

LEADERSHIP IN HEALTHCARE

[ROUTLEDGE ISBN 0-415-34328-3; 2006]

EXTRACT

Chapter 1 and the concluding chapter are reproduced in full plus the key points of the intermediate chapters

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCING LEADERSHIP

Key points of this chapter

- Research on leadership has been prolific but it is resistant to definition.
- Leadership and management are different but they are not mutually exclusive.
- Leadership is essentially a relationship-based activity.
- Context, vision, passion and follower engagement are important components of leadership.
- Overall leadership effectiveness is not influenced by gender.
- There are links between leadership and other literature such as power and trust.
- There are numerous myths about leadership.

Key terms

- Leadership
- Management.
- Vision
- Context
- Gender
- Social relations

WHAT ARE LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT?

Definitions of leadership are too numerous to list and there are almost as many definitions as there are writers on the subject. To take a typical definition (Dawson 1996):

Leadership exists when someone (the leader) exercises influence over others (the followers) in their group or organisation. Their influence may be wide-ranging or

narrowly focused but within formal organisations they particularly emphasise: values that are espoused; directions in which future developments are guided; and the manner in which everyday tasks are accomplished.

There are three critical points from this definition. First, leadership is not a characteristic of any one individual working in isolation. Leadership is played out between leaders and followers, without whom leadership cannot exist. Second, there can be numerous leaders in one organisation, each leading on different issues. And third, leadership is not always synonymous with hierarchical position. Leaders can be found at different levels and in different departments, services or networks across an organisation. At this point the reader should note that throughout the book leadership is most frequently referred to in the context of the organisation but it is equally applicable to other contexts such as a service or department, a clinical or inter-organisational network, and a healthcare or inter-agency system. In addition, chapter 4 on networks, partnerships and collaboration discusses specific aspects of leading and working across service, departmental and organisational boundaries.

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

A frequently asked question is, what is the difference between management and leadership? In general, although most commentators would agree that there are differences, they are unlikely to agree on the extent of the differences. Rost (1993) identifies four substantive differences between the two (see Table 1.1)

Table 1.1 Distinguishing leadership from management

Leadership	Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence relationship • Leaders and followers • Intend real changes • Intended changes reflect mutual purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority relationship • Managers and subordinates • Produce and sell goods and/or services • Goods/services result from co-ordinated activities

The first three differences are clear enough but the remaining difference appears less distinctive and therefore may be more difficult to use. Mutual purposes are best described as common purposes developed over time as followers and leaders interact in a non-coercive or non-hierarchical relationship about the changes they support. There is nothing in the definition of management about mutual purposes, so when that begins to happen between people, it is leadership that is emerging. Leaders and followers are constantly in the process of developing mutual purposes and their commitment to that purpose makes the leadership relationship different from the management relationship. Rost's definition of leadership, with its emphasis on mutual purposes, is one of the few definitions that takes the role of followers in leadership into account.

Management is a largely a 20th century phenomenon that emerged with the creation of large manufacturing organisations, for example car production. The aim of management is to cope with organisational complexity and provide stability. It is essentially concerned with the implementation of decisions. There are always four key processes at the heart

of virtually all descriptions of management: planning, budgeting, organising and controlling. In the hierarchical relationships that continue to exist within many organisations, managers use authority based on their formal position by working in a single and top-down way. In contrast, leaders attempt to influence other people in a number of different directions often beyond their own department or service and increasingly today, beyond their organisation's boundary to other organisations.

Management is different from leadership in that it is more formal and scientific with a set of explicit analytical and decision-making tools and techniques based on rational reasoning that are designed to be used in similar ways across a wide range of situations. Managers are concerned with keeping the system turning over and although they will often propose change it will be mainly by changing structures and reorganising work processes. Short-term success can result but with little lasting beneficial effect. From another perspective, management can be viewed as an attribution made to explain performance, whilst leadership is viewed as a social construction that serves to rationalise and reinforce existing patterns of social relations (Bresnen 1995). This view, which is based on discussion with practicing managers, argues that although attribution-based approaches are valuable they largely ignore the impact of broader social relations. Although the practicing managers involved in the research offered some support for the notion that leadership embodies prevailing assumptions about the distribution of power, authority and control, this rested uneasily with their personal, experiential and phenomenological differences that they use to construct their own theories and explanations of leadership. In other words, there is a gulf between those who study leadership and those who practice it. There has been only ad hoc development of schools of leadership and although the UK public sector has a number of separate leadership centres, for example in health and education, there is not a leadership school for the public sector as a whole. This gulf between academics and managers can make it difficult to frame and understand what makes sense for those who want to not only study leadership but also put the concept to work.

Managers will tend to view work as an enabling tool, helping processes along by assessing potential opposition and controversy and reducing tensions when they arise by seeking compromise solutions. Not surprisingly, managerial tactics are based on transactions including negotiation and bargaining along with the use of rewards, punishments or other forms of coercion. In contrast, leaders work in the opposite direction by not limiting choices but developing fresh approaches to long-standing problems. What this means is that managers, rather than leaders, relate to people according to the role they play in a sequence of events or in production and decision-making processes; while leaders, who are more concerned with ideas, relate in more intuitive and empathetic ways. In other words, they view people from an emotional perspective and they see them as human beings with distinct and individual personalities.

Others reflect these views. Wheatley (1999) reminds us that one quality particular to human beings is the need to know 'why'; to understand and ascribe meaning to events and change. When people can reflect on their experiences and develop an interpretation of an event then they are more able to endure major change. Research in UK health systems has confirmed that successfully tackling issues or events that are seen as important to local players is an almost necessary precursor to addressing major, externally driven change, such as that from national government (Goodwin 2002.) There is also evidence of UK NHS nurse leaders performing an interpretation and translation

role in order to bridge the divide between the policy context and practice (Antrobus & Kitson 1999). The ability to make sense of the wider working context, for example the impact of new government policy, and to interpret and describe the likely impact within the local working context, is a powerful leadership skill.

There are some who see leadership as an integral part of the manager's role, arguing that whilst formal authority gives the manager power, it is leadership, exercised through non-coercive, interpersonal relationships, that determines in large part how much of it is used (Mintzberg 1989.) The importance of inter-personal relationships in leadership is underscored by 'soft' systems thinking (Checkland 1985). The term 'soft' is used because of its support for the importance of maintaining relationships as opposed to 'hard' systems thinking with its emphasis on goal-seeking found in the management science of the 1950s and 1960s. This is a social constructional approach, which reflects the view that leadership is rarely a one-way process and is strongly associated with other organisational processes of power, communication and decision-making. In other words, leadership is seen when one or more people succeed in framing and defining the reality of others and these people emerge as leaders because their framing of reality provides a viable basis for action. Again, it is about explaining 'why' and the impact of wider context on individuals and organisations. And for most large organisations and industrial sectors, including healthcare, the operating and political context is now more complex than ever before.

Finally, although management and leadership can be very different they are not mutually exclusive; for example, managers' plans do not have to include a vision and budgets do not necessarily have strategies (Kotter 1990). In relatively stable working environments, limited leadership coupled with strong management would work well but in times of major change or chaos, strong leadership with some limited management may be what is required. In summary, leadership is essentially concerned with pursuing change via the development of influential and empathetic interpersonal relationships; and the process that leaders will go through to achieve that is essentially twofold:

- first, creating an agenda for change using a strong vision; and
- second, building a strong implementation network to get things done through other people.

CONTEXT

Although there is a strong theme in the literature supporting the view that leadership is the critical factor in determining organisational success or failure, this underplays the significant environmental, macro-economic, political and business influences that potentially impact on organisational performance. It is important to note that there has been much more research on the consequences of leader behaviour than on its determinants such as the impact of external forces on the effects of leadership (Lieberson & O'Connor 1972; Yukl 1994). This is probably because of the widespread bias to perceive leaders as players who shape events rather than being shaped by them. Strong advocates of leadership argue that leadership is the pivotal force behind successful organisations because it provides vision and the mobilisation of people to achieve change. The alternative view is reflected by resource dependency, which asserts that organisational performance depends primarily on factors such as economic conditions, government policies and technological change (Pfeffer 1982). Unfortunately,

only a few theories have been developed to explain how the context in which leaders operate actually influences behaviour.

Two questions can be asked about the relationship between leadership and organisational performance (Thomas 1988). First, to what extent do leader differences account for performance variations within organisations over time? Second, to what extent do leader differences account for the total variation displayed by a whole set of organisations, which includes both intra- and inter-organisational variance, in comparison with that accounted for by contextual variables? Lieberman and O'Connor (ibid.) argue that leadership influence is a product of the internal and external constraints on the leader and his or her relative ability. Consequently, if differences cannot be seen when there is a change of leader then does it matter who occupies the position or how they behave. This is often referred to as the ambiguity of leadership (Pfeffer 1977.) Leaders in high-level positions, such as chief executives and senior executives actually have unilateral control over fewer resources and policies than might be assumed. Many decisions, such as investment proposals or major organisational change require the support and approval of other senior managers, often the board of directors or sometimes other organisations and external stakeholders. What this means is that organisations and the people within them will often constrain the behaviour of their leaders and consequently, the observed effects of leaders on organisational outcomes may actually be small.

Another way of looking at this is from the work of Kakabadse and Kakabadse (1999), who argue that the alternate pursuit of vertical and horizontal synergy strategies in an organisation can rapidly create a leadership gap. Vertical synergies are concerned with economics, cost, structures of organisations and overheads. They are the components requiring constant attention and adjustment in order for the organisation to operate efficiently. Thus, pursuing a vertical synergy strategy focuses on sustaining competitive advantage on price and cost. In contrast, horizontal synergies are concerned with issues of quality, being responsive to market needs, providing a service and being sympathetic to the needs of consumers, other organisations perhaps, and to staff and management internally. To pursue horizontal synergies requires a consultative management style including teamwork, open communication and an attitude of sharing and co-operation. For organisational leaders facing these vertical and horizontal challenges a paradox may be generated: how can costs be controlled at the same time as promoting an internal environment of openness, trust and co-operation? Is it possible to lead effectively but separately for vertical and horizontal synergy strategies? The result may be a leadership gap filled by strife, division, tension and fundamental differences of view concerning the future, with individuals having no sense of responsibility for their leadership role.

Wisdom and maturity are also important characteristics for the more effective leaders. In their book, *Geeks & Geezers*, Bennis & Thomas (2002) confirm that among leaders there is an enormous variance in IQ, birth order, family wealth, family stability, level of education, ethnicity, race and gender. Although these factors cannot be dismissed entirely when assessing leaders, it is adaptive capacity that is the single quality that determines success. Adaptive capacity includes critical skills such as the ability to understand context and to recognise and seize opportunities. It is the essential competence of leaders. It is the ability to view a challenge or crisis laterally and see a number of possible unconventional solutions. In a study of leadership development in 30 public and private sector organisations Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawler (2001) found

evidence of a contextual model of leadership, by which is meant that leadership is contingent on factors such as culture and interpersonal working. Also, Pettigrew et al (1994) identifies cooperative inter-organisational networks as one of eight key factors for successful change in the UK NHS. Whilst the importance of context in leadership studies continues to be debated, what is probably true is that the leader, at any level within an organisation, is potentially the biggest influence on their immediate operating environment. This is because people working in a formal hierarchy particularly feel their main identity is with their department or service rather than with the whole organisation. Consequently, most people are often only dimly aware of wider contextual issues both within and beyond their organisation.

In the light of these differences of view about the added value of leadership it is not surprising that the question is asked whether leadership matters at all because of the degree that leaders can actually influence organisational performance. Consequently, we should not be surprised to hear it argued that leadership is much less important than is believed. It is likely that the answer lies between those supporting the contextual view and those strongly supporting the concept of leadership. However, strong evidence for either is difficult to establish because of the challenge of gaining access to observe top management in action in organisations or in carrying out controlled investigations of organisations. This is because it is impracticable for organisational research to be undertaken in controlled, laboratory conditions. What we need to understand about context is that it is important to leaders because they rely extensively on their ability to read situations. Good leaders sense an environment, absorbing and interpreting soft data without having it spelt out for them. Is this a natural instinct or can it be learned? It is probably both and it is certainly true that some individuals seem to have a natural intuitive ability to read situations. On the other hand, many managers have clearly improved their ability in that area through improving their emotional intelligence and systematic training in interpersonal skills. Emotional intelligence is discussed further in chapter 5.

VISION AND PASSION

Vision

Vision is the essence of leadership and it is often synonymous with the terms mission and strategic direction. It is a prerequisite to providing inspiration and momentum. This is important because in leadership because people are not led by paper policies, strategies and quantitative analysis. People actually do business with other people, not with other departments or organisations. Vision is an agreement about future direction. It is a positive image of what an organisation or service could become and the path towards that aim. Determining direction and purpose is of paramount importance for the leader; it is the basis on which the leader acts and seeks to secure followers. Consequently, the content of a vision is crucial in determining whether its aims will be achieved.

The research in this area is limited and since leadership is a people process the research has focused primarily on entrepreneurs, for example Steven Jobs of Apple Computers, Anita Roddick of The Body Shop, Jack Welch of General Electric, Jan Carlson of Scandinavian Airways and Richard Branson of Virgin. These entrepreneurial individuals have been or are very charismatic leaders operating in successful industries and therefore, it is debatable whether they are truly representative. What is known from the research is that a leader's vision has to evolve within the context or environment of

the organisation or service. In addition, the vision of the charismatic leader must be empathetic to and reflect the shared concern of, followers and supporters. For example, the success of the UK's environmentally sensitive The Body Shop cannot be separated from the growth of the Green movement across Western Europe in the 1980s. Similarly, the success of Richard Branson's Virgin Group reflects consumer desire for change across Europe and the US in both retail and low cost transport, an approach that has now been replicated by many competitors.

One of the most important roles of a leader is to make the vision meaningful largely through language, actions and stories. Story telling can be very powerful in leadership: as in life generally, people respond to images and stories in their work. What effective leaders do is to provide a framework of understanding so that their followers know what they are doing and why. Implementing vision requires high levels of follower commitment and performance, instilling in followers the value, beliefs and behaviours necessary for the vision's realisation, and devising and executing strategic initiatives that further the vision within the organisation and beyond. When it is communicated clearly, vision seems simple. Consider Henry Ford's *I will build a motor car for the great multitude*; Federal Express founder Fred Smith's *To deliver all packages within 24 hours*; or more simply, Walt Disney's *To make people happy*; and shorter still, Honda's *Destroy Yamaha!* But leaders can make mistakes in defining their vision of where they and their followers should go. To get it right leaders need to remember two things. First, vision is not to be confused with mission. Vision is the long-term aspiration of the business or organisation or service, for example achieving the best reputation or being the most reliable; whilst mission is a higher purpose focusing on the broader impact on society. To return to FedEx, whilst the vision is about faster delivery, the mission is actually concerned with transforming the way people communicate. Secondly, visions need to be bold and ambitious otherwise it will be viewed as an objective or organisational aim. If Fred Smith had articulated his vision as *Let's beat the US Post Office by 25 percent*, it would not have had the same motivational impact on his staff and potential customers.

To create effective visioning through team working, organisations must develop a culture that is built on trust and is seen to reward creativity and diversity. Team members must develop a collective sense of responsibility and direction. Effective visioning requires a willingness to create all the options and to share information needed to develop them. It also demands that staff commit to a plan of action that is in the best interests of the organisation, even if this may result in unwelcome changes. Creating a visioning culture can be time consuming because it can take up to five years to achieve, which may present problems when staff commitment and action is required over a shorter timescale. The link between visioning and leadership is simple: for vision to work, a champion is needed to inspire other participants and stakeholders. Clear, frequent and above all, personal communication is crucial if the vision is to be accepted and people to be inspired. Video messaging or email cannot distribute visions although they can be used to reinforce them. Finally, an experienced and credible team is necessary to shape, sell and drive the vision. In today's complex world, whether commercial business or healthcare, one person cannot know everything and do it all. Consequently, leadership teams are essential. They are also important if one person's views, with all their potential prejudices, are not to dominate the organisation or service.

Passion

Passion is also an important characteristic of leaders. It is an essential personal

characteristic if potential followers are to be inspired. Although the popular view is that the voluntary and public sectors produce passionate leaders, increasingly the private sector and government are embracing it too. Indeed, passion is often an essential requirement for the successful political leader. Passion is important because people who are motivated and involved in pursuing a vision or task produce their best. And the best way to motivate others is to be both passionate and motivated yourself. Facts and quantitative analyses are important in generating support for change but so are emotions. Having said that, there is also a dark and dangerous side of passion. It can deceive, cloud judgement and destroy. History is littered with passionate political and organisational leaders who have pursued their personal aims to the detriment of their country or business. Passionate leadership requires the balancing of beliefs, risks and personal visions. Passion can create vitality and energy but it needs to be underpinned by trust, clear values and a preparedness to temper its dark side by assessing risk. Achieving that requires the leader to surround themselves with a strong and trusted team who are capable of counterbalancing the leader's views and opinions with their own. For chief executives and executives who operate corporately at board level, counterbalancing can be achieved by working with a team of experienced and independent non-executives with a focus on organisational governance.

LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS

Another essential element flowing from the definition of leadership is that the people involved in this relationship are leaders and followers. Since leaders can be anyone, so too can followers. That does not mean that leaders and followers are equal. A distinction between leaders and followers remains crucial to the concept of leadership. Since leadership is a relationship-based process, leaders must interact with other people; after all, leaders cannot exist without followers. If all the people with whom leaders interacted were other leaders, leadership as a meaningful construct would not make much sense. People who are active in the leadership process are followers. This is an important distinction from passive people who are not in a relationship because they have chosen not to be involved, they have no influence and therefore, they cannot be followers. In contrast, active people can fall anywhere on a continuum of activity from highly active to minimally active, and their influence in the leadership process is based on their level of activity, their willingness to get involved, and their use of the power resources they have at their disposal to influence other people.

There are also links between bad leaders and bad followers (Kellerman 2004). Bad leaders include those who act unethically because they cannot tell the difference between right and wrong. Leaders are also bad if they are incompetent, overly rigid, corrupt, callous, insular, evil and intemperate. According to Kellerman, bad leaders may display one or more of these characteristics. In contrast, good leaders are both effective and ethical in their approach. What is important to note is that if leaders are bad then so will be some of their followers, as history has shown only too well. In situations of actual or potential bad leadership, followers can strengthen their personal capacity to resist leaders who are ineffective or unethical by empowering themselves, being loyal to the whole and not to any single individual, being sceptical, taking a stand when necessary and paying attention. Above all else followers should hold leaders to account.

Followers can become leaders and leaders can become followers in any one leadership relationship. People are not stuck in one or the other for the whole time the relationship exists. Followers may be leaders for a while, and leaders may be followers for a while.

This is particularly so when groups are formed from across different organisations, where one organisation may take the lead for one part of an initiative and another organisation takes the lead for something else. This ability to change places without changing organisational positions gives followers considerable influence and mobility. In short, followers are not always followers in all leadership relationships. Finally, if we have leadership then is there such a thing as followership? One strongly held view is that followers do not do followership, they do leadership (Rost *ibid.*) Both leaders and followers form one relationship, which is leadership; and consequentially, there is no such thing as followership. Followers and leaders develop a relationship in which they influence one another as well as their working environment, and that is leadership. They do not do the same things in the relationship, just as composers and musicians do not do the same thing in making music but they are both essential to success. But dissecting that is difficult, which is why leadership is one of the most observed yet least understood phenomena on earth.

GENDER AND LEADERSHIP

A frequently asked question is, are women and men different in how they think about leadership, how they practice it, and how others perceive them as leaders? Gender has been central to Western thought, entering virtually every domain of human experience and structuring human relationships. Gender categories are often used to organise our experiences since they allow us to define and categorise individuals. In *Women and Leadership, a Contextual Perspective* Klenke (1996) reports little or no difference between men and women on the interpersonal versus task orientated leadership styles. However, comparisons of leader effectiveness favour men more and women less when three conditions are present (Northhouse 2001): when the context is male dominated; when a high percentage of the leader's staff are male; and when the role is seen as more congenial to men in terms of self-assessed competence, interest and low requirements for co-operation coupled with high requirements for control. Effectiveness comparisons favour women leaders to the degree that these conditions are reversed. Further, effectiveness comparisons favour women leaders for second-level or middle management in business, education and government or social service, while they favour male leaders in first level or supervisory positions.

It is not surprising that the literature concludes, in the light of women tending to demonstrate less effective leadership skills in roles that are male-dominated, that women leaders are particularly devalued when they work in male-dominated environments and when their evaluators are men, even though women evaluators did not favour one sex over the other (Northhouse *ibid.*) In their evaluation of the evidence of the female leadership advantage Eagly & Carli (2003) discuss the assertion that women are more likely than men to lead in a style that is effective under contemporary social conditions. Their evaluation of the evidence shows that women have some advantages in typical leadership style but suffer some disadvantages from prejudicial evaluations of their competence as leaders, especially in a masculine organisational context. Women used a more participative or democratic style and a less autocratic or directive style than men did, although this tendency declined in a highly male-dominated environment. Both men and women emphasised more the achievement of objectives when the number of leaders of their own sex dominated the environment. This should not be interpreted as the tendency of women to lead more democratically as either an advantage or disadvantage, since a democratic leadership style may enhance leader effectiveness under some circumstances, while the autocratic style may facilitate a leader's

effectiveness under a different set of circumstances, for example during a crisis situation.

What the above means is that leadership styles divided along gender lines are less obvious. Concern for people may only become appropriate and acceptable to followers once attention to the vision and task has established the leader's credibility and defined a context for the interaction between the leader and followers. Finally, whilst overall effectiveness does not differ for leaders of either sex, female and male leaders may differ in the conditions that prove a good fit for their leadership style. Some men also experience discomfort with women leaders because they see them as perceiving a need to adapt their behavioural style so that men avoid feeling intimidated. Consequently, a narrower range of acceptable behaviour exists for female than for male leaders.

In the light of the above literature it is not surprising that prejudice about women leaders can have a direct impact on their careers. Female and male leaders differ in the lengths to which they must go to be promoted, in the need to adapt their behaviour at work, in the amount of support they tend to receive at work and the impact of family factors on career advancement. Women are more likely to be devalued when they comprise a small proportion of the numbers considered for promotion, when performance standards and information are ambiguous, when affirmative actions are perceived as influencing selection decisions and when organisational practices make demographic group membership pertinent. In other words, majority male cultures do not favour the advancement of women leaders. Personal barriers to female advancement refer to elements of their personal lives or a lack of knowledge that may be an obstacle. Women leaders have reported lower political personal skills as a factor that has impeded their advancement although other women executives have reported skills in building alliances and navigating the competing priorities affecting organisational decisions. Perhaps more serious for many women leaders are the home or non-work obligations for which in many societies they remain primarily responsible in a household. The need for better balance in the seeming impossibility of combining successful personal and professional lives has been a frequent theme in women leaders' descriptions of their lives. These tensions sometimes arise because of organisational conditions that put women at a disadvantage compared to their male peers Northhouse (ibid.)

In addition to unsupportable corporate cultures that discourage balancing career aspirations with personal obligations, there are also cultures that dissuade women from applying for senior management or require women to accomplish major tasks without sufficient resources. It should not be surprising therefore that women can be viewed as less competent and disinterested in significant challenges with the consequence that unlike their male peers they need to actively seek challenging objectives rather than wait for them to be allocated. Nevertheless, more women are rising into leadership roles at all levels, including executive positions. They suggest that the reasons for this are multifactorial: in organisations, leadership roles have changed and practices that constituted barriers to promoting women into positions of authority have eroded; at a cultural level, appointments of female leaders have come to symbolise a progressive organisational culture; and women have changed by assuming the personal characteristics required to succeed in new organisational roles.

In examining women's leadership in developed and developing countries Klenke (ibid.) concluded that it makes little sense to group together as comparable the leadership of all countries of the western world on the grounds that they are all democracies. The review

highlights the importance of cultural specificity and context in shaping women's (and men's) leadership both domestically and internationally, which makes it difficult to generalise about female and male leaders. This may have implications for leadership development in Europe's less economically developed countries (culture is discussed further in chapter 5 on emotional intelligence.). What is more consistent with the contextual importance of leadership is not to ask the question, do female and male leaders act similarly, but more importantly, in what context and under what conditions do female and male leaders act similarly? The one certainty that does exist is that in the increasingly complex work environment of today and tomorrow, women and men need to learn the strength of each other's leadership styles and practices. They need to support each other's ways of leading as opposed to treating one approach as necessarily better than the other.

LINKS BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND OTHER LITERATURE

Power

Power in organisations is open to many interpretations but essentially it is concerned with the ability or potential to influence (Fiol et al 2001). Although the literature on power discusses consequences for individuals and groups, it does not provide a model tracing the linkages between them and how power develops and is transferred between them. The power literature introduces 'power mental models', which are organised mental representations in the minds of individuals about their power and that of others. These tend to lead to relatively predictable behaviours within a particular context. Power mental models (PMMs) can be subdivided into models about individuals and their groups, called 'identity PMMs' and 'reputation PMMs'. The former is a unit's own set of beliefs about how powerful it is, whilst a reputation PMM is the set of beliefs about how powerful the unit is. Importantly, these models do not develop in isolation and individuals develop power bases through social interaction.

Fiol et al (ibid.) propose a cross-level and multi-level approach, the value of which lies in the explicit recognition that individual- and group-level power are not independent of each other but are mutually affected in critical ways. This means that failure to recognise that these inter-relationships may result in practical interventions at one level producing a negative or neutral result because of the unanticipated influences of other levels. Further, there are strong linkages between power identity and power reputation. The transfer of power across organisational levels can occur when a less powerful group gains power because of the presence of a powerful new member; the same can potentially happen when a less powerful person gains power because of their membership in a powerful group. There are links here with leadership and the management of change involving the formation of new groups or the realignment of power and decision-making across an inter-organisational or network-based system. The most important consequence of linking the power and leadership literatures is the need for future research to focus on power not only within but also between organisational levels as well between organisations.

Trust

The trust literature shows, among other things, the difficulties of working across organisational boundaries and securing support for change from stakeholders over whom there is no hierarchical or managerial control. Consequently the development of

trust and cooperation can be difficult because of conflicting objectives. This raises the question of whether group membership is an affective or emotional context for trust development (Williams 2001). Motivation to trust is defined as the desire to view another person as trustworthy enough to be relied upon. In turn, people who view others as trustworthy enough see this as one way of attempting to build and maintain social relations. In general, we develop the trustworthiness of others by interacting with them over time and specifically from our perceptions of their ability, benevolence, integrity and honesty. It is not surprising therefore that people use their feelings as information when making judgements about others. There are links here with emotional intelligence, which is discussed in chapter 5.

Williams argues that traditional managerial approaches to developing trust, and thereby improving cooperation and coordination are increasingly inappropriate to rapidly changing environments. These approaches include reward systems and structuring tasks in ways that promote individual identification with an inclusive group such as the project or organisation. In contrast, what is required is the need to attend to the affective context of work interactions; for example, managers who articulate sources of negative feeling such as stress related to a change programme may be able to decrease its impact by referring to the difficulty of the change programme rather than the behaviour or personality of others. Consequently, this could decrease negative influences on the evaluation of the trustworthiness of other people when change involves people from different departments, services or organisations. Therefore, the expression of negative feelings and the reasons for those feelings may represent an effective but underused leadership skill at times of change. Trust is discussed in more detail in chapter 4 on networks, partnership and collaboration.

THE MYTHS OF LEADERSHIP

In the light of the long and complex history of leadership it is not surprising that myths about leaders and leadership have emerged (Goffee and Jones 1999.) The most well-known and persistent myth is that leadership is associated with superior position and therefore restricted to small numbers of people. It is a myth that when you are in charge of your organisation or service you are automatically a leader. The people who make it to senior positions may have done so because of self-promotion rather than because of personal leadership qualities and delivery of positive change. They may have networked their way to the top or just been in the right place at the right time when promotion opportunities arose. Remember that luck plays its part in most careers to some extent. This chapter has emphasised that leadership is not about position – it is about process, relationships and influence. Leadership involves personal skills and abilities that are useful irrespective of organisational or hierarchical position.

The next myth is that not everyone can be a leader but this is only because many executives and managers do not have the self-knowledge or the authenticity for leadership. Developing self-knowledge is discussed further in chapter 5 on emotional intelligence. Another popular myth is that leaders will deliver the required results. This is not always the case because some well-led organisations do not necessarily produce short-term results whilst conversely, some organisations with successful results are not necessarily well led. If results were always a matter of good leadership, choosing leaders would be easy for both the public and private sectors. Finally, there is the myth that leaders are good coaches. This is not always true but it has not prevented the idea growing that good leadership equals good coaching. This somewhat simplistic belief

rests on the assumption that a single person can both inspire people and impart the necessary technical and leadership skills. Today's world is complex with its increasing dependency on inter-organisational collaboration for the achievement of results and the management of relationships. Consequently, personal and organisational success is dependent upon the development of individual leadership skills coupled with the creation of sustainable and high calibre leadership teams to both support and complement the skills of the individual leader. One person can no longer do it all.

CONCLUSION

Understanding leadership can be difficult, which partly explains why academics argue that leadership has proved to be one of the most appealing yet more challenging subjects within management research. This is largely because of two difficulties. First, as is clearly seen from the literature, leadership is not solely about command and control and the obedience of followers. Second, leadership cannot be understood in any significant way when it is reduced to the sweeping generalisations of the biography of the business or political leader. It is much more complex than that. Although the exploration of leadership tells us is that it is resistant to unambiguous definition, what can be stated with certainty is that leadership is about three components: the leader, the followers and the context within which the leader and followers work. Context is very important because it raises the question, not whether leaders make a difference but under what conditions they can make a difference. However, as yet there has been little work on the impact of organisational leadership under different conditions.

Leadership has more to do with personal authenticity than an easily learned approach to be used at all times and in all situations. The real personal challenge for aspiring leaders is to be true to themselves and not merely to copy the habits of some other leader. It is important to remember that ongoing personal learning is an essential part of the leadership process for everyone involved, whether new or experienced leader, follower or stakeholder. Experienced leaders know that no two work situations are the same and people's behaviour in any given situation can never be wholly predicted. Learning from each situation is therefore important for future personal leadership development. Unfortunately, the persistent and popular view of leadership has too many connotations of individualism and heroism. We have to surrender the myth of leadership as an isolated, heroic activity and replace it with leadership distributed among other individuals and teams within and between organisations.

The job of leaders at the top of organisations is to create the culture and systems under which others are encouraged and motivated to lead themselves. Organisations that will be the most successful in the future will be those in which it is everyone's job to be creating and using ideas for positive change. Most managers will not know all the answers but they will not have to do all the work of leadership by themselves. Shared leadership means empowering individuals at all levels and giving them the opportunity to take the lead. This is now becoming more common as top-down organisational structures give way to flatter, more decentralised and network-based forms, which is seen as a way of promoting intra- and inter-organisational collaboration and partnership. Although shared leadership can happen anywhere within an organisation or between organisations it will tend to develop where there is a number of partnerships and alliances both within and between organisations where managers work jointly on specific projects or assignments. Flatter organisational structures mean the sharing of responsibility and accountability throughout – and increasingly between - organisations

working collaboratively so that power, authority and decision-making are more dispersed, both laterally and vertically. Given that inter-organisational working is more important than ever before for personal and organisational leadership success it is unfortunate that inter-organisational aspects of leadership and consequently, inter-organisational influence, have largely been ignored in most studies and definitions of leadership. In today's more complex, networked and systems-based world a more appropriate definition of leadership would be as follows (Goodwin 2002):

'Leadership is a dynamic process of pursuing a vision for change in which the leader is supported by two main groups: followers within the leader's own organisation and influential players and other organisations operating in the leader's wider, external environment.'

Today's generation of female and male leaders, compared to those of previous generations are more likely to be open to consensus building, participative decision-making, and delegation of responsibility and the empowerment of followers. The preoccupation of the last century with leadership tasks is now being replaced by an emphasis on people issues such as the mutuality and reciprocity of leader-follower relations. Today's leaders are likely to create and communicate a shared vision of the future that not only creates a common ground among people of differing views but also responds creatively to an environment of ongoing societal and organisational change. At a macro-political level this has been seen reflected in the societal changes of the former communist countries of Europe. However, although the broader socio-political context of leadership may be different to what it was fifty years ago, leadership skills are still an essential prerequisite to its practice and the achievement of results. We should not lose sight of leadership being a means to an organisational end and not an end in itself: leadership remains concerned with the achievement of results. But if one leadership skill is to be emphasised above others then it is influence. This is because much of the leader's activity, irrespective of the context, involves attempts to influence the attitudes and behaviour of others. In essence, leadership as an influence-based relationship activity that has two characteristics:

- first, it is multi-directional in that influence flows in all directions and not just up and down the hierarchy; and
- second, it is non-coercive, meaning that it is based not on managerial or positional authority or power but on personal persuasive behaviours and actions, which allows anyone in the leader-follower relationship to freely agree or disagree and ultimately to drop into or out of the relationship.

The complexity and understanding of leadership is pursued further in chapter 2, which discusses leadership models and styles.

FURTHER REFLECTION POINTS

1. Do you understand the difference between management and leadership? Can you identify examples of both in your organisation and do you know when each is happening and why? What can you personally learn from your observations?
2. Do you know when you are operating in managerial and leadership roles? Are you aware of the additional personal skills you bring into use when operating as a leader?

3. Do you have a vision for the future of your organisation or service? Is it exciting and motivational and can you articulate it clearly to others around you?
4. Do you see examples of leadership teams in action - perhaps you lead or participate in one? Can you observe how the leader and the team members interact and work together?
5. Do you see the differences that leaders and their teams have on the work of your organisation, network or service?
6. Do you have the opportunity to observe female and male leaders in action and do you see any differences between the two?
7. Can you see examples of powerful people in leadership positions in networks and understand why they are powerful?
8. What do you understand by trust in your professional work? Do you think your work colleagues would have the same understanding?

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING

Alimo-Metcalfe B, Lawler J. 2001. Leadership development in UK companies at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Lessons for the NHS? *Journal of Management in Medicine*. 15 (5): 387-404.

Antrobus S, Kitson A. 1999. *Nursing leadership: influencing and shaping health policy and nursing practice*. Journal. of Advanced Nursing. 29, 3: 746-753.

Bass BM. 1990. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership Theory, Research & Managerial Applications*. New York: The Free Press.

Bresnen MJ. 1995. All Things to All People? Perceptions, Attributions, and Constructions of Leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 6 (4): 495-513.

Eagly H & Carli LL. 2003. The Female Leadership Advantage: an evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14: 807-834.

Checkland P. 1985. From Optimizing to Learning: A Development of Systems Thinking for the 1990s. *Journal of Operational Research Society*. 36 (9): 757-767

Dawson S.1996. *Analysing Organisations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Fiol CM, O'Connor EJ, Aguinis H. 2001. All for One and One for All? The Development and Transfer of Power Across Organisational Levels. *Academy of Management Review*. 26 (2): 224-242.

Goodwin N. 2002. *The Leadership Role of Chief Executives in the English NHS*. University of Manchester: PhD thesis.

Kakabadse A, Kakabadse N. 1999. *Essence of Leadership*. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Kellerman B. 2004. *Bad Leadership: What it is, How it Happens, Why it Matters*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Klenke k. 1996. *Women and Leadership. A Contextual Perspective*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Kotter JP. 1990. What Leaders Really Do. *Harvard Business Review*. May-June: 103-111.

Liebertson S, O'Connor J. 1972. Leadership and organisational performance: A study of large corporations. *American Sociological Review*. 37: 117-130.

Mintzberg H. 1989. *Mintzberg on Management, Inside Our Strange World of Organisations*. New York: The Free Press.

Northouse PG. 2001. *Leadership Theory and Practice*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.

Pettigrew A, Ferlie E, McKee L. 1994. *Shaping Strategic Change, Making Change in Large Organisations: the case of the National Health Service*. London: Sage.

Pfeffer J. 1997. The Ambiguity of Leadership. *Academy of Management Review*. January 1997: 104-112.

Pfeffer J. 1982. *Organisations and Organisation Theory*. Boston: Pitman.

Rost JC. 1993. *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Praeger

Thomas AB. 1988. Does Leadership Make a Difference to Organisational Performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 33: 388-400.

Wheatley MJ. 1999. *Leadership and the New Science. Discovering Order in a Chaotic World*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers

Williams M. 2001. In Whom We Trust: Group Membership as an Affective Context for Trust Development. *Academy of Management Review*. 26 (3): 377-396.

CHAPTER 2

LEADERSHIP MOVEMENTS AND MODELS

Key points of this chapter

- There are numerous leadership theories but they are not conclusive about the nature of leadership.
- Until the advent of contingency theory in the 1960s, initial theories of leadership focused on whether there was a single, best type of leadership.

- Leadership is not radically different in the private and public sectors but historically there have been differences of emphasis.
- Leadership research needs to develop as a strong inter-disciplinary area of study in its own right rather than as a sub-set of other disciplines.
- There are many myths about leadership, which add to its complexity and our lack of understanding of its true nature.
- Most research has focused within organisations and consequently, we know less about inter-organisational leadership, which is now an important feature of the operating context of the healthcare sector.
- Academia has failed to develop a school of leadership that clearly articulates an understanding of what leadership actually is.

Key terms

- Trait and style theories
- Situation or context
- Contingency and path-goal theories
- Charismatic leadership
- Bad leadership
- Transformational leadership

CHAPTER 3

THE CONTEXT OF EUROPEAN HEALTHCARE

Key points of this chapter

- Differences between the funding systems of health services in European countries have become less significant as a result of health service reforms in recent years.
- There are quantitative differences between Europe's healthcare services but they all face pressure from the need for greater efficiency, the impact of increasing patient consumerism and worsening population health.
- Structurally, there is a trend towards devolution of power and decentralisation in health sector reform.
- There is emerging internationalisation of healthcare provision.
- National governments directly influence the role of the local healthcare leader by determining policy, structure and organisational accountabilities and an important responsibility of the local leader is making sense of this national operating context.

- Political will and leadership is the key to implementing health service reforms.
- A key feature of professional organisations such as those in healthcare is that doctors, nurses and other clinical staff can exercise considerable power.
- The risk for the healthcare leader is becoming squeezed between politically driven reform and resistance to change from the professional staff required to implement change.

Key terms

- Europe and the European Union.
- Consumer
- Context and environment.
- Clinical leadership.
- Reform and change.
- Healthcare organisations, networks and services.

CHAPTER 4

NETWORKS, PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

Key points of this chapter

- The leadership process is common to both public and private sectors, and it is only the context that is different. However, there are few relevant studies focusing on leadership as a process.
- It is the successful management of significant local issues such as service and financial strategies by chief executives and their teams that creates a local leadership culture, which then forms a basis for further, successful change.
- Boundary crossing and creating inter-dependencies are important skills because healthcare cannot be organised nor controlled from one centre.
- The network organisation is a distinct structural form that is neither market nor hierarchy. Those who occupy central positions in a network and exercise control over the flow of information are most likely to emerge as leaders.
- For the more successful leaders, networking with outsiders including socialising and politicking, has a statistically significant relationship to personal managerial success.
- Collaborative advantage comes from work in large public sector organisations. It is concerned with the creation of synergy between collaborating organisations and their management teams.

- For collaboration to be successful stakeholder consideration must be at the heart of the leader's approach. Creating strong inter-personal relationships, as the basis of effective inter-organisational collaboration requires trust as an absolute necessity.
- Failing to manage upwards could have adverse consequences. The main aim of successful upward management is to achieve mutual trust and support.

Key terms

- Network and networking
- Boundary crossing
- Collaboration and collaborative advantage
- Stakeholders
- Managing upwards

CHAPTER 5

LEADERSHIP AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Key points of this chapter

- Leadership is as much about the 'how' as the 'what' and self-awareness is central to successful leadership.
- Effective leaders must possess a high degree of emotional intelligence, which means being concerned with the domains and competencies of personal and social skills.
- Emotional intelligence can be developed in most people and personal and social skills can be learned through a mixture of self-awareness, coaching, training and experience.
- Cultural intelligence – the ability to interpret unfamiliar and ambiguous gestures and behaviours from a local cultural perspective - is likely to become important with workforce movements across Europe.
- Leaders need to rely on the skills and experience of others in their team; and insisting on gender and ethnic diversity may be the only way to ensure a team considers a wide range of options and opinions.
- All male leadership cultures should be avoided because women tend to have stronger empathy and relationship skills than men.
- Leaders need to recognise and manage their own anxiety. Being self-aware of your own emotions and the impact they have on others is as important as being aware of the emotions of others.
- There are links between emotional intelligence and intuition or gut feeling.

- Leaders occasionally need to show their human side by admitting mistakes and showing their weaknesses.

Key terms

- Emotional intelligence or EQ
- Self-awareness
- Intuition and gut feeling
- Cultural intelligence
- Leadership teams
- Neo-cortex and limbic system
- Groupthink

CHAPTER 6

HEALTHCARE LEADERSHIP IN ACTION

Key points of this chapter

- Healthcare management is heavily context driven and a case study research approach provides a frame of reference for both the researcher and the reader to interpret events.
- The research results presented here are relevant to all healthcare organisations across Europe.
- Successful leadership involves achieving a balance between implementing nationally driven change and achieving objectives seen as significant to local players.
- Successful leaders need the support of an able team, and networks of other leaders and followers both within and across healthcare organisational boundaries.

Key terms

- UK National health Service (NHS)
- National and local context
- Primary care group (PCG)
- General practitioner (GP)
- Local medical committee (LMC)
- Local government authorities
- Case study
- Qualitative research
- Organisational boundaries
- Network and networking

CHAPTER 7

FAILING AND LEARNING

Key points of this chapter

- Failing is a normal part of development for everyone and important to personal leadership development.
- In contrast with the private sector, failure in healthcare organisations adversely affects patients more than staff.
- Leaders tend to fail because of faults with their personal leadership style.
- Self-awareness and personal reflection, rather than the more traditional lecture and case-study analytical methods of leadership development, are crucial to learning from personal leadership failure.
- Mentoring and coaching can help develop personal reflection and self-awareness as contributions to future leadership success by helping people discover meanings and solutions to issues that are often completely unique to them.
- Women often rise to positions of authority by excelling at collaboration and are less inclined to resort to intimidation to achieve their objectives.
- Because women can successfully lead indirectly through relationships and emotions they run the risk of being accused of being political in style and having hidden agendas.

Key terms

- Failure
- Mentoring
- Coaching
- Emotional intelligence
- Adversity
- Reflection and self-awareness
- Personal development
- Alpha males

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The analysis and approach to leadership presented in this book reflects the strongly contextual aspect of leading healthcare across Europe. Although no European countries are alike each country is increasingly facing the same

significant challenges. What this means above all else is continual change but delivering that in a transformational and sustainable way will be very challenging and probably for some countries, impossible. The leadership challenge of managing the changes being pursued by most countries of Europe are not to be underestimated, not only for the countries and governments concerned but also for the millions of healthcare staff that will be affected. Governments are demanding change to the structure and systems of their healthcare services and the people leadership challenges will be enormous. Leadership is about change and it is about people: it is a dynamic, interpersonal based process that increasingly has to be practiced not only within but also across organisational boundaries. For that reason, the leadership approach that has been presented here focuses on pursuing change based on the development of effective and sustainable interpersonal and inter-organisational relationships, underpinned by the leader committing to a proactive, self-awareness based approach to personal development driven by analysis of previous leadership experiences.

The leadership approach also has been supported by the presentation of a major qualitative research study into chief executive leadership demonstrating for healthcare leaders at all levels how leadership can be practiced in their day-to-day world. The outcome of that research, coupled with the description of leadership in this book, provides a practical way forward for a leadership based approach to managing change in public services and healthcare across Europe. The research was undertaken on the basis that leadership research needs to adopt a more holistic, contextual approach rather than the alternative of focusing on one or two specific organisational or leadership variables, as has frequently been the case in much historical leadership research both generally and in the healthcare sector (Pettigrew and Whipp 1993; Pettigrew et al 1994; Rost 1993.)

In their paper on future challenges for research into organisational change Pettigrew et al (2001.) argue that the impact of time, process, discontinuity and context are still insufficiently understood in organisational change. This is exacerbated by the increasing complexity facing not only the commercial sector because of the globalisation of markets but also European healthcare because of its political, economic and general operating contexts. A new pluralism of organisational change research is called for, comprising multiple levels of analysis and the reciprocal study of contexts and change actions that take into account time, history and the presentation of change as a continuous process rather than a detached episode.

Pettigrew et al (2001) also emphasise that there remains a dearth of research linking organisational change to organisational performance. A new dimension on linking change and leadership is offered by Wheatley (1999) who discusses moving away from the somewhat traditional engineering-based thinking of organisational change in which problematic organisations are treated as broken machines with the failing parts merely identified and replaced. The alternative approach is to view organisations as systems, which essentially is how European

healthcare increasingly operates. Wheatley argues that although systems are composed of parts they cannot be understood solely by only looking at the parts. It is necessary to work with the whole of a system in order to understand its dynamics at any moment in time, a view derived from quantum physics and chaos theory. These views chime with leadership being viewed as a dynamic, relationship-based intra- and inter-organisational process with a strong emphasis on transformation. Therefore real change needs to be seen as rooted in personal behaviours or when individuals see change within organisations or across systems that enables them to contribute more to what they have already defined as meaningful in their work. Further, there are links with networks. Although information may energise a network it is the people in the network who decide what is meaningful to them, requiring leaders to pay close attention to interpersonal, intra-organisational and inter-organisational processes.

A greater understanding of the issues arising from the above may help answer what is probably the most important leadership question of practical importance to leaders raised by Pettigrew et al (ibid.) and arising from the research outcomes presented in chapter 6, namely what is the relationship between the management of change processes and organisational performance? The research of Goodwin (2002) suggests that leadership is the unique variable that accounts for performance variations within organisations over time, at least within the English NHS and probably for the majority of healthcare and public service organisations. However, the four health authority case studies also raise issues other than the variables that constituted the basis of the research, namely leadership, inter-organisational relationships and the impact of the unique features of the environment for public services. The other raised by the case studies include power relationships, perceptions of organisational performance and organisational success, and specific attributes of inter-organisational networking such as trust and the management of negative, rather than positive, networks. These and related issues need to constitute the core of the organisational research agenda of the future and they can probably be distilled into following five research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between organisational change, organisational performance and leadership?
2. Can future research move away from the increasingly anachronistic question, does leadership matter, to the more important question, under what conditions and context can leadership make a difference?
3. What future contributions can the network and networking literature make to defining and explaining leadership?
4. Can a more holistic approach to leadership research be pursued linking leadership to other literature such as such as trust and power?
5. Can the impact of the environment be researched from the perspective of inter-organisational collaboration rather than the traditional and historical single organisation based approach?

This research agenda offers enormous potential to make a significant contribution to leadership research. However, researchers have been chided for not bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and its practical application (Pettigrew et al *ibid.*; Rost .1993) To bridge the gap requires not only exploring change processes through time and context but also engaging much more with actual management practice. One way forward would be to encourage individuals to work across both research and practice adopting a partnership approach to the funding, production and dissemination of future research.

Finally, there are implications for selecting and developing healthcare leaders flowing from the approach to leadership presented in this book, the strong operating context of Europe's healthcare services and from the research results presented in chapter 6. To recap, the conclusion of the research is that where healthcare leadership does exist it is rooted in the successful tackling of significant local issues based on an approach of developing effective networking and interpersonal skills and inter-organisational relationships. In turn, this approach is most likely to drive the local implementation of bigger, nationally driven strategies for change. Consequently, developing healthcare leaders needs to focus on personal learning and reflection based on their experience of tackling significant local challenges. The implications for selecting and developing the healthcare leaders of the future are fourfold.

First, the selection of senior healthcare executives, especially those aspiring to chief executive posts, needs to include assessment of their ability to form effective interpersonal relationships and by so doing, being able to influence other organisations through the development of inter-organisational networks. For the reasons given in chapter 5, the selection process should include an emotional intelligence-based component approach because of the greater impact of emotional intelligence at the top of organisations on corporate and personal success.

Second, because not only the context of each countries' healthcare system is different but also the context of local healthcare systems within each country, leadership is best learned and developed through the successful tackling of significant local issues. Governments should exercise restraint in the setting of national targets and criteria in order for local chief executives, managers and clinical leaders to have optimum freedom to develop a local leadership culture. This would not only increase the probability of sustainable rather than short-term results being produced but also develop a foundation of strong and effective interpersonal and inter-organisational relationships for when local healthcare leaders are required to implement nationally or regionally driven change.

Third, the extent to which leadership can be learned via participation on classroom based development programmes is limited. National and regional governments can best support leadership development by providing the necessary resources and personal and organisational development support for

local consumption. If national or regional resources are used to support such an approach then their use can be assessed within a national or regional leadership development framework that outlines senior and corporate leadership requirements for all healthcare organisations.

Fourth, given the increasingly multi-sectoral and inter-agency approach to health and healthcare management, much greater emphasis needs to be given to learning how to develop inter-organisational networks and influencing both within and beyond healthcare organisations. Inter-organisational rather than intra-organisational development practitioners need to be available to support local healthcare leaders if they are to be more successful in working across inter-organisational, inter-sectoral and inter-agency boundaries.

References

Pettigrew A, Whipp R (1993) *Managing Change for Competitive Success*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pettigrew A, Ferlie E, McKee L (1994) *Shaping Strategic Change, Making Change in Large Organisations: the case of the National Health Service*. London: Sage.

Pettigrew AM, Woodman RW, Cameron KM (2001) Studying Organizational Change and Development: Challenges for Future Research. *Academy of Management Journal*. 44 (4): 697-713.

Rost JC (1993) *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Praeger.

Wheatley MJ (1999) *Leadership and the New Science. Discovering Order in a Chaotic World*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.