called for the model, was accompanied by another paper looking at the leader's individual make-up in that an exploration of the pressure of temptation or Dilemma presented a conflict between corporate and individual needs in decision making.

With two elements of individual contribution for shared leadership and two elements for the corporate environment necessary to accommodate it published, a natural framework evolved for the themed research. It was clear on the individual side that an exploration of how leaders used their power – Discretion - would complement the existing studies on individual Default style and Dilemma. Also having explored the free Dialogue of shared leadership and already given it a Direction to go, it was clear that a study looking at how to purposefully retrieve information from the business and followers would complement the corporate arguments in the ongoing research – Deliberative inquiry.

Later, other papers added technological, social and international dimensions to the research journey and the author was inspired to be creative and propose this new model designed for academic discussion and for use in business. A conference paper containing the model was written and presented to invite robust challenges to the research and to assess the level of its potential contribution to research in this area.

Pre 2007 Publications

This section contains pre-2007 publications for two purposes:

1. Two of the papers form two of the component parts of the 6D framework
2. Books and papers outside of the 6D framework show early stages of the author's research journey and highlight the subsequent evolution in writing and contribution.

The two following papers form the beginning and the end component parts of the presented model, Default and Direction.

Default

Quite simply accepting the way one defaults in terms of a leadership personality is key to subsequent development of shared leadership prowess (Bolden, 2011) by outlining those areas which specifically need the development. The base line of self awareness – knowing the default – is a difficult search. That knowledge of self though is essential so leaders know what to rely on or to adapt for their own sustainable success (Ashford 1991).

Direction

In Corporate terms the research aims have their value diminished if they have no place to go (Parnell, 2011). Without Visioning (Kakabadse et al 2005), sight is taken off the external, competitive environment and the strength gained from the synergy of the collective all facing in the same direction is denied leaving the organization weaker with having to face the subsequent internal issues. With organizational energies facing inwards, staff begin to form short term survivalist attitudes which naturally focus more on getting through more imminent matters rather than planning and contributing to more longer term ones (Laverly 2004)

Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), “Unique study assesses interactivity and impact of leadership styles”, in Coate, P. (Ed.) *Handbook of Business Strategy*, Emerald, pp 177-188.

This paper forms the ‘Default’ element of the Shared Leadership Model. In order to gain insight into the leadership personality and establish the personality default themes, a large empirical study was undertaken using leaders on a programme at an internationally known business school. A Leadership Development Board consisting of 12 HR Directors from large scale organizations designed and implemented an Integrated Leadership Development Programme (ILDLP) based on competitive selection. With a waiting list of two years, the program was delivered three times per year to 18 delegates. Four cohorts totalling 72 delegates were interviewed several times each resulting in 216 interviews to form the data basis for the study.

An interpretivist approach was selected to complement the independent semi-structured interview method in order to gain the real opinion of the delegates regarding their own defaults and development in leadership. Themes regarding leadership and leadership development were discussed as well as two critical leadership dimensions – individual proposition and orientation in order to highlight how leaders exercise choice according to the perceived discretion parameters of their role.

Transcription of the data triaged into three overarching themes of leadership self perception, peers’ experience of leaders and the effect of leadership development on leaders. Certain candidates displayed predispositions towards an analytical or objective approach where in contrast some held a contextualist orientation of what felt right using more subjective thinking. Categorised into four main types from the data, leaders were ideologist, developer, dictator or opportunist in their default. Rather than merely label types the data was analysed to reveal the relationships between types of default and acknowledge that peer perception of the default could have a considerable impact on the

outcomes in terms of the feelings that leaders and their leadership default have on their environment.

The data was then analysed to ascertain the effect that leadership development has on both of the above elements as well as the individual way it would affect different leadership default personalities. Clearly, different default types benefitted in different ways. This was useful in terms of deciding the design of future leadership development programmes. The program did raise the self awareness of all of the participants so each could in turn recognise development needs in themselves and accept their own default. The study also assisted in the participants understanding their own interpretivist defaults.

Kakabadse, N. Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), “Visioning the Pathway: A Leadership Process Model”, *European Management Journal*, Vol. 23, No.2, pp 237-246

This paper forms the ‘Direction’ element of the proposed Shared Leadership Model. As one of the first papers written in the set and a pre 2007 publication which underpins and adds to both model and study, this conceptual paper also forms the last logical step of the elements making up a shared leadership approach in a new model. A wide range of current and classic texts are used to define and explore the art of visioning. The exploration looks at the positive effects of creating and implementing a vision and also at the negative effects of failing to do so. From this discussion a model is formed to illustrate how these decisions, whether deliberate or accidental, all pivot on the Leader’s Choice. The conceptual investigation stretches from the strategic need to have a vision in place to the tactical implications of having or not having a vision or the ability to implement it effectively. The discussion highlights areas for the leader to anticipate issues or to plan more effective systems to allow for more successful completion of the strategic aims. By outlining some of the negative aspects of being directionless, the discussion also delves into the corporate harm which results from short termism and

survivalism – two direct symptoms of being visionless or unable to effect a vision as a leader.

Kakabadse, N., Rozuel, C. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), “Corporate Social Responsibility a Stakeholder Approach: A Conceptual Review”, *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, Vol. 1. No. 4, pp 277-302

Kakabadse, A., Lawson, S., Kakabadse, N., Lee-Davies, L. (2006) “1% for 10%: Executive Strategies for Customer Care”, *Strategic Change*, Vol 15, No. 2, pp 103-111

Lee-Davies, L., (2006) *Developing Work and Study Skills* Thomson Learning UK

Lee-Davies, L. (2006) *Leadership Chapter 10, Human Resource Management in Organisations*, Robinson, I.,CIPD

These pre 2007 publications were not used to form the model but they were an important part of the research journey in the earlier days.

Publications

Six publications form the mainstay of the proposed model. Four of these peer reviewed journal papers are post 2007. To support this five further post 2007 peer reviewed journal papers highlighted the social obligations, technological dilemmas and international comparatives. A further peer reviewed paper – this time a conference paper presented at the European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance – pulls together the model elements and proposes its use for longevity. In addition a co-authored book on leadership skills sets and a further book chapter highlighting the dilemmas faced at Board level, both post 2007 provide more popular approaches to the themes. In all, 10 peer reviewed papers, 1 co-authored book and 1 co-authored book chapter directly make up the publication set for this submission.

Discretion

As a supplement to exploring the default leadership personality through self perception and context, the aim to view this in terms of leadership discretion was decided to follow the path of power. As well as leadership personality default being a factor in leadership success, it was held that leadership choices (Karp and Helgo 2008) and use of power – ie. Leadership discretion was a further element for observation. Also as leader discretion level rises and falls through the ranks and as context fluctuates, then some leaders may have more discretion than others and that discretion may change with external and internal circumstance (Hambrick and Finkelstein 1987).

Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2009) “Leadership Discretion: A Developmental Experience”, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 18, pp 111-124

This paper formed the ‘Discretion’ element of the proposed Shared Leadership Model. A focused study of 20 experienced CEOs from different contexts within large private sector organizations and aged 45-55 explored the breadth and depth of a range of leadership skills accrued in relation to how the power in their position of responsibility

was utilised. The sample was taken from firms operating in a homogeneous socio-political context in the UK, USA and Australia with inductive interviewing to allow candidates to speak in their own terms and express their own views in an open way. The resulting qualitative data in transcripts was then compared to identify themes and to develop summary themes.

The candid comments collected highlighted the effect that personal influence can have on decision making and of course the ultimate repercussions from those decisions. The data also surfaced potential conflicts within individuals as far as the use of power was concerned so creating debate about the components of leadership discretion itself.

The open approach also exposed individual use of leadership discretion to further scrutiny in that moral dimensions were analysed as well as an insight into micro choices, deterrents and values highlighted. This confirmed that individual and unpredictable emotional elements were present in the application of leadership discretion and therefore self audit and accountability were essential in understanding one's own motivations for the decisions made.

Dilemma

Extending the empirical studies with further executive candidates to push the boundaries of leadership default and discretion under further situational pressure (Sergiovanni 2005) was a further research journey in looking at the leadership individual and the components of individual leadership for which they would need a self checking mechanism, if they were to succeed (Karp and Helgo, 2008).

Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. and Lee-Davies, L. (2007), “Three Temptations of Leaders”, *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp 196-208

This paper forms the ‘Dilemma’ element of the proposed shared leadership model. Two empirical studies used for the model development highlighted personal influences on decision making and leadership discretion. This study conducted between the two focused on the dilemmas leaders faced when making decisions. A small range of focused case studies were undertaken to enable more specific depth to the data findings. The intimate nature of the case studies revealed what leaders are tempted by and why they may succumb to hedonism, power and posterity when making their decisions for organizations.

Seven CEO leaders were chosen from a purposive sample of 17 for focus and these studies were supported by using a significant supporting person such as colleagues to provide further context and validation of the data. The 34 interviews in total allowed free speech and three themes of temptation were defined from the findings, hedonism, power and posterity. Hedonism includes temptation posed by pleasure, Power includes temptation posed by self standing and Posterity includes temptation posed by permanent impact – all drivers linked to narcissistic action. It is recognised that some narcissism is necessary in successful leaders but the study hints at the tipping points and also begins to suggest ways of safeguarding against falling to the temptations - deliberately or even accidentally.

Deliberative Inquiry

From the ascertained personal shared leadership qualities another research aim was to position this in organizational context through a dedicated empirical experiment of deliberate inquiry. The art of deliberately finding out what one needs to know to run the company rather than waiting for the information to arrive was worth exploration through an active experiment. By deliberately courting uninhibited and widely varying

contributions from others leaders can better understand their business and the motivations of the staff within. (Seeskin 1986; Yankelovich 2001).

Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L., Johnson, N. (2010)

“Deliberative Inquiry: Integrated Ways of Working in Children Services”, *Systems Practice Action Research*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp 1573- 1591

This paper forms the ‘Deliberative Inquiry’ element of the proposed model. Another empirical qualitative study sought to expand on the previous findings above as well as link to several other related conceptual papers which explored what fed decision making and leadership discretion and rather than focus on personal dilemmas affecting the individual in the singular, look at how the plural approaches can enhance better decision making and leadership and indeed ensure this is in line with strategic context. This paper sought to explore how deliberately seeking out information from the surrounding internal and external environments made better leadership and team working and this time did not focus on the very top leadership but different layers of leadership beneath.

A steering team of 15 professionals involved in various leadership/decision making roles for Childrens’ services such as police, probation, social etc. were put through a live, longitudinal experiment to investigate whether a deliberative inquiry approach would benefit their leadership decision making. By starting out with the intent of integrating their services and ensuring clear communications it was expected a better service would be provided from this platform of better understanding. This proved to be the case and in the process the difficulties of furnishing a deliberative inquiry approach to gain these benefits were discussed along with a fuller understanding of the participants of the motivations and thinking of each other in addition to the tasks in hand.

Dialogue

After setting up an attitude and even a deliberate process/environment (Ryfe 2002; Miller and Rose 2007) to find out what one needs to in order to act upon it, it is necessary to ensure that the working environment courts and cultivates the input of all opinion at all levels at all times. The shared leadership role is to expertly and exactly channel the wider discussion and effort in the most positive way to the overall vision (Flyvberg 2001) – yet allow it room to reveal itself.


Lee-Davies, L., Kakabadse, N. and Kakabadse, A. (2007) “Shared Leadership: Leading through Polylogue”, *Business Strategy Series*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp 246-253

This paper forms the ‘Dialogue’ element of the proposed shared leadership model. Alongside the empirical research exploring other aspects of leadership in other papers in this collection, a conceptual argument was put together in this paper to investigate the benefits of a shared leadership approach. Default and dilemma issues were highlighted in other papers of the collection so it followed that the study through this leadership path would explore the actual mechanics and benefits of creating a shared leadership platform. The creation of shared meaning and shared ownership of vision by the leader through multiple dialogue or polylogue results in more willing effort from followers. Followers are willing to do more and will give their opinions more, which is valuable as they are closer to the customer. By creating such a platform of multiple communication and embracing the views of different levels, strategy is better informed and organizations more likely to make the right decisions for that particular competitive environment. The same platform forms a platform of learning as the shared information teaches different followers and these capabilities and competences further enrich the organization from within.

The paper also highlights that it is not a simple process to set up a polylogue environment and that it must be guided to flourish rather than deteriorate into an internal competitive environment where opinions are aggressively lobbied rather than shared.

Collaboration is key and frameworks for it need to be carefully thought through so they show appreciation for all effort and ideas, even if not chosen as key drivers. Such shared endeavour through polylogue forges agreements and empowers the individuals concerned to enact them. Advances are faster and more effective as more highly motivated staff work together for a common cause rather than merely obey an order to complete a task.

Shared Leadership Model



Lee-Davies, L. and Kakabadse, N. (2011)

The resulting diamond model offers a balanced approach to leadership longevity diagnostics (Leary, Reilly and Brown 2008) as well as forming a frame for leadership longevity development – not just in corporate terms but in the individual ones which underpin those of the overall. Forward facing leaders who wish to future proof themselves and subsequently their organizations are prompted to think beyond their usual two dimensional environmental and performance data to form embedded three dimensional, multi-level viewpoints (Gibbins-Klein 2011). Armed with better self knowledge in terms of acceptance of what is and improvement of what could be in their own personal terms, the more robust and long lived leader will have expertly engineered feedback systems they can delve into beyond what is seen on the surface of the corporate organogram. This provides the polylogue (Lee-Davies et al 2007) platforms for richer and real time data which in turn impact on the calculation/design of and the ongoing alignment to successful strategic direction.

Other studies and papers influenced the model and further papers written on the research journey investigated leadership from different environmental perspectives. These in turn influenced the developing model and prepared the author for the academic conference in which to present the contribution.

Conference

Lee-Davies, L and Kakabadse, N. (2011) “*Individual and Corporate Longevity*”, The proceedings of the 7th European Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance, Sophia-Antipolis, pp 246-253

This peer reviewed conference paper (peer review in appendix 1) brought together the components of the Shared Leadership model from six papers and took it to an academic audience for discussion. Using four of the peer reviewed journal papers for this submission and two earlier papers a model proposing an equal weighting of self and corporate knowledge was furnished for leaders to consider their own fitness and longevity. Self awareness through Leadership Default, Discretion and Dilemma – that is

knowing one's natural leadership tendencies, how one uses their leadership power and how one acts under temptation. Corporate awareness through Deliberative Inquiry, Dialogue and Direction – that is seeking out information from staff to know them and be up to date, furnishing a platform for multiple dialogue so it is safe to speak freely and input into the success of the company and of course setting the direction based on that gathered data.

By using this in conference presentation forum, the input of a number of international academics was sourced to comment on the direction and expansion of the study for doctoral submission as well as test the model. This was in addition to asking masters students to apply it to their own workplaces and critique. Thus, a business and academic input was achieved and expansion of the propositions and direction for the literature review into shared leadership for further study was gained using this conference paper. *This paper received highly commended feedback in all of the sections. Please see Appendix 1.*

The following publications did not contribute directly to the model but were essential in their investigation of the dilemmas and defaults of leadership in technological and sociological terms.

Kakabadse, N., Lee-Davies L. and Kakabadse, A. (2008) “Smart technology: the leadership challenge”, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 17, pp 235-249

This paper focuses on technological issues faced by the leader. There was a strong belief that the research journey should contain technological arguments given the time in which it was made and the current reliance on technology by the business and management sectors. There were many choices to be made here with advances in social media and other means of mass communication. In order to assist the leadership skills exploration, it was decided to choose a technological advance still much in its infancy

and one which was still controversial in ethical terms for the leader. Hence the subject of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) – ‘chips’, ‘tagging’ was thought to provide this forum. Notably it was written directly after the empirical case study paper on temptation so a theme of leadership dilemma continued at this time and begged for further conceptual argument.

This paper furnished a discussion about the emotional and ethical considerations for the leader of implementation of new technology in business at operational and more strategic levels. The controversial nature of RFID showed that simply embracing new technology is not enough for leaders. Leaders have to be predictive in what impact such implementation can have on followers and the business. Equally, the paper draws out the question of who takes responsibility in that if a leader positively encourages the introduction of radical new technology and then subsequently a negative effect is found down the line. By highlighting the known benefits and history of RFID through secondary sourced documents, the paper devotes a section to Ethical and Operational balance. This discusses the dilemma faced by leaders before going into detail about the future of RFID and the leadership implications ahead as well as at present. A number of hard hitting questions are raised at the end of the paper before suggesting a plan for leadership development in this area.

Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2009) “CSR leaders road-map”, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp 50-57

In addition to exploring dilemmas and paradoxes through technological lenses, it was decided to move the research journey to investigate ‘softer’ dilemmas in the modern leadership world and highlight the need for leaders to adopt more holistic understanding of heading any implementation. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) gave the forum for this as such a topic is at the forefront of the leadership agenda in all size and manner of organization. It was also felt that a more obvious international flavour would add to

the research journey as well as ensuring that roughly equal conceptual and empirical approaches were offering balanced data evidence and thus opportunities for discussion.

Using a case based analysis from over 300 interviews in over 65 organizations in the USA, UK, Europe, Africa and Australia, and at all levels of leader, this paper compiles a clear road map for the implementation of CSR. From this data, several key themes emerged and formed the process of CSR decision, CSR adoption and CSR commitment. Interestingly, the data led to a better understanding of the importance of gaining willing commitment from followers, consistency in evangelization of the message and staying power of the purpose and mission to make it work. The bringing together of these findings also highlights the need for strong persuasive powers in the leader and most strongly emphasizes the power of dialogue to gain success. Although the paper used CSR as the medium to follow through this study, it is clear that the same factors of leadership apply to anything which needs to be implemented successfully.

Kakabadse, N., Lee-Davies, L. and Theodorakopoulos, N. (2010),
“Entrepreneurship, Sustainability and CSR: The role of values in SME, Institute of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, e magazine Enterprising Matters”,
<http://www.isbe.org.uk/TheoleofvaluesinSME>, Summer Issue, July (ISSN 2041-2606)

This short article highlights the embedded values in the SME and discusses how influence in the community can occur from such concerns. The article was written for an electronic journal and although it is not an academic piece, offers a further extension of the themes chosen and shows the attempt to reach wider audiences to gain a bigger impact at popular level as well as academic ones.

Wang, J., Lee-Davies, L.N., Kakabadse, N. and Zhijie Xie (2011), “Leader Characteristics and Styles in the SMEs of the People’s Republic of China During the Global Financial Crisis”, *Strategic Change: Briefings in Entrepreneurial Finance*, Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2, pp 17-30

To further the international impact of the research journey, it was decided to participate in a focused study of leadership skills in China. This paper used a conceptual approach to bring in classical leadership theories as well as an empirical study to explore the discussion findings more deeply.

The semi-structured interviews to 57 mixed level leaders and employees of mixed gender and age range showed the need for different leadership styles during global crisis. Not only did the study pinpoint the prevalence of a democratic style for greatest success, it served to highlight a gap between the leader’s more augmented view of themselves compared to that of their employees. This supports the view that leadership self awareness not only needs to be propagated but perhaps also calibrated.

The study also sets a tone for cultural change in leadership styles. Using the catalyst of global crisis, the findings highlight a shift from more traditionally coercive styles in China to more democratic and inclusive styles with a more strategic viewpoint in mind.

Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. Knyght, R. and Lee-Davies, L. (2011), “The Invisible Hand Guiding Technology: Crossing the Boundary of Humanity”, *International Journal of E-Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp 1-15

This paper provided more than further technological context for leadership dilemma in that the study used the dilemma presented to explore what drivers in the subjects were present when they were making their decisions. RFID was chosen again as a good amount of research had already been done for a previous journal paper and that exercise had shown that the exploration of some of that research had brought leadership dilemmas to light. In this case, it was decided that a better understanding of driving forces from followers might be gained from looking at the issues at the source of deciding whether to follow. This understanding of followers would then help the leader shape themselves to serve those followers better.

An intimate study of 16 subjects investigated the drivers for their acceptance or rejection of RFID implants and this, interestingly, furnished drivers, inter alia, of – the level of information, exclusivity, fear of safety and commercial pressures. This informs leaders of any implementation to predict such worries or drivers when planning their directions and when developing their own skills to be useful to their followers.

The study also looked briefly at modes of introduction and brought the further dilemma of how much information a leader should relay to their followers as well as listing a number of areas for further housekeeping and research successfully honing the matter of political influences to an individual and intimate and very human level.

Kakabadse, A, Kakabadse, N. Lee-Davies, L.(2008), “The Contrasting Faces of the Chairman of the Board”, *Strategy, Innovation and Change –Galavan, R.,Markides,C., Murray,J.*

This research and writing exercise brought the opportunity to explore leadership issues from the top down and look at the pressures on the leader in a lateral sense from fellow board members. It was felt an exercise touching on the aspects of Corporate Governance would add a more rounded discussion to the research journey.

The chapter focused on the different ways CEO and Chair would work together and brought to mind how this relationship benefited corporate progress as well as sometimes hindered it. It explored the conflict between the agenda of the executive in question and the corporate agenda and outlined the pressures such as performance targets having an effect on the alignment of the two. Personal impact in a pressurized time versus organizational impact for a robust future provided a good debate.

Kakabadse,A., Kakabadse,N. &Lee-Davies,L. (2008) *Leading for Success, The Seven Sides of Great Leaders, Palgrave Macmillan*

Publishing a book with totally original content and a new model was a very exciting part of this research journey. The formed elliptical model provided a portfolio of leadership skills from looking at and understanding self, crafting the future, surfacing sentiments,

finding ways through at operational level, engaging employees, driving for success with good performance management and developing leaders and succession planning. This rounded offering provided much food for thought in the chapters and was underpinned by a range of high quality interviews from high level leaders - Dr. Hans Blix, Rona Cant, Steven Crawshaw, Viscount Davignon, Olivier Giscard d'Estaing, Val Gooding, Baroness Maggie Jones, Dannie Joste, Lord Sawyer, Dr. Bernd Scheifele, Vanni Treves, Sister Judith Zoebelin. The book was deliberately fashioned to appeal to executives and for them to be able to apply the thinking prompted from the book directly to their workplace. A key message from the book was that focusing on one aspect of leadership is not enough – one has to have a rounded selection of leadership skills and to be able to apply them appropriately.

Some Additional Thoughts on the Research Questions that Inform the Published Papers.

In terms of purpose this paper focuses on reducing the margin for leadership error in meeting strategic aims by forming a more robust approach to developing a broader and more reliable set of leadership skills to provide a greater likelihood of strategic alignment between corporate and individual need, increasing both of their respective shelf lives. Therefore it is necessary to position the research alongside current thinking and research on shared leadership as well as base it firmly on top of the solid classic writings on leadership skills sets for length as well as depth. There is also the intent to ensure that the academic exercise, whilst rigorous for this purpose, also translates well to the real world in that leaders at different levels can easily relate to the study at a more time effective cosmetic level to serve those business minds less interested in the academic origins of what they receive and more enthusiastic for fresh and modern thinking to energise their leadership offering to their followers.. The model formed from the research and discussion can serve as a trigger to think about the various elements of leadership success or indeed be used as a checklist.

In recent years, arising prominently from the ‘team-based’ leadership literature, the concept of “shared leadership” (Currie et al, 2009) emerged in various forms and names, such as distributed leadership (Gronn, 2008), co-leadership (Pearce and Conger, 2003), collective leadership (Denis et al, 2001; Fridereich et al, 2009), collaborative leadership (Pearce and Conger, 2003), self-leadership (Politis, 2006). Many of these terms are being used interchangeably whilst some areas are recognised as overlapping and/or being fluid in how they are interpreted (Pearce and Conger, 2003). Although the idea of shared leadership is not new, Follett’s (1924) “law of the situation” suggests that leadership could stem from any individual within the group that poses the most relevant skills in a particular situation. It was popularized by a small group of American academics (Manz and Sims, 1980; 1987; 1989; 1991; 1993; 2001; Avolio et al. 1996; 2009; Pearce and Sims, 2000, 2002; Pearce and Manz, 2005; Pearce et al, 2008; 2009).

Pearce and Conger (2003) for example, conceptualize shared leadership as a ‘dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both’. The key characteristics of shared leadership is that it is enacted by multiple individuals in the organization (who are not necessary occupying formal leadership roles), that cognition is shared by members of the group and ‘stretched over’ human actors embracing context and that leadership practice is continuously (re)shaped by these interactions between leaders, followers and context. For some scholars, the value of shared leadership is in its recognition of the important reality of inter-relationships among colleagues seeking the same objective and as such a more relational process, a shared or distributed phenomenon occurring at different levels and dependent on social interactions and networks of influence” (Fletcher and Käufer, 2003: 21). In Fletcher and Käufer’s (2003) ‘relational’ view of shared leadership, the individual is seen as a ‘self-in-relation’ to others. The shared leadership as more of a learning system interwoven and interdependent and at the same time freed from the inhibition focused leadership brings (Kakabadse and Kakabadse, 1999).

Such Distributed Leadership mobilises collective engagement and challenges or reinforces traditional forms of organization (Bolden, 2011). The knowledge of self as fit to serve others well (Skordoulis and Dawson 2007) in terms of knowing one’s own default, discretionary use of power and reaction to dilemma teamed with the knowledge of the organization and awareness of its whole distribution by deliberative inquiry and multiple and free dialogue aligned to the strategic direction, forms a powerful shared approach to leadership which disperses power and uses communicative frameworks (Gordon, 2010).

Self Knowledge

Ethics pertaining to the individual and use of the power bestowed on the leader was clearly analysed by Zeno, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. They placed that decision making in context of outcome and impact on others (Smith, 2000). This research journey sets out to do the same and to investigate the facilitation of goodwill from followers resulting from this self knowledge (Skordoulis and Dawson, 2007). By exploring *Default – the natural skills and embedded attitudes*, *Discretion – the way power of leadership is administered*, and *Dilemma – the way one acts under pressure and temptation*, a picture of *Individual Shared Leadership* can be drawn and contribute to the Socratic raising of questions and prompting of original thought from the reader regarding what shared leadership is and how it may be made up.

Corporate Knowledge

The level of organizational knowledge of the individual leader concerned then becomes the next area for debate. Setting up deliberate systems and practices which ensure the most up-to-date data feeds the strategic planning is not an accident and involves going and finding out what one needs to know internally in the organization as well as the usual environmental factors all executives entertain. By being approachable and information seeking overt and covert agendas are better understood through collaborative practices crossing all levels (Flyvbjerg 2001) and a sense of ownership by staff achieved (Karp and Helgo 2008). This multiple dialogue (Yankelovich 2001) facilitates compromise as well as ensuring the decision making executive is as up to date as possible (Bohem 1996). New learning is gained through this inquiry (Skordoulis and Dawson) and a better direction decided (Hay and Williamson, 1997). So by investigating *Deliberative Inquiry – the intent to find out what one needs to know*, *Dialogue – the platform of open communication to bring this about* and *Direction – the act of aligning all activities to the overall corporate objectives* a better picture of are then key areas for exploration in terms of the *Corporate Shared Leadership* is drawn to balance the rounded look at elements for successful and robust shared leadership.

Individual Shared Leadership

Individual or self-leadership refers to the process of influencing oneself to achieve the self-motivation and self-direction needed to behave in desirable ways and as such requires self-knowledge (Manz, 1986; Manz and Neck, 2004). The self-knowledge important to gain and go on to share, is thus, knowing how one *defaults* in terms of natural leadership personality (constructive thought pattern strategies); knowing how one uses the *discretion* of leadership power given to them (behavioural strategies) and knowing how one reacts to the inevitable temptations (natural reward strategies) in the *dilemmas* which arise from gaining that power.

Default

Sustainable success (Ashford 1991) can be difficult to measure and business in general uses many inspired self assessments (Jung, 1923) for development purposes and being able to lead others (Leary et al, 2008 and Brown and Reilly 2008). This is often accompanied by follower and superior opinion via 360 degree assessments in the workplace for context and reality checks. (Tornow and London 1996 and Cashman 1998).

Management, leadership and personality defaults in yacht race winners have been studied externally (Cranwell-Ward and Bacon 2002) as have the defaults of predisposition and orientation in a study of senior leaders in the Integrated Leadership Development Program (ILDLP) (Kakabadse, Kakabadse and Lee-Davies 2005), Transactional and transformational (Bass 1985) defaults populate many a leadership article along delegatory and consultative trends (Hersey and Blanchard 1988) and management and leadership skills differentiation, (Bennis & Nanus 2004) formed good base for questioning as to what balance was needed to be a successful leader. Softer default traits derived from these writings take readers into the area of transcendence where real willing effort is extracted (Hooper and Potter 2000) and onto emotional balances of the understanding of self and others (Goleman 1996; Cooper and Sawaf 1998; Leary, Reilly and Brown 2008). Recognising this in self and in the impact on

others ensures an ability to refine and develop such skills sets towards success (Kakabadse and Kakabadse 2003).

Discretion

The discretionary choices leaders make are influenced by their core defaults (Karp and Helgo 2008). and abilities as well as context. Their ‘authenticity’ (Smith 2000: 403) can be influenced by many factors which dictate decision outcomes (Whittington 1988 and Gibbins-Klein 2011) in such ‘latitudes of managerial action’ (Hambrick and Finkelstein, 1987). Indeed a number of economic, legal, ethical or discretionary motives can be at work here (Carroll, 1979:500). Added to this there are international influences which can make the difference in the use of power (Kolthoff et al 2010) as well as technological advances such as RFID which create further conflict for the leader (Kakabadse, Lee-Davies and Kakabadse, 2008) in terms of whether to charge ahead or to wait to check safety etc..

Dilemma

There can be a dilemma between the balance of what is expected and what leaders perceive and judge themselves (Hunt et al 1988) no matter what scripts or mental maps have influenced the situation (Sergiovanni 2005).

Use of power with such dilemma is the test of true leadership self (Kakabadse et al 2007). Knowing how one actually reacts to temptation and pressure rather than how they think or hope they will react (Karp and Helgo 2008) is important in testing one’s true ethical (Kohlberg 1969; Weber, 1990; Trevino and Brown, 2004). Knowing what one can achieve in reality as opposed to what is desired to be achieved is another leadership dilemma (Grint, 2005). Also deciding what one tells the troops and how transparent one is as a leader can be a difficult decision (Baker, 2007).

Hedonism, power control and legacy drivers have been identified as temptations (Kakabadse, Kakabadse and Lee-Davies, 2007). Again, measurement of such moral reaction as in the ‘Moral Competency Index’ (MCI) (Lennick and Kiel 2005) is difficult with external factors also an influence (Martin and Austin 2010). One could include

factors such as Emotional Quotient/Intelligence EQ/EI (Daniel Goleman 1996) and perhaps Leadership Quotient (LQ) and Management Quotient (MQ) (Dulewicz 1999).

Corporate Shared Leadership

In addition to a full knowledge of the default, discretion and dilemma handling in self, the life span of the executive leader depends also on the level of knowledge they have of their organisation. Removed or at a considerable distance from the front line of their business or service, the leader has need of a system of communications which bring real data to their attention. The three parameters here are a *deliberative inquiry* for that data must be set up and a level of comfortable, corporate *dialogue* ensured to capture the true feelings and advice of the followers. These must then be given a *direction* and the skill of the leader to align activities with the overall strategic aim or indeed choose the strategic aims based on real time data ultimately decides the success of the organization.

Technological innovation that facilitates generic globalisation and in turn affects society at the social, cultural, political and organisational levels, enables creation of transnational organisational forms and at the same time encounters resistance from employees and managers alike (Sklaire, 2005). Nanschild (2008) for example, examines these resistance behaviours and concludes that they emanate from the defence of one's values when under perceived threat, as 'people view the world through the lens of their personal values and the priority they give them influences their worldview. This means that people can have different interpretations about events depending on their personal values lens. Often there is a gap between beliefs and behaviour, between rhetoric and reality, exacerbated by the dynamics of conflicting values in the workplace and elsewhere. People will go to great lengths to defend their values'. Overcoming resistance to change through creating of shared values can be achieved through deliberative inquiry (Kakabadse et al, 2007). The most potent lever for reducing potential threat is dialogue (Plato, 1974). Dialogue has the capability to alleviate stress, improve understanding of organizational politics and actions, create shared values and

build trust while ‘making significant transitions in knowledge and thinking’ (Megginson and Clutterbuck, 1995). Dialogue participation through shared leadership has the benefit of setting the broad direction but without being too prescriptive and allowing local solutions to be identified and introduced locally without hesitation, all of which makes the business more responsive to change and therefore more agile (Getz, 2009; Michel, 2007; Pearce et al, 2008; Kitching et al 2009).

Deliberative Inquiry

Delving into what matters to individuals to increase learning at a deeper level and therefore create more appropriate and meaningful resulting action (Flyvberg 2001) and more appropriate and educated decision (Ronald 1992) can also result in a deeper self understanding (Seeskin 1986; Yankelovich 2001).

Deliberative Inquiry involves the setting up of a culture to surface sentiments (Kakabadse, Kakabadse and Lee-Davies, 2008) accommodate and also facilitate the different shared inputs (Ryfe 2002; 2005; and Rose 2007:). More positively informed (Fischer 2003) mean more possibilities are explored for solutions (Shotter and Katz 1996) and wider inputs and opinions ensure that potential error is conceptualised in the abstract before becoming an expensive reality. This may be a particular skill when dealing with technological advance and questions of human rights of followers (Foster and Jaeger, 2007) need consideration along with the need for corporate progress.

Dialogue

Deliberative Inquiry needs Deliberate Dialogue. The working environment must cultivate and collect opinions at all levels at all times. The longer lived, sharing leader will ensure fresh dialogue to inform the strategic plan as well as establish what is necessary for strategic alignment (Gibbins-Klein 2011). Thus in addition to deliberately setting out to inquire through the ranks (Skordoulis and Dawson 2007), a culture is needed to hold and use the dialogue from all levels (Hay and Williamson, 1997). This polylogue (Kakabadse and Kakabadse 2003) is then a platform for self propagating and self feeding connectivity (Ryfe 2002) underpinned by a shared mindset, (Simpson, 1998). Such platforms help achieve a balance between corporate and individual need as well as open channels to embrace new issues such as privacy, civil liberty (Kelly and

Erickson, 2005) associated with changing times, new technology and even the new crimes that evolve with that (Brown, 2007).

Direction

The value in surfacing more intricate and informative data through Deliberative Inquiry and dialogue is only high when translated back into the Corporate Vision by those that create it being fully informed (Flyvberg 2001) and aligning and emotionally engaging (Campbell & Yeung, 1991) those who follow it beyond the level of mere duty to full commitment (Brabet and Klemm 1994). Any confusion from having not one direction (Parnell 2011) where staff may begin to form short term survivalist attitudes (Lavery 2004) is avoided by the leader being a 'visioneer', steering the quality systems and accessible (Hay and Williamson, 1997) carefully planning operations and corporate integration for the needed speed and flexibility (Skipton, 1985) and ensuring fast feedback without threat of blockages (Varey 1996). All of this is constantly updated, refined and aligned and is thus more sustainable (Morita, Flynn and Ochiai, 2010).

Conclusion

Knowing how one is naturally made up, reacts to the privilege of power and temptations provides the greater strength and ability to deliberately find out what one needs to know, create the ongoing flow of crucial knowledge and data to create, care for, control and calibrate the strategic longevity of the organization. Thus a balance for shared leadership depends on the inner strength of the both the individual and the organization.

Clearly, as the model prompts, this is not accidental and a deliberative approach in both personal and corporate terms is essential to gain a shared approach. The modern leader must deliberately set about maintaining a balance of self and corporate knowledge.

Ensuring the right level of self awareness is essential in understanding the proper use, rather than abuse of power. Having controls in place to prevent succumbing to the temptations of the potential for even the smallest corruptions from that power provides the safety stop and a base from which to propagate an ongoing self analysis to ensure that leadership is of a high enough quality for the followers to have faith in.

Creating the right level of corporate knowledge is essential in making the right strategic decisions and creating the vision/direction. Having systems of deliberative inquiry in place to encourage and capture the right information in the comfort and trust of an easy dialogue environment (Morita, Flynn and Ochiai, 2010), provides fresh and pertinent information for the external competitive environment and assists in understanding an realigning the internal environment and operational systems to the strategic vision with more ease (Skipton, 1985). This strengthens the likelihood of success of those strategic aims in that followers believe in their mission, have a shared mindset, (Simpson, 1998) and have an emotional commitment to the vision (Campbell and Yeung, 1991).

The partnership of the two knowledges – individual and corporate – thus form a co-dependent partnership where one is very much aligned to the other and their mutual and symbiotic relationship of synergetic value to both. Such successful coexistence increases the commitment from both sides of the shared equation.

With the strength of this insight born of such duality, leaders must still prompt themselves to not only embrace external influences and fashions but predict them and the internal issues which would then arise from them. Technological changes both internally and externally bring their own leadership challenges and require more than modern leadership – indeed reflexive modern leadership at the very least (Beck, 1992). The impact of using such a lens of self and corporate reflection and then using it to project needs for strategic planning is that the leader is better able to change with the change itself as they face the paradoxes delivered by technology and other external influences. This enables them to provide a collection of responses appropriate to the situation (Western, 2008) and to evolve an approach of continuous innovation for easier and easier change implementation (Mabey and Finch-Lees, 2008).

A portfolio approach such as this ensures the leader has a choice of skills to use appropriately in different and changing situations, though not merely in a reactive manner. Using the shared leadership approach, and indeed a shared leadership model, strengthens the predictive quality of a leaders insight as it prompts beyond what is instantly evident and ensures that they look for potential areas likely to block progress in the strategic plan. Indeed, they are more able to devise strategic plans more likely to succeed by ensuring they themselves and their staff become future led and proactive. Thus, a shared leadership model can contribute in a very large way to the outlook and attitude of the leader as well as cultivate plural practices which engage staff to perform in a transformational way.

Limitations of the Research

Every effort was made during the leadership research journey to select methods of data collection, comparison and critique across a range of subjects representative of those using the skills in business and service. A mix of conceptual and empirical approaches was chosen for strong foundation though it is recognised that even wider samples and more quantitative approaches could have complemented the findings further. The interview approaches to selected samples furnished interesting data sets of a qualitative nature and indeed allowed for personal views to be aired. It would be fair to observe that, in some cases, a larger sample of respondents could have been questioned more formally to collect a more accurate perception of trends.

Evidence of Impact and Contribution

Impact was evident when this model and research journey was applied to a number of MBA and Executive cohorts. Specifically in classes studying Strategic Change for Masters courses, cohorts worked in discussion groups to identify the impact of the lack of self knowledge, the lack of corporate knowledge internally and of course the inability to embrace technological change. These students – numbering in excess of 200 over two academic delivery years - offered a wide range of commercial, public and voluntary sector experience and used the model and the research journey which brought it about to improve their understanding of potential issues to plan for at work. The shared leadership theory was also used in Masters' dissertation work along with visioning materials. Teaching was greatly enhanced by the use of the author's own research and writing in the sessions.

The research and models were also applied directly to executives on commercial courses in the UK and in Cyprus through the author's own consultancy. It provided a useful pivot for discussion about the responsibilities of leadership and added to a 360 degree view of each individual's leadership skills portfolio for their personal development planning.

Similarly so the model produced in the text ‘The Seven Sides of Great Leaders’ proved as useful to these cohorts to take a focused look at their leadership offering. So much so that from this and their input a simple self audit tool was invented by the authors and this was used on a range of executive delegates from Health Authority to Motor Trade with great effect. At the time of writing the model is still in current use for commercial leadership courses most recently used on Nigerian Senior Executives on a life changing leadership trip to Singapore. All national and international delegates are reassured by the credibility of the leadership trainer having real experience but also having their own research, publications and innovations directly for use in the classroom.

As the students are all mature students and many in executive positions – the feedback is both operational and strategic as they apply the theories to practice.

“Linda taught me how leaders need to be visionary and what behaviours leaders utilise. This deepened my understanding and I have been able to see why some leaders make decisions within my organisation but also re evaluate my styles of leadership and ensure longevity for my area of work through visionary techniques and enabling and suggesting to my seniors how this should be done. And actually this has come into its own recently due to a job role change and having to establish a business and take on the role of leadership. Because of this I am confident I will be successful.”

Laura Wood - Commercial Contracts Manager, Healthwatch, Northamptonshire

“By creating a vision for the future, leaders can play a role in shaping up that direction to go. Inspired by the work of Linda Lee-Davies, I know that I need to modify the theories used and that in this ever changing business world, things are getting complicated, so there is no one individual who can do everything then a team of individuals have to live up to the expectations of the stakeholders. Thus by people care and constant support to my colleagues and team I have build a strong team-force for being a successful manager with good leadership skills for organisational performance here in India”

Shinakha Sharma. Samyani – Human Resources

“Linda combines a vibrant passion for her specialist subject with a human approach, which makes her an excellent mentor and challenge to any senior leader”

Dawn Whittaker - Deputy Chief Fire Officer, Northamptonshire County Council

As students are made more aware of the need for good dialogue, deliberative inquiry and the influences and dilemmas facing oneself when leading the way forward – not just in strategic planning terms or keeping up with technological change but also in the implementation of softer practises such as CSR ensures the studying leader thinks carefully about their own impact on their staff and their company, not just the impact of the subject matter itself. Models such as the CSR leaders road-map show that real and greater positive impact is directly linked to gaining willing effort in addition to instructed obedience rendering a further impact of leadership longevity and deeper relationship with followers. Such a contribution was also shown in the study of leadership styles in SMEs in China which also emphasised the need to know oneself – realistically- in order to achieve this as employee opinion can be very different to how leaders regard themselves.

In order to reach even wider audiences, a range of publications were completed. This included an article on SMEs written for an electronic popular journal, books and academic journals to ensure attempts to make an impact were multi level and multi media.

Conference presentation and the included peer review of the paper proposing the Shared Leadership Model for Longevity provided the author with a personal experience of high worth. The discussion of the content at the conference by academics from many international institutions enabled its contribution to broader leadership areas as well as attracting senior level advice from prominent academics in the field. It is evident that potential writing partners from across continents will be willing to collaborate for further international research.

The research journey has had both a national and international impact not only as the published content contains national and international data but also as it is used both nationally and internationally.

Further Areas of Exploration

This valuable research journey had benefitted the author in many ways and left a number of potential areas of further exploration open.

The inclusion and influence of mature practitioner students does lend to providing further materials for this market. The provision of a book based on the shared leadership concept aimed at a more popular management/leadership market could have a large impact. Equally, given the recent trend to look at leadership development more seriously with teenage markets, the model and concept could be further simplified to provide an easily readable text.

In academic terms, this journey has opened many areas for further research. In particular, research into how shared leadership approaches could benefit public sector institutions such as Universities who now face more challenging times is of great interest to the author. Further, deeper research into particular methods for deliberative inquiry also opens up opportunities for studying soft structures and cultures in organizations.

The author would also like to continue this research in papers covering predictive perception. so that by looking ahead at environments, whether hard, soft, hidden, internal or external, in ways which collect a rounded and informed level of data, leaders can increase their chances of more successful strategic planning.

The research journey has provided an introduction to many potential national and international writing partners with expertise in leadership. This has given the author many opportunities exist to research across cultures and continents. It is a research journey that will continue.

References

- Ashford, S.J. (1991), "The role of feedback seeding in individual adaption: a resource perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp 465-87
- Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F.O. and Weber, T.J. (2009). "Leadership: current theories, research and future directions". *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, pp. 421–449.
- Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., Murray, W. and Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). "Building highly developed teams: focusing on shared leadership processes, efficacy, trust, and performance". In Beyerlein, M.M., Johnson, D.A. and Beyerlein, S.T. (eds), *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams: Team Leadership*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 173–209.
- Baker, D., (2007), "*Strategic Change Management in Public Sector Organisations*". Chandos Publishing: Oxford.
- Bass, B.M. (1985), "*Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*", Free Press, New York, NY
- Beck, U., (1992), "*The Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*". Sage, CA
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (2004) "*Leaders*", Harper Collins
- Blumberg, B., Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.S. (2008), "*Business Research Methods*", McGraw-Hill
- Bohem, D. (1996) In: Nichol, L. (ed) "*On Dialogue*". London: Routledge
- Bolden, R. (2011) "Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research". *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), pp. 251-269.
- Brabet, J and Klemm, M. (1994), "Sharing the vision: company mission statements in Britain and France", *Long Range Planning* 27(1), 84-94
- Brown, A. (2007), "Not with a bang: civilization's accelerating challenge". *The Futurist* 41(5): 35-39
- Brown, F. and Reilly, M. (2008) "The Myers-Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership", *Journal of Management Development* Vol. 28 No. 10, 2009 pp. 916-932
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2003). "*Business Research Methods*". 1st Ed. New York:Oxford University press Inc.
- Campbell, A. and Yeung, S. (1991), "Creating a sense of mission", *Long Range Planning*, Volume 24, Issue 4, p10-20
- Cashman, K. (1998), "*Leadership from Inside Out*", Executive Excellence Publishing, Provo, Utah

- Collis , J. & Hussey, R. (2003) “*Business Research, A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*”, (2nd ed) Palgrave Macmillan
- Cooper, R. and Sawaf, A. (1998), “*Executive EQ*”, London, Texere
- Cooper, R., C. and Schindler, P., S. (2003) “*Business Research Methods: International Edition*”. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Cranwell-Ward, J., Bacon, A. and Mackie, R. (2002), “*Inspiring Leadership – Staying Afloat in Turbulent Times*”, Thomson
- Cresswell, J., W. (1994) “*Research Designs: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*”. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Currie, G., Lockett, A. and Suhomlinova, O. (2009), "The institutionalization of distributed leadership: A 'Catch-22' in English public services", *Human Relations*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 1735-1761.
- Denis, J.L., Lamothe, L. and Langley, A. (2001). “The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organisations”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, pp. 809–837.
- Dulewicz, V. and Higgs, M. (1999) "Can emotional intelligence be measured and developed?" *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 20 Iss: 5, pp.242 – 253
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., Jackson P. and Lowe, A. (2008) “*Management Research* “(3rd Ed) Sage, London.
- Fischer, F. (2003) “*Reframing public policy; discursive politics and deliberative*”. UOP, Oxford
- Fletcher, J.K. and Kaufer, K. (2003). “Shared leadership: paradox and possibility”. In Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (eds), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 21–47.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) “*Making Social Science Matter; why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*” (trans: Sampson, S.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Follett, M.P. (1924). “*Creative Experience.*” New York: Longmans Green.
- Foster, K. R. & Jaeger, J. (2007), “RFID :The murky ethics of implanted chips”. *IEEE Spectrum*, 44(33), 24-29

- Ghauri, P. and Gronhaug, K.(2010). “*Research Methods in Business Studies*”. 4th Ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gibbins-Klein, M. (2011) "Winning by thinking: how to create a culture of thought leadership in your organization", *Development and Learning in Organizations*, Vol. 25 Iss: 1, pp.8 - 10
- Goleman, D. (1996), “*Emotional Intelligence*”, London Bloomsbury
- Gordon, R. D. (2010). “Dispersed leadership: exploring the impact of antecedent forms of power using a communicative framework”. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24, pp. 260-287.
- Grint, K. (2005), “*Leadership: Limits and Possibilities*”. Palgrave Macmillan: New York
- Gronn, P. (2008), "The future of distributed leadership", *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 141.
- Hambrick, D. C. and Finklestein, S. (1987), “Managerial discretion: a bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes”, in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Staw, BM, Cummings LL (eds), JAI press: Greenwich, CT; 369-406
- Hay, M. and Williamson, P. (1997), “Good Strategy: the View from Below”, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp651-664.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K., (1988), “*Management of Organization Behaviour: Utilising Human Resources*”, Prentice Hall, New Jersey
- Hodgkinson, GP,. Herriot, P. & Anderson, N, (2001), “Re-aligning the stakeholders in management research: lessons from industrial, work and organizational psychology”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol 12, Special issue, pp41-8
- Hooper, A. and Potter, J. (2000), “*Intelligent Leadership – Creating a Passion for Change*”, Random House Business Books, New York, NY
- Hunt, J.G., Baliga, B.R. Peterson, M.F. (1988) "Strategic Apex Leader Scripts and an Organisational Life Cycle Approach to Leadership and Excellence", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 61 – 83.
- Hussey, J. and Hussey, R. (1997). “*Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*”. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Jung, C. (1923), “*Psychological Types*,” Harcourt Brace, New York, NY
- Kakabadse, A. and Kakabadse, N. (1999), “*The Essence of Leadership*”, International Thomson, London.
- Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005) “Visioning”, *European Management Journal*, Vol. 23, No.2, pp 237-246
- Kakabadse, N., Rozuel, C. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), “Corporate Social Responsibility a Stakeholder Approach: A Conceptual Review”, *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, Vol. 1. No. 4, pp 277-302

- Kakabadse, A., Lawson, S., Kakabadse, N. and Lee-Davies, L. (2006) “1% for 10%: Executive Strategies for Customer Care”, *Strategic Change*, Vol 15, No. 2, pp 103-111
- Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. and Lee-Davies., (2007), “Three Temptations of Leaders”, *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 28, No.3
- Kakabadse, N., Lee-Davies L. and Kakabadse, A. (2008) “Smart technology: the leadership challenge”, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 17, pp 235-249
- Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2009) “CSR leaders road-map”, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp 50-57
- Kakabadse, N, Lee-Davies, L. and Kakabadse, A., (2009) “Leadership discretion: a developmental experience”, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 18, pp 111-124
- Kakabadse, N. and Kakabadse, A., (2003), “Polylogue as a Platform for Governance: Integrating People, Planet, Profit and Posterity”, *Corporate Governance: International Journal of Business in Society*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 5-38.
- Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Kalu, K. (2007) “Communicative action through collaborative inquiry: journey of a facilitating co-inquirer”, *Syst Pract Act Res* 20(3): 245-272
- Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005) “Leadership: Unique study assesses interactivity, impact of leadership styles”, *Handbook of Business Strategy*, Vol. 6 No.1
- Kakabadse, A, Kakabadse, N. Lee-Davies, L.(2008) “The Contrasting Faces of the Chairman of the Board”, *Strategy, Innovation and Change –Galavan, R.,Markides,C., Murray,J.*
- Kakabadse,A., Kakabadse,N. & Lee-Davies,L. (2008) “*Leading for Success, The Seven Sides of Great Leaders*”, Palgrave Macmillan
- Kakabadse, N.,Lee-Davies, L, Theodorakopoulos, N. (2010) “Entrepreneurship, Sustainability and CSR: The role of values in SME, Institute of Small Business and Entrepreneurship”, e magazine Enterprising Matters,
<http://www.isbe.org.uk/TheRoleofvaluesinSME>, Summer Issue, July (ISSN 2041-2606)
- Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A., Lee-Davies, L. and Johnson, N. (2010), “Deliberative Inquiry: Integrated Ways of Working in Children Services”, *System Practice Action Research*, Vol. 37, No.2, pp1573-1591
- Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. Knyght, R. and Lee-Davies, L. (2011) “The Invisible Hand Guiding Technology: Crossing the Boundary of Humanity” *International Journal of E-Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp 1-15
- Karp, T. and Helgø, T. (2008), “Leadership as identity construction: the act of leading people in organizations”, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 28 No. 10, 2009 pp. 880-896

- Kelly, EP & Erickson, SG, (2005), "RFID tags: commercial applications v privacy right". *Industrial Management and Data systems* 105: 703-713
- Kennedy, M., M. (1976) "Generalizing from single case studies". *Evaluation Quarterly*. 3 661-678.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969), "Stages and sequences: the cognitive development approach to socialization", in Goslin, D.A. (Ed.) *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, IL, pp347-80
- Kolthoff, E., Erakovich, R. and Lasthuizen, K. (2010), "Comparative analysis of ethical leadership and ethical culture in local government", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 23 No. 7, pp 596-612
- Laverty, K. (2004) "Managerial myopia or systemic short-termism?: The importance of managerial systems in valuing the long term", *Management Decision*, Vol. 42 Iss: 8, pp.949 - 962
- Leary, M., Reilly, M. and Brown, F. (2008), "A study of personality preferences and Emotional Intelligence", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* Vol. 30 No. 5, 2009 pp. 421-434
- Lee-Davies, L. (2006) "*Developing Work and Study Skills*", Thomson Learning, London
- Lee-Davies, L. (2006) "Leadership Chapter 10", *Human Resource Management in Organisations*, Robinson, I., CIPD
- Lee-Davies, L. , Kakabadse, N. and Kakabadse, A., (2007), "Shared Leadership: leading through polylogue", *Business strategy series*, Vol, 8, No. 4
- Lee-Davies, L and Kakabadse, N. (2011) "*Individual and Corporate Longevity*", The proceedings of the 7th European Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance, Sophia-Antipolis, pp 246-253
- Lennick, D. and Kiel, F. (2005) "*Moral Intelligence: Enhancing Business Performance and Leadership Success*", Wharton School Publishing, Upper saddle River, NJ
- Mabey, C. & Finch-Lees, T., (2008), "*Management and Leadership Development*", Sage, London.
- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. (1980). "Self-management as a substitute for leadership: a social learning perspective". *Academy of Management Review*, 5, pp. 361–367.
- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (1987). "Leading workers to lead themselves: the external leadership of self-managing work teams". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, pp. 106–128.
- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (1989). "*Superleadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*". Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (1991). Super Leadership: beyond the myth of heroic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, pp. 18–35.

- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (1993). *“Business without Bosses: How Self-Managing Teams Are Building High Performance Companies”*. New York: Wiley.
- Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (2001). *“The New Superleadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves. San Francisco”*, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Manz CC (1986). “Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of selfinfluence processes in organizations”. *Acad. Manag. Rev.*, 11(3): 585–600.
- Manz CC, Neck CP (2004). *“Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence”* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Martin, D. and Austin, B. (2010) “Validation of the moral competency inventory measurement instrument”, *Management Research Review*, Vol 33, No. 5 pp 437-451
- Maylor, H. and Blackmon, K. (2005) *“Researching Business and Management”*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- McNeil, P. (2005), *“Research Methods”* (3rd ed) Routledge, London
- McNiff, J. with Whitehead, J., (2000), *“Action Research in Organizations”*, Routledge, London.
- Megginson, D. and Clutterbuck, D. (1995). *“Mentoring in Action: A practical guide for managers”*. London: Kogan Page.
- Miller, P and Rose, N, (2007) *“Governing the present”*, Polity Press, Malden, MA
- Morita, M, Flynn, E and Ochiai, S, (2010), “Strategic management cycle: The underlying process building aligned linkage among operations practices”, *International Journal of Production Economics*, 133, p530-540
- Parnell, J. (2011) "Strategic capabilities, competitive strategy, and performance among retailers in Argentina, Peru and the United States", *Management Decision*, Vol. 49 Iss: 1, pp.139 – 155
- Partington, D. (2002) *“Essential Skills For Management Research”*. London: Sage.
- Pearce, C. L. (2007), "The future of leadership development: The importance of identity, multi-level approaches, self-leadership, physical fitness, shared leadership, networking, creativity, emotions, spirituality and on-boarding processes", *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 355-359.
- Pearce, C. L., Conger, J. A. and Locke, E. A. (2008), "Shared leadership theory", *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 622-628.
- Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003). “All those years ago: the historical underpinnings of shared leadership”. In Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (eds), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 1–18.

- Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (Eds) (2003) “*Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*” Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.
- Pearce, C.L. and Manz, C.C. (2005). “The new silver bullets of leadership: the importance of self and shared leadership in knowledge work”. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34, pp. 130–140.
- Pearce, C.L. and Sims, H.P. (2000). “Shared leadership: toward a multi-level theory of leadership”. In Beyerlein, M.M., Johnson, D.A. and Beyerlein, S.T. (eds), *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams: Team Development*, Vol. 7. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 115–139.
- Pearce, C.L. and Sims, H.P. (2002). “The relative influence of vertical vs. shared leadership on the longitudinal effectiveness of change management teams”. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 6, pp. 172–197.
- Pearce, C.L., Conger, J.A. and Locke, E.A. (2008). “Shared leadership theory”. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, pp. 622–628.
- Pearce, C.L., Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (2008). “The roles of vertical and shared leadership in the enactment of executive corruption: implications for research and practice”. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, pp. 353–359.
- Pearce, C.L., Manz, C.C. and Sims, H.P. Jr (2009). “Where do we go from here? Is shared leadership the key to team success?” *Organizational Dynamics*, 38, pp. 234–238.
- Pearce, C.L., Yoo, Y. and Alavi, M. (2003). “Leadership, social work, and virtual teams: the relative influence of vertical versus shared leadership in the non-profit sector”. In Riggio, R.E. and Smith Orr, S. (eds), *Improving Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 180–203.
- Philips, D. & Burbules, N. (2000): *Postpositivism and Educational Research*. Lanham & Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Pickering, M. (2009). *Auguste Comte: Volume 2: An Intellectual Biography* (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.
- Plato, (1974), “*The Republic*”, D. LEE (Translator) London: Penguin.
- Politis JD (2006). “Self-leadership behavioural-focused strategies and team performance: The mediating influence of job satisfaction”. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 27(3): 203–216.
- Remenyi, D., Williams, B., Money, A. and Swartz, E. (1998) *Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method*. London: Sage.
- Ronald, A.C. (1992) “*Dialogic education: conversation about ideas and between persons*”, Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL
- Ryfe, DM (2005) “Does deliberative democracy work?”, *Annual Review Political Science*, 8(1): 49-71

- Ryfe, DM, (2002), "The practice of deliberative democracy; a study of 16 deliberative organizations", *Polit Comm* 19:359-377
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009) "*Research Methods for Business Students*". Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Seeskin, K. (1986), "*Dialogue and discovery; study in Socratic method*", State University of New York press, New York
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). "*Strengthening the heartbeat: Leading and learning together in schools*", San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shotter, J. and Katz, A, (1996), "*Articulating a practice from within the practice itself: establishing formative dialogues by the use of social poetics*". *Concept Transform* 1(2/3): 227-238
- Simpson, D. (1998), "Why Most Strategic Planning is a Waste of Time and What You Can Do About It – Part II", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp623-627
- Skipton, M.D., (1985), "Helping managers to develop strategies", *Long Range Planning*, Volume 18, Issue 2, p56-68
- Skordoulis, R. and Dawson, P. (2007) "Reflective decisions: the use of Socratic dialogue in managing organizational change", *Management Decision*, Vol 45, No. 6, pp 901-1007
- Smith,A. (1776/2000)"*The Theory of Moral Sentiments*". Prometheus Books: New York
- Tornow, W.W. and London, M. (1996), "360 degree feedback: the leadership challenges", *Leadership in Action*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp 18-27
- Tranfield, D & Starkey, K (1998), "The nature, social organization and promotion of management research: towards policy", *British Journal of Management*, Vol.9,pp341-53
- Trevino, L.K. and Brown, M.E. (2004), "Managing to be ethical; debunking five business ethics myths", *The Academy of Managerial Executive*, Vol 18 No.2p 69
- Varey, R. (1996) "Conscious corporate communication: A conceptual analysis", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 1 Iss: 2, pp.134 - 144
- Wang, J., Lee-Davies, L.N., Kakabadse, N. and Zhijie Xie (2011), "Leader Characteristics and Styles in the SMEs of the People's Republic of China During the Global Financial Crisis", *Strategic Change: Briefings in Entrepreneurial Finance*, Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2, pp 17-30
- Weber, J. (1990), "Managers' moral reasoning: assessing their responses to three moral dilemmas", *Human Relations*, Vol 43, No.7,pp687-702
- Western, S., (2008) "*Leadership: A critical text*", Sage , London.

- Whittington, R. (1988) "Environmental structure and the theories of strategic choice",
Journal of Management Studies 25: 521-536
- Yankelovich, D (2001) "*Magic of dialogue*", reprint edn. Simon and Schuster, New
York
- Yin, R., K. (2009) "*Case Study Research Design and Methods*". Thousand Oaks CA:
Sage

Appendix 1

Peer Review of Conference Paper

Appendix 2

Statements of Contribution

Dear Linda

My co-authors, Prof. Kakabadse, R. Knyght and Dr. Theodorakopolos and I feel that your participation in our joint publications are as follows,

Statements of Contribution

Article	1	2	3	4
Kakabadse, N. Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), Visioning the Pathway: A Leadership Process Model, European Management Journal. -	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse,N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), Unique study assesses interactivity and impact of leadership styles, in Coate, P. (Ed.) Handbook of Business Strategy, Emerald, pp177-188.	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, N., Rozuel, C. and Lee-Davies, L. (2005), Corporate Social Responsibility a Stakeholder Approach: A Conceptual Review, International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics.	NK 33%	CR 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, A., Savery, L., Kakabadse, N. and Lee-Davies, L. (2006), '1% for 10%: Executive Strategies for Customer Care', Strategic Change, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 103-111	NK 25%	AS 25%	AK 25%	LLD 25%
Lee-Davies,L. Kakabadse, N. Kakabadse,A. (2007) Shared Leadership: Leading through Polylogue, Business Strategy Series, Emerald	LLD 70%	NK 15%	AK 15%	
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2007), 'The Three Temptation of Leaders', Leadership and Organization Development Journal, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.198-208.	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A., Lee-Davis, L. (2008), 'Smart Technology: The Leadership Challenge', Strategic Changes, Vol. 17, No. 7-8, pp. 235-249	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davies, L. (2009) CSR leaders road-map, Corporate Governance, Vol 9 p50-57	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Lee-Davis, L., (2009), 'Leadership Discretion: A Developmental Experience', Strategic Change, Vol. 18, No. 3-4, pp. 111-125.	NK 33%	AK 33%	LLD 33%	
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A., Lee-Davis, L. and Johnson, N., (2010) 'Deliberative Inquiry: Integrated Ways of Working in Children Services', Systemic Practice and Action Research, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 1573-9295.	NK 25%	AK 25%	LLD 25%	NJ 25%

Wang, J, Lee-Davis, L., Kakabadse, N. and Zhijie Xie, 'Leader Characteristics and Styles in the People's Republic of China (PRC) SMEs during the Global Economic Downturn', Strategic Change: Briefings in Entrepreneurial Finance, Vol. 20, Nos. 1-2, pp. 17-30.	JW 25%	LLD 25%	NK 25%	ZX 25%
Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A., Knyght, R. and Lee-Davies, L., (2011) 'The Invisible Hand and Invisible Technology: Crossing the Boundary of Humanity', International Journal of E-Politics (IJEP), Vo. 2, No. 4, pp. 1-15.	NK 10%	AK 10%	RK 60%	LLD 20%
Kakabadse, N., Lee-Davies. L. and Theodorakopoulos, N. (2010), 'Entrepreneurship, sustainability and CSR: The role of values in SMEs', ISBE e-magazine Enterprising Matters, http://www.isbe.org.uk/TheRoleofvaluesinSME , Summer Issue, July (ISSN 2041-2606).	NK 33%	LLD 33%	NT 33%	

Conferences	1	2	3	4
Lee-Davies, L and Kakabadse, N (2011) Individual and Corporate Longevity, The proceedings of the 7th European Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance, Sophia-Antipolis	LLD 80%	NK 20%		

Book Chapters	1	2	3	4
Kakabadse, A, Kakabadse, N. Lee-Davies, L.(2008) 'The Contrasting Faces of the Chairman of the Board, Strategy, Innovation and Change' in Galavan, R., Markides ,C., Murray, J. (Eds.)	AK 33%	NK 33&	LLD 33%	
Lee-Davies, L. (2006) Leadership Chapter 10, Human Resource Management in Organisations, Robinson, I.,CIPD	LLD 100%			

Books	1	2	3	4
Lee-Davies, L., (2006) Developing Work and Study Skills Thomson Learning UK	LLD 80%	SB 20%		
Kakabadse,A., Kakabadse, N. & Lee-Davies, L. (2008) Leading for Success, The Seven Sides of Great Leaders, PalgraveMacmillan	AK 25%	NK 25%	LLD 50%	

We wish you well with your endeavour for PhD by published work Best wishes

Nada