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Abstract

This organizational improvement plan (OIP) presents possible leadership approaches and solutions to enhance team motivation through a period of rapid change. The OIP focuses on a team within an educational training institute, strategically aligned to a large educational organization. The training institute was previously known as the professional learning and development (PLD) department and was situated within the corporate office of the organization. The Governing Board moved the PLD department into a separate business entity, a training institute, with a new commercial vision. The team therefore transitioned from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation, to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation.

Although this OIP focuses on enhancing motivation, there are two goals central to the implementation plan. Goal one is to increase individual and team motivation, in order to achieve goal two, which is the commercial goal of the Institute to be financially profitable by year 3 of operation. As this OIP progressed, it became clear that the emergent theme was interdependence, through the frame of human resource (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The interdependent leadership approach of Trianalogue Leadership, created for the purpose of the OIP, has been aligned with the interdependent solution strategy of collaboration, collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers, and team building. Trianalogue Leadership involves three styles of leadership, including: Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985) and Distributed Leadership (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2005). The leadership approach and solution are inclusive across all organizational functions of the Training Institute, and all team members. If successful, the results of such could be shared with the wider organizational context in order to impact change more broadly.

Keywords: collaboration, interdependence, motivation, team, servant, distributed, transformational, trianalogue.
Executive Summary

The problem of practice (PoP) central to the OIP poses the question: “How can team motivation be enhanced, whilst going through a period of rapid change and transition from one operational style (service-oriented) to another (commercial oriented)?”

My PoP is grounded within a perceived neo-liberal context (Apple, 2001), of an international, for-profit, private education organization that owns 52 schools (UAE and Qatar). I am part of the senior leadership team within a new training institute, that focuses on teacher learning and leadership. This entity was previously known as the Professional Learning and Development (PLD) department, that was situated within the corporate office of the organization. Approximately 24 months ago, the Governing Board decided to move the PLD department into a separate business entity, a training institute, with a new commercial vision. We (the ‘Institute Team’) are therefore transitioning from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state), to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state).

Chapter 1 highlights the significance of the organizational context in which the PoP is positioned, and how the liberal Institute Team is demotivated and cynical as a result of a conservative, command and control organizational culture, within a wider neo-liberally driven context. A number of external and internal factors have contributed to this, including: marginalization, multiple value exercises, command and control culture, unilateral team behavior, team growth, and general versus domain-specific team expertise. These factors appear to demonstrate positional power (external) and personal power (internal factors). The result of which is affecting the people within the Institute Team. People are behaving politically in relation to what they see, by aiming to advance their own interests, and these factors have affected the congruence of the people, work, informal and formal structures within the Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model. Amidst the strategic change, the Institute Team require leadership approaches and solutions through the human resource frame.
Chapter 2 takes a much deeper look into the organization and considers the effect the internal and external factors are having on the Institute Team, but to also consider how various solutions and leadership approaches can be implemented to promote motivation. Viewing my OIP through the human resource frame empowered me to feel that I can “make a difference” (Sowell, 2014, p. 212). The deeper organizational analysis using the Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model highlights a demand for a specific shift or clarity in direction from leadership. The leadership approach created for the purpose of this OIP—Trianalogous Leadership—aims to meet that demand.

In the culminating chapter of this OIP, chapter 3 connects to chapter 1 and chapter 2, so that there is coherence and flow from the initial introduction of the PoP, through to the organizational analysis, whereby subsequent solutions to the PoP are presented into the change plan. Chapter 3 demonstrates a clear implementation plan, inclusive of robust monitoring and evaluation tools and measures, with consideration to the ethical commitments for the relevant stakeholders, that is presented in a clear and persuasive communication plan. These elements were consistently aligned to the core goals of the OIP. Goal one is to increase individual and team motivation, in order to achieve goal two, which is the commercial goal of the Institute to be financially profitable by year 3 of operation. As chapter 3 progressed, it became clear that the emerging theme was interdependence. The interdependent leadership approach of Trianalogous Leadership, is aligned with the interdependent solution strategy of collaboration, collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers and team building. The solutions and leadership approaches themselves, actually became the mode of communication and are integral within the communications plan of chapter 3, in order to enact the interdependent solution effectively.

Application of this plan will hopefully improve the motivation of the Institute Team whilst going through the period of rapid change from one operational style to another.
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1.0 Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 1 introduces the organizational context of the organizational improvement plan (OIP). It explains the layers of complexity from the country, to the organization, to the training institute in which the problem of practice (PoP) is situated. The PoP is explained in detail, highlighting the specific external and internal factors affecting the training institute. We (the ‘Institute Team’) are therefore transitioning from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state), to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state). Amidst the organizational context, I share my leadership position, values and focused vision for change, whilst framing the PoP within two chosen models: The Nadler and Tushman Model and Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model. The organizational readiness for change is then discussed taking the aforementioned into consideration.

1.1 Organizational Context

1.1.1 Contexts and Organizational Structures

The context in which the OIP is positioned has multiple layers, all of which influence the PoP. These include the country (United Arab Emirates (UAE); i.e., the federal context), the organizational context, and the context of the training institute upon which the PoP is grounded.

The UAE is a federal absolute monarchy and resonates strongly with conservatism in terms of leadership. However, the country has a specific growth agenda focused on its vision for the goal year 2021. The UAE national agenda includes a set of long-term performance outcomes—in the sectors of education, healthcare, economy, police and security, housing, infrastructure, and government services—that allow comparison of the UAE performance against global benchmarks. These national indicators are periodically monitored by
Government leadership to ensure their targets are achieved by 2021 (UAE Government, 2017). The predisposition to performance strongly resonates with neo-liberalism.

The organizational context demonstrates significant similarity to the federal context in that it is perceived as predominantly neoliberal with conservative leadership. The organization is an international, for-profit, private education organization that owns 52 schools within the UAE and an additional 20-30 schools globally. I am part of the senior leadership team within a new training institute, that focuses on teacher learning and leadership. This entity was previously known as the Professional Learning and Development (PLD) department, situated within the corporate office of the organization. We are accountable to numerous stakeholders including the Chairman and Founder, Managing Director, Investor Board, Chief Academic Officer (CAO), Vice Presidents (VPs) of each school cluster, and the Corporate Office Departmental Directors (see Figure 1.1). Collectively I refer to these stakeholders as the “Governing Board.” Approximately 24 months ago, the Governing Board decided to move the PLD department into a separate business entity, a training institute, with a new commercial vision. We (the “Institute Team”) are therefore transitioning from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state) to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state). I perceive the Institute Team to be predominantly liberal in nature, although influenced by a conservative leadership structure. The reasoning for the conservative, neo-liberal and liberal perceptions are described below.

Apple (2001) would describe the key tenets of neo-liberalism as privatization, marketization, performativity. In comparison, Ryan (2012) would describe neo-liberalism as “accountability-driven pedagogy and curricula, competitive testing, and market enterprises” (p. 19). It is on these tenets that I perceive the federal and organizational context of this OIP through a neo-liberal lens. According to Ryan (2012), the organizational context would be ideal for most neoliberal reformers, as he states “the ideal school is private, one that is owned and operated by individuals or groups” (p. 26). The federal government within the UAE inspects our schools...
every year, putting pressure on the schools to perform and improve yearly, which is an accountability measure used within our organization to compare school success: performativity (Apple, 2001). This contributes to the pressure of schools performing to their highest standards, as it is what “consumers” would then use to choose appropriate schools for their children. A market based on performance prevails, because “if they do not do well, they will go out of business” (Ryan, 2012, p. 26), and these are the short-term consequences of target-focused, results-based schooling as described by Husbands and Gleeson (2003). As the schools in the organization pertain to such a marketized culture, so do the support service businesses that assist the schools. Therefore, this has high significance for the context in which the training institute is positioned. Figure 1.1 below demonstrates the positioning of the training institute within the wider organizational structure, i.e., an organization within an organization.

![Figure 1.1. Positioning of the training institute within the wider organizational structure.](image)

Based on the preoccupation of standardization and control, neo-liberalism has resonance with conservatism, where command, control and accountability procedures tend to prevail (Gutek, 1997). The key tenets of conservatism describe institutions or organizations as those that promote practices, rights, and duties from the past and differences in human potentiality results from social milieus where they are reared and elitism prevails. A tested
culture then forms in the organization and tradition becomes the repository. These contributions organically align the past with tested traditions, into a social caste system structured hierarchically (Gutek, 1997). The current organizational culture has a clear hierarchical organizational structure (Figure 1.1 above), and the use of command and control is evident by a number of elitist stakeholders: The Governing Board. The Governing Board have converged in one context and bring their own “traditions” and ways of working (conservatism), and through the hierarchical structure, certain traditions are slowly becoming embedded. One tradition seems to be that of command and control. An “elitist” group (i.e., the Governing Board) has made the decision to move the central PLD department to a profit-making, commercial training institute, without little input and discussion from the PLD department, and as such, we are subject to a command and control culture. Due to the level of corporate governance and hierarchical leadership structure, accountability also prevails (Huse, 2005), supporting Gutek’s (1997) earlier definition of conservatism.

Gary (2006) describes liberal education as “skeptical of authority and received views” seen to promote change and transformation, whether it is internal or external (p. 121). Raven (2005) highlighted participative democracy as an appropriate leadership style within the liberal approach. Having led and worked within the PLD Team for over 6 years now, I understand the prevailing culture to be one of liberalism, with a democratic style of leadership, open feedback, and regular risk-taking. However, the team have significantly grown recently by 300% (from four to 16 people) and now that we are going through the organizational change, this culture seems to be at risk itself.

Schein (2017) defines culture as “the accumulated shared learning of that group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration; which has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, feel, and behave in relation to those problems. This accumulated learning is a pattern or system of beliefs, values, and behavioral norms that come to be taken for granted as
basic assumptions and eventually drop out of awareness” (p. 6). When Schein (2017) defined culture as accumulated shared learning, he also posited three major levels of cultural analysis, including: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts refer to visible structures, processes and observed behavior; espoused beliefs and values are less visible, and they tend to reflect individual assumptions; and basic underlying assumptions defines for us what to pay attention to, what things mean, how to react emotionally to what is going on, and what actions to take in various kinds of situations (Schein, 2017, pp. 18-22).

Upon considering this definition and levels of culture, the team appears to be averse to taking risks now, due to the external adaptation of the higher command and control culture that is affecting the internal integration. Their espoused beliefs and values, in particular, are being influenced by the Governing Board, because the team does not yet have any shared knowledge as a group to take common action. It could be interpreted that the team members are unable to act and behave in a liberal manner due to the constraints of a conservative leadership at the higher levels of the organization, despite going through a period of transformation. The team seems to be conforming, rather than being skeptical of authority, as Gary (2006) describes.

Although a Senior Leader within the team (Head, Internal Quality Management) position) and a member of the Institute’s Senior Leadership Team (SLT), our Senior Vice President is the team’s overall leader, to whom I report directly. Figure 1.2 depicts the previous organizational structure of the training institute. Figure 1.3 demonstrates the recently changed organizational structure of the institute, as we move quickly to achieve the commercial-orientation (future state). Evident within Figure 1.3 is a more substantial senior leadership team (i.e., the Vice President and the three Head roles), that are directly accountable to the Senior Vice President and members of the Governing Board.
ORGANIZATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1.1.2 Vision, mission, values, purpose, and goals

Although it was the Governing Board that made the decision to move the PLD department into a separate business entity (a training institute) to meet a commercial vision, environmental factors were also dominant drivers to the change. Federal regulations are changing the way teachers will be assessed, developed, and licensed in the UAE. This federal
change is part of the national vision to achieve a first-rate education system (UAE Government, 2017), and creates the need for preparation and development programs for all teachers to comply to the licensing protocol. If we had remained as a central PLD department, there would have been a conflict of interest in preparing and developing the teachers across the organization’s schools, hence promoting the decision to move into a separate business entity.

Part of the vision for the training institute is to not only to serve the interests of the organization but also the Government and the external customers and schools across the UAE. Federally, the training institute will be of seminal influence across the country, supporting their vision to increase the percentage of high quality teachers across all schools in the region. The Governing Board’s interests would be served commercially in terms of revenue from selling numerous development programs. Educationally, the “customers” would include: Principals of each partner school, participants, trainers, facilitators, program designers, and the future external clients. Their interests lie in the quality of the PLD and how it improves their practices. Therein lies a dichotomy between quantity and quality.

As I consider my own future and leadership vision, the ultimate strategic aim would be to develop a truly interdependent, collaborative, and motivated team that support each other across the different roles and responsibilities, in order to achieve the organizational and federal visions. With consideration to the above, there are different organizational, contextual, and leadership visions for change. However, I believe I can merge these visions to provide effective solutions so that the commercial goals can be met whilst enhancing the Institute Team’s quality of performance and motivation.

Overall, the organization is in transition, with complex issues to consider. The next section will start to consider these complex issues through my lens of leadership.

1.2 Leadership Position Statement

Based upon the varying levels of influencing contexts within the OIP, a complex style of leadership is demanded, whereby the needs of the liberal Institute Team can be balanced
amid the neo-liberal federal and organizational objectives, within a conservative leadership structure.

Although I am a member of the Institute’s SLT, our Senior Vice President is the Institute’s overall line manager (the change agent or leader), to whom I report directly to. “Change agents or leaders need to take calculated actions and be prepared to undertake the work needed to create and support the powerful coalitions to effect change in organizations” (Cawsey, Deszca, & Ingols, 2016, p 26). This initially created a sense of ambiguity toward the level of agency I felt I had to support the team through the organizational change, but interestingly, as I reflected on my position during the change management process, I now understand I have agency to effectively implement and sustain the change as a change facilitator. Change facilitators are said to effectively use their interpersonal skills—high levels of self-awareness, emotional maturity, and behavioral support—to work with teams or groups and the effectiveness of their role comes from managing the consequences of decisions and creating desired results, highlighting that the role is important and needed in organizations so a sustained integrated approach can be followed (Cawsey et al., 2016).

My core leadership values reside with integrity, authenticity, and transparency, and I believe the main role of a leader is to develop others and motivate others to be the best they can be, despite the command and control culture of my wider organization. Northouse (2016) claims that “integrity is the quality of honesty and trustworthiness” (p. 25), authenticity “focuses on whether leadership is genuine and real” (p. 195), and “transparency refers to being open and honest in presenting one’s true self to others” by sharing core motives and intentional clarity (p. 203). The definitions of three values demonstrate collective resonance to honesty and self-awareness and are synonymous to the interpersonal skills of change facilitators, that Cawsey et al. (2016) claim are important for a sustained integrated approach. Russell (2001) promotes that personal values result in attitudes that in turn affect behaviors. Such values can, therefore, affect a leaders’ perception of situations, subsequently affect the solutions that are
generated, and affect the extent to which leaders accept or reject organizational pressures or goals (Russell, 2001). Upon my perception of the organizational and contextual pressures, the most prominent vision for me is in enhancing and maintaining team motivation. This is the position from which I will generate solutions and leadership approaches. The term motivation is defined in section 1.3.

The three leadership approaches that I attribute closely to my own values include Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985) and Distributed Leadership (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2005). I define these three approaches below and connect them to my current practices in an aim to demonstrate my default leadership position.

1.2.1 Servant Leadership

The leadership style of most resonance to my values is servant leadership. This leadership is committed to genuinely caring about the individuals in the organization (Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears, 2004; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, & Jinks, 2007), and “servant leaders assert the important place of values, beliefs, and principles in leadership” (Russell, 2001, p. 79). Historically, Greenleaf (1977) defined servant leadership, claiming “a great leader is seen as servant first” (p. 19). He took “a fresh critical look at the issues of power and authority, and stated people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creative supporting ways” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 20). A servant leader is interested in the growth and well-being of people in the communities that they are part of, and they do this by sharing power and putting the needs of others before them, inadvertently helping people perform and develop to their best (Greenleaf, 1977).

The literature suggests there are particular attributes and principles congruent to servant leadership: *integrity*, *modeling*, and *stewardship* (Russell, 2001; Russell and Stone; 2002; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004). With integrity, I believe it important to be who you say you
are, and operate with truthfulness, fairness and having respect for the individuals you work with (Russell & Stone, 2002). However, before you can behave with integrity, I feel it is important to have a high degree of self-awareness (Spears, 2004). As Taylor et al. (2007) quotes: “to be a model for others one must first understand oneself and one’s leadership” (p. 416). “Servant leaders model the way through personal example and dedicated execution to attract followers into commitment, into dedication, into motivation, and into excellence” (Russell & Stone, 2004, p. 149). When I design any leadership development programs for example, I am emphatic about starting with self, before even considering how to develop others. I believe leaders must develop their self-awareness—an interpersonal skill of change facilitators—so that they can then improve their self-management, and then they can consider developing others with true integrity. Therefore, if I preach such self-awareness, I must therefore model the same. I always aim to be conscious of my behaviors and the effect these have on others. I have a critical friend in the team who regularly gives me feedback on this, and as a result, she is now doing the same.

Spears (2004) states stewardship uses openness and persuasion, or what I would refer to as transparency, to assume a commitment to serving the needs of others. Ultimately, regardless of whether we become more commercial in our organizational objectives, the core of our work is focused on the service we provide to schools, aiming to improve their teaching and leadership. I regularly reiterate this with the team, and although they feel their voices aren’t heard by the Governing Board, it is important to highlight and celebrate the positive feedback they receive from participants within and across the schools to promote their motivation. Effective use of evaluation data from our training programs allows us to do this, and our monthly reporting strategy is shared with the team. I ensure that I draw out the key headlines from this data and share openly in our weekly team meetings. This seems to encourage team members to celebrate success, as well as promote a solution-based culture where we aim to improve any specific areas arising.
Through the use of servant leadership, I always aim to lead by example (with authenticity), evoke trust (through integrity and transparency), and inspire all stakeholders by developing a culture of mutual respect, exemplifying the effective use of interpersonal skills as promoted by the role of change facilitators. However, “at its core, servant leadership is a long-term transformational approach” (Spears, 2004, p. 7) and is positioned by Northouse (2016) as a behavioral style of leadership. Within the complex, fast-moving context of the OIP, the above servant leadership attributes of integrity, modeling, and stewardship, may take some time to fully embed into the team culture as “accumulated shared learning”, like Schein (2017, p. 6) would promote. Schein (2017) states that “we cannot rely on overt behavior alone because it is always determined both by the cultural predisposition and by the situational contingencies that arise from the immediate external environment” (p. 13). Developing such a culture that enhances and maintains motivation can therefore be difficult, particularly through one type of leadership approach alone. Distributed and transformational leadership are therefore positioned as additional leadership approaches, that are resonant to each other, and to my values and agency as a leader.

1.2.2 Distributed Leadership

Acknowledging the team component that is significant within this OIP, distributed leadership responds to “the complexities of team processes that demand the attention and focus of all members of the team” (Northouse, 2016, p. 365), and as Spillane (2005) claims, it is focused on “practice rather than on leaders or their roles, functions, routines, and structures” (p. 143). A key theorist who focuses on Distributed leadership is Gronn (2000) whose intention was upon the agency–structure interplay. He emphasized the “centrality of conjoint agency, that is, the satisfactory completion of discretionary tasks is attributable to the concertive labor performed by pluralities of interdependent organization members” (Gronn, 2000, p.318). It is here that the notion of interdependence arises but becomes prominent throughout the development of this OIP. Interdependence within the context of this OIP refers to the
dependence of approaches, strategies or components with one another for greater and more effective impact. Gronn (2000, p. 318) continues “that a distributed view of tasks and activities implies the existence of a new form of the division of labor at the heart of organizational work. Such a development has important implications for traditionally defined individual roles and for crude dualisms such as leader–follower and leadership–followership.” Distinct similarity exists here with servant leadership, with reference to sharing power and putting needs of others first as posited by Greenleaf (1977).

Collaboration is a practice of distributed leadership (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002) and is defined as the “ability of a team to work well together in which team members can stay problem focused, listen to and understand one another, feel free to take risks, and be willing to compensate for one another” (Northouse, 2016, p. 370). It is something I passionately model through regular meetings with my team and the extended team of stakeholders. The meetings are mostly aligned to the organizational functions of the Training Institute and are used to review current programs, products and practices, and I always ensure I explain the ‘why’ of certain decisions, before we collaboratively agree on the ‘how’, maintaining transparency. However, this also aids collective distribution in which leaders work interdependently, but separately (Diamond, 2015), therefore it is also a practice that continues outside of meetings. I believe learning should be transparent in all areas and the development of interdependence, sustainability, and capacity building should be paramount, so that the “collective” can sustain success (Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013). As intimiated earlier, the notion of interdependence emerges significantly throughout chapters 2 and 3 of this OIP, particularly when considering both servant and distributed leadership with transformational leadership.

1.2.3 Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is selected in addition to servant and distributed approaches because they all have relatively analogous characteristics and are seen as dynamic forms of leadership (Stone et al., 2004). Northouse (2016), however, would position
transformational leadership as a process that changes and transforms people. This modern positioning of transformational leadership has resonance to the historical view by Bass (1985) who defines the transformational leader as someone “who provides a model of integrity and fairness with people and also sets clear and high standards of performance, and he encourages followers with advice, help, support, recognition, and openness” (p. 468). The resonance to the integrity of Greenleaf’s (1977) servant leadership is also clear from this definition, and despite the notion of followers that Gronn (2000) would argue against, Bass (1985) promotes resonant features such as help, support and openness between leaders and their people. In a hierarchical structured organization as depicted on Figures 1.1-1.3, the reality of leaders and followers exists, hence choosing transformational leadership approaches.

A transformational leader’s focus is directed toward the organization, and it is their behavior that can build follower commitment toward organizational objectives (Stone et al., 2004). This resonates with my agency as change facilitator, to effectively implement and sustain the organizational change (Cawsey et al., 2016). However, despite transformational leadership being concerned with the process of how certain leaders are able to inspire followers to accomplish great things, it “stresses the importance to understand and adapt to the needs and motives of followers” (Northouse, 2016, p. 190). I feel it is necessary that the team and the leader initially understand their own motives, values and influencing motivational factors, so that we can build a collaborative culture, in which we can then collectively strategize toward optimistically meeting the organizational commercial objectives. I believe that I lead by example by being transparent and authentic with my own values and motives, particularly during collaborative work with the team. However, I would like to understand the individual team members to a greater extent in terms of their motives, particularly since the team has grown rapidly recently, and then be able to build greater follower commitment through acting confidently and optimistically about the new change. Such motives and needs are discussed in
The three leadership approaches of servant, distributed, and transformational leadership have significant synergy and are complementary ideologies (Taylor et al., 2007; Stone et al., 2004). Taylor et al. (2007) claimed that servant leadership, integral with distributed and transformational leadership, rests on the authenticity and true value of empowering others. However, in contrast to each other, Northouse (2016) positions servant leadership as behavioral, and transformational leadership as a process, whilst Spillane (2005) would position distributed leadership as being first and foremost about leadership practice. These differential notions of behavior, process and practice are further developed in section 2.4 of chapter 2 and it is upon these tenets that interdependence is promoted.

In summary, within my current context I see my leadership agency as a change facilitator, modeling my own values through servant, distributed, and transformational leadership approaches, in order to enhance and maintain team motivation. Considering my leadership position discussed in this section, and the complex issues in my organization as described in section 1.1, the next section will define the leadership PoP that will become the core driver of this OIP.

1.3 Leadership Problem of Practice (PoP)

The PoP central to the OIP poses the question: “How can team motivation be enhanced, whilst going through a period of rapid change and transition from one operational style (service-oriented) to another (commercial oriented)?” At this stage, before I explain the context further, I believe it is important to define motivation. Motivation is “the reason underlying behavior” (Guay, Chanal, Ratelle, Marsh, Larose & Boivin, 2010, p. 712). Researchers recognize two major types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to do or achieve something because one truly wants to and takes pleasure or sees value in doing so and extrinsic motivation is the desire to do or achieve something not for the
enjoyment of the thing itself, but because doing so leads to a certain result (Pintrich, 2003). I believe this OIP needs to balance the intrinsic needs of the team members, with the extrinsic needs of the organization, and this is where the following notion by Peterson (2007) becomes prominent to this PoP: “Motivation is not designated by a leader to a team member; instead, motivation is internal to each team member and derived from a team member’s desire to achieve a goal, accomplish a task, or work toward expectations” (p. 60).

My PoP is grounded within a perceived neo-liberal context (Apple, 2001), of an international, for-profit, private education organization that owns 52 schools (UAE and Qatar). I am part of the senior leadership team within a new training institute, that focuses on teacher learning and leadership. This entity was previously known as the PLD department and was situated within the corporate office of the organization. Approximately 24 months ago, the Governing Board decided to move the PLD department into a separate business entity, a training institute, with a new commercial vision. We (the ‘Institute Team’) are therefore transitioning from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state), to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state).

The Institute Team have gone through significant change over the last 24 months, and for whom a degree of frustration, demotivation and cynicism has resulted. A number of external and internal factors have contributed to this. The three main external factors that are framed by the larger organization include: marginalization, multiple value exercises, and command and control culture. The three main internal factors that are framed by the Institute Team include: unilateral team behavior, team growth, and team expertise. The variance between the external and internal factors demonstrate the complexity of an organization within an organization as previously highlighted.

Within my leadership role, I tend to be exposed to the Governing Board, but work closely with the Institute Team and the schools. The Governing Board seeks feedback (predominantly verbal) from the Principals (of the 52 schools) and leaders of the corporate
business units in the corporate office regarding training and PLD provided, but it would seem that the Institute Team, participants and trainers, and the school based PLD Coordinators are not consulted. They therefore express verbally that they feel marginalized in that their voices are not being heard.

The value and worth of PLD is regularly being questioned through a number of channels. Firstly, the Senior Vice President (SVP) of the Institute Team, has regularly questioned the value of what we do and expresses the desire to cull some programs, without indicating which ones; creating a sense of ambiguity. Secondly, the Vice President’s (VP’s) representing the operational and the educational components of the schools have also questioned what we do and how PLD impacts their business objectives. These value exercises seem to scrutinize current practices and appear to question the trustworthiness of the team, creating a feeling of cynicism amongst the Institute team toward the larger organization.

The Governing Board made the decision to move to a profit-making training institute, with little input and discussion from the Institute Team and as such, we are subject to a command and control culture (Gutek, 1997). “There is still so much system dysfunction, mostly arising from inappropriate command and control and that, when problems inevitably arise, blame is often incorrectly placed on individuals and groups” (Glatter, 2006, p. 75).

In support of Glatter’s (2006) above statement and the fear of such blame, I have noticed that some members of the team seem to be taking steps to ensure they protect themselves unilaterally. They ensure that the work they do is clearly recorded and shared with positional leaders, without necessary due consideration to how others in the team are working and communicating, highlighting the differences within the coalition. Such behavior demonstrates that personal power is prominent (Bolman & Deal, 2013) causing the team to start to disband and work separately and independently to one another, opposed to working interdependently as a team.
Another factor that has exacerbated team disbandment is that the team has grown 300% within the last 24 months, and within that time there has been a turnover of at least 30%. Members are made of those who mostly have a specific area of expertise (e.g., Arabic teacher development, initial teacher training), with a small number operating more generically across teacher and leader development. Specialist team members tend to work more unilaterally, to the frustration of those team members who tend to work in a more generalist and collaborative approach. This has created internal team tensions, amidst the organizational and external pressures.

As a result of the change management processes moving toward commercialization, the Institute Team have been subject to a number of contributing factors including: marginalization, multiple value exercises, command and control, unilateral team member behavior, team growth and varying team expertise, and are therefore feeling demotivated and cynical. The next section will now consider the potential lines of inquiry and the challenges emerging from the PoP.

1.4 Guiding Questions Emerging from the PoP

1.4.1 Potential lines of inquiry stemming from the main problem

If the PoP were to be metaphorically represented, the team would be symbolized as a fast-moving “train”, and the continuously changing “scenery” as representative of the wider organizational (external) and environmental context. Considering the metaphor, the core line of inquiry is the team motivation on the train, with further inquiry lines stemming from the multiple internal factors (in the train) and external factors (the scenery) that have affected, and continue to affect, the main problem. This metaphor is captured in Figure 1.4.

It is therefore important to understand the influential factors on previous, current and future motivation, on an individual level and also at the team level. When considering individual motivation, factors such as personality, motivational approaches and orientations, and also the causes of employee cynicism require investigation. On a team level, consideration
to the constructs of team motivation and performance is required. In terms of team motivation and subsequent impact on team performance, interpersonal relationships and the combination of general and domain-specific expertise (Gardner, 2012) is to be deliberated. The effect of which will impact team performance. Gardner (2012) defines team performance pressure as an externally imposed set of three interrelated factors increasing the emphasis on excellent performance, that can be anticipated or planned for. These factors include: outcome accountability, scrutiny and evaluation, and consequences of performance. Performance pressure affects four group processes. These include: the drive towards consensus, a focus on common knowledge, an orientation toward completion, and conformity with hierarchy. All of the above are phenomena within the main problem and will be investigated further in the next section (1.5) whilst framing the PoP and subsequently determine the leadership-focused vision for change (section 1.6).

1.4.2 Challenges that emerge from the main problem

The most significant challenge within the PoP is the continuous change surrounding the actual change process. In such a dynamic organizational context, consistency becomes difficult (Thomas-Hunt & Phillips, 2001). During the time of this OIP, the wider organization has changed in terms of growth and staff turnover as has the Institute Team, highlighting the challenge of an organization within an organization. With the transient nature of the UAE team members change relatively regularly, so a challenge will be to try and establish the intended culture that is stable enough despite team members leaving and new ones joining and one that is able to adapt to further change, as Schein (2017) suggests through his notion of “accumulated shared learning” (p. 6). As a ‘start-up’ business entity, this is difficult, as the culture needs to be founded for the new institute, whilst a degree of legacy culture has transitioned from the original (although smaller) PLD department, as well as the influencing culture of the wider organization.
Given the multitude of contributing factors internally and externally to the PoP, a potential challenge within this OIP could be my leadership agency, not only with the team per se, but also in managing those in positional power (i.e., leading up and leading across). My personal leadership values and default leadership approaches (predominantly shared and collaborative) are not congruent to the default style of the organization (predominantly conservative, command and control), creating immediate tension and potential frustration. However, in an attempt to utilize specific leadership approaches to influence the team culture, we could operate our own internal congruence, despite the wider organizational culture.

In addition, I am the longest standing member of the Institute Team, and I may need to be careful that my personal biases do not pose a significant issue to the plan. I have varying established relationship dynamics with some members of the team, and I may need to monitor these and their effect on the whole team, whilst trying to establish stronger relationships with the other members of the team.

From the onset of this OIP the context has changed rapidly and continues to change as described above, therefore I may need to operate with short-term goals, with a long-term vision. The transfer of change from service-orientation to commercial orientation needs to be carefully and systematically managed at an appropriate pace, so that commercial goals can be met successively without compromising the Institute Team’s performance and motivation any further. The below section focuses deeper into the theory surrounding team performance and motivation, and the analytical frameworks that can be used to substantiate the PoP in the broader contextual forces that may shape the solutions and practices.

1.5 Framing the PoP

This section articulates the perspectives of the PoP using key organizational theories and frameworks and aims to address the lines of inquiry emerging from the section above. The Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model and Bolman and Deal’s (2013) Human Resource Frame are posited as the organizational analysis frameworks, and then the
influencing motivational factors – from an individual level and a team level – are considered, followed by a reflection upon team member expertise and employee cynicism.

1.5.1 Nadler and Tushman Model

The Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model highlights how inputs are transformed into outputs. The inputs being the Governing Board’s commercial strategy and the federal regulations (environmental influence), and the outputs being the commercial gain and quality PLD services. The PoP demonstrates resonance to those features. The complexity and dynamism of these inputs and outputs also resonate with Sterman’s System Dynamics Model (Sterman, 2001) as it acknowledges systems thinking and a more complex, nonlinear model, emphasizing that decisions lead to “side effects” as well as intended effects or “goals.” However, Sterman’s System Dynamics Model (Sterman, 2001) does not seem to explicitly consider the inputs leading into the “decisions” and the long-term solution mapping to specific outputs, regardless of whether these will change dynamically as the process progresses. The Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model acknowledges that the inputs are important to future change and it also recognizes that the system is dynamic. As the environmental conditions shift or are altered, the “informal organization” needs to also do so (Cawsey et al, 2016). Of most significance however, particularly with respect to the PoP, is the transformation within the core of the model: organizational coherence (Nadler & Tushman, 1999). Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model was designed as an organizational analytical tool and “puts the greatest emphasis on the transformation process and specifically reflects the critical system property of interdependence” (p. 39). The model was chosen as it demonstrates how the combination of the external and internal factors can influence the organizational components. If there is a lack of alignment between the factors affecting change and the people component, demotivation could result, negatively affecting team readiness for change.
Figure 1.4 captures all contributing factors within a conceptual model that has been derived from a combination of Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model. Despite these models originating in 1993 and 1980 respectively, they are still widely used in practice and research in this decade (Amis, 2017; Kirrane, Lennon, O’Connor & Fu, 2016; Kondakci, Beycioglu, Sincar & Ugurlu, 2017; Neves & Schyns, 2018; Seong, Kim & Szulanski, 2015). In Amis’ (2017, p.27) paper, Tushman claimed that his “most impactful work was the congruence model and is still always shocked when he sees it used in teaching and practice now”. Since 1980, Tushman has developed the congruence model with O’Reilly to also consider ambidexterity. He claims “ambidexterity is simply the congruence model on steroids, multiple congruence models simultaneously” (Amis, 2017, p.27). Although the challenge of an organization within an organization was highlighted earlier within the context of this OIP, the congruence model will only be applied the Institute team in terms of the organizational analysis in Chapter 2. Further next steps would be to also apply the congruence model to the wider organization and investigate the concept of ambidexterity further.
The model captures the contextual factors (moving scenery) affecting this PoP (environmental, external, and internal), whilst demonstrating the movement of the team (on the train), and the internal concepts that need consideration (inside the core of the train shape in the above model). Surrounding the “train” and also receptive to the contextual factors, is the leadership approach and role, so that credibility manifests throughout the journey of change.

The introduction of this internal congruence model frames the core PoP, but also becomes the key focus of organizational analysis in section 2.2. Beyond the organizational analysis, Bolman and Deal’s (2013) four frame model was considered to identify the key driver that may be suitable in leading the change forward.

1.5.2 Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Model

Bolman and Deal (2013) suggest four frames to help leaders understand their organizations through multiple perspectives or lenses, in order to gain clarity and find strategies that make a difference (Sowell, 2014; Lyon, Nadershahi, Nattestad, Kachalia & Hammer, 2014). The four frames include the: structural frame, human resource frame, political frame and symbolic frame. All four frames or lenses were considered within the PoP; however, the political frame and human resource frames emerged more prominently and are discussed below.

The political frame is claimed to be universal and proposes, “power relations inevitably spawn political activity” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 188). As described earlier, there are number of power relations evident within the PoP, including position and personal power. The conservative, hierarchical organizational structure of the context clearly depicts positional power. The regular questioning of the value and worth of PLD and marginalization of the Institute Team through such positional power channels could be attributed as a key product of a neo-liberal context (Ryan, 2012). In such a demonstration of positional power, each person or
group also express minimal interest in the history of the PLD department. Without consideration to such “history”, it would seem the side effect of frustration is created, affecting the congruence with the informal organization. In addition, as the accountability of creating a commercial training institute increases, coupled with the growth in team size, unilateral team behavior is resulting, demonstrating personal power. This exemplifies that not only is the Governing Board controlling an agenda through position power, but it would seem so are the members of the team through personal power, and as such “politics are more salient and intense in difficult times” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 190). Therefore, the political frame initially seemed prominent in diagnosing the features of the PoP.

However, despite the power relations existing within the PoP prompting the political frame lens to be initially considered, the people component of the core congruence model specifically emerged as a specific focus for the OIP, and the human resource frame was therefore chosen. According to Bolman and Deal (2013), the human resource frame positions people as the most important asset in organizations. In such a changing environment, greater consideration for how people are changing within that organization is expected, particularly if they “can make or break an organization” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117). The human resource frame emphasizes the interdependence between people and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004) and for the human resource frame to function successfully, the needs of both the individual and organization need to be aligned symbiotically, so “good fit benefits both” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117). This not only resonates to the emerging theme of interdependence within this OIP but promotes the definition of motivation stated earlier in section 1.3, whereby the balance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is synergistic to that of the needs of both the individual and organization. I believe this OIP needs to balance the intrinsic needs of the team members with the extrinsic needs of the organization. This is where the following notion by Peterson (2007) becomes prominent to this PoP: “Motivation is not designated by a leader to a team member; instead, motivation is internal to each team member
and derived from a team member’s desire to achieve a goal, accomplish a task, or work toward expectations” (p. 60). The aim of the human resource frame is to “align the needs of individuals and organizations, engaging people’s talent and energy while the enterprise profits” (Bolman & Deal, 2013; p. 117), also demonstrating direct correlation to Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model. Bolman and Deal (2013) posit human resource-frame leaders as process-oriented who serve as facilitators and consensus-builders. Aligned to my agency as change facilitator, and with consideration to my own leadership values, the human resource frame seems to have resonance to servant, distributed, and transformational leadership approaches. These leadership approaches are committed to genuinely caring about the individuals and stakeholders in the organization, rooted in integrity (Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). Taking the above into consideration, the Human Resource frame was chosen as the key driver in leading the change, within the PoP.

Figure 1.5 below demonstrates how the human resource frame and the above leadership approaches have been mapped directly into Figure 1.4 within the red section (Leadership Approach, Role and Credibility).
Figure 1.5. The human resource frame mapped into the conceptual model. Adapted from Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model.

Figure 1.5 highlights the people component that is emerging strongly within this OIP and demonstrates how it is positioned at the core of the congruence model. The Leadership Approach, Role and Credibility (red colored area) surrounds the core team and their congruence, acting almost like a shield to the external and environmental factors, of the organization and the federal bodies. Within reference to my leadership agency, this depicts the genuine care for the Institute Team through the three leadership approaches (servant, distributed and transformational) and the aim to improve their motivation from within, whilst almost being a protective barrier to the command and control organizational culture externally. The distributed leadership practice of collaboration is demonstrated as driving the train as it were. This practice or solution is expanded further in chapter 2 and 3 of this OIP.

If we are to therefore consider how people are changing within the organization, particularly if they “can make or break an organization” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117), it is
important to understand the influencing motivational factors, from an individual level and a team level. The next sub-section aims to address this.

### 1.5.3 Influencing Motivational Factors

As previously defined, motivation is “the reason underlying behavior” (Guay et al., 2010, p. 712). Researchers recognize two major types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to do or achieve something because one truly wants to and takes pleasure or sees value in doing so and extrinsic motivation is the desire to do or achieve something not for the enjoyment of the thing itself, but because doing so leads to a certain result (Pintrich, 2003). Some refer to this divide as the difference between true motivation and “engagement,” or simply holding one’s attention. Others see not a divide but a spectrum; any action could be motivated by a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Murray, 2011; Rigby, Deci, Patrick, & Ryan, 1992). According to Peterson (2007), motivation can inspire, encourage, and stimulate individuals, and a leader must take the time to understand how every individual is motivated. However, it is to be noted that “motivation is not designated by a leader to a team member; instead, motivation is internal to each team member and derived from a team member’s desire to achieve a goal, accomplish a task, or work toward expectations” (Peterson, 2007, p. 60). In support of this, Pink (2011) suggests that if people are intrinsically motivated, a greater sense of mastery and purpose will ensue. There are a number of motivational theories posited by Peterson (2007) that a leader can consider to understand the reason for demotivation and adjust leadership approaches as required. These include: McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y; McClelland Achievement, Affiliation, and Power Motivation; and Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Personal Style.

McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y motivational approach classifies two polar differences in team members. Theory X people tend to avoid added responsibilities and require an authoritative and controlling work environment. Theory Y are those who want to work, seek constant improvement, and need to be challenged and empowered with responsibilities. An
authoritative environment, such as that of the command and control wider organizational culture of the PoP, can be demotivating to Theory Y people, and they require a much more liberal environment conducive for motivation, as Gary (2006) posits.

McClelland’s Achievement, Affiliation, and Power Motivation theory identifies particular individual drives or orientations for motivation. Achievement motivation is driven by the need to succeed, a need to be good at what they do, and these individuals tend to be self-driven. They demonstrate similarities to Theory Y individuals and would flourish in high-respect and high-trust environments, where leader credibility is perceived. Affiliation motivation is driven by relationships with others, team unity and a willingness to assist and support others. In contrast, power motivation is driven by the ability to dominate, lead or be given ownership of broad tasks with decision making capabilities. These people tend to be the authoritarians that Theory X individuals may potentially thrive with. Alternatively, Driskell, Goodwin, Salas, and O’Shea (2006) found that those who are dominant and controlling can be an anathema to interdependent team interaction.

Finally, MBTI Personal Styles determine preferences and motivation tactics of each individual, by reviewing four common traits: personal contact with others, application of realism, ability to apply logic, and influences of judgement. A leader with such information will be able to shape communication and interaction more easily (Peterson, 2007). Peterson (2007) identifies the importance of creating an environment conducive to team collaboration and promoting peak team motivation and performance, as opposed to trying to motivate each individual directly. No matter how large the team or organization is, the importance of individuality is highlighted when taking such theories into consideration.

Conversely, Driskell et al. (2006) acknowledge that team performance is multidimensional and different individual personality facets are predictive of performance dimensions. They identified the core teamwork dimensions that must be accomplished within teams: team management, interpersonal relations, and adaptability. They hypothesized that “it
is likely that specific facets of team member personality may have differential effects on these activities that underlie effective team performance” (Driskell et al., 2006, p. 250). It was concluded that the team member facets that are predicted to be critical across all teamwork dimensions are *adjustment* and *flexibility*. They even went as far as claiming that “one team member low on adjustment can impact an entire group” (Driskell et al., 2006, p. 265). Eby, Adams, Russell, and Gaby (2000) support such critical dimensions, claiming that flexibility is necessary for successful change efforts. Driskell et al. (2006) suggest that these facets may be capable of training efforts. This allows for a different perspective when considering whether a leader should shape communication and interaction as Peterson (2007) suggests, or to shape the individual team members through training.

Thus far, motivational theories of individual team members have been considered, as well as individual personality traits, stating the effect these can have on team performance. This section has highlighted that although individuals will be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated in different ways, it is important that I understand these motives on an individual basis, so as to impact the wider team. I will discuss this further in chapter 2, when I consider the varying solutions that could be implemented. Individual *expertise* within a team performance context will now be contemplated.

### 1.5.4 Team Member Expertise

Gardner (2012) discusses two types of expertise: General professional expertise and domain-specific expertise. General professional expertise is defined as the expertise that professionals acquire through formal training, together with capabilities and judgement they develop over time. In contrast, domain-specific expertise is knowledge about a single organization’s technology or systems and its unique work practices and tends to emerge over time through repeated interactions with the specific organization or “client” (Gardner, 2012). It was found in this study that performance pressure leads a team to rely more on general expertise and less on the domain-specific expertise, although domain-specific expertise could
allow them to customize their work. Generally, team members tend to view domain-specific expertise as unsafe because it requires nonconformity from generally accepted and proven practices. In addition, in situations of outcome accountability, individuals tend to operate to more stereotypical standards and engage in self-protective behavior that is easily defensible and justifiable (Gardner, 2012), as seen among Institute Team members. A performance pressure paradox tends to be created in that teams and their members are highly motivated to deliver but tend to rely on low risk and proven solutions, that therefore limits team’s ability to draw effectively on full range of knowledge and expertise. “As an externally imposed standard, performance pressure can undermine open decision making and impair a team’s capacity for expansive thinking” Gardner (2012, p. 8), as also characterized by short-term performativity (Apple, 2001). This may provide further possible reasoning for the unilateral team behavior exhibited within the PoP. In comparison to performance pressure, “employee cynicism has been shown to be negatively related to work motivation” (Kim, Bateman, Gilbreath, and Andersson, 2009, p. 1437) and team performance. Motivation has been previously defined as the reasons underlying behavior (Guay et al, 2010), however cynicism tends to be conceptualized as an attitude (Kim et al., 2009). The PoP statement has identified both concepts (motivation and cynicism) as outcomes of the current contextual situation, and effects of the internal and external factors. The concept of cynicism is discussed further in the next section.

1.5.5 Employee Cynicism

Conceptualized as an attitude, cynicism is depicted in three dimensions: cognitive (a belief that the organization lacks integrity), affective (a negative affect toward the organization), behavioral (a tendency to criticize the organization). It is seen as an attitudinal consequence of top management behavior and a negative predictor of employee commitment and job performance, resonating to command and control, the unheard voices and multiple value exercises featured in the PoP. To further support this notion, Kim et al. (2009) explain
that “cognitive cynicism exists when employees believe that their organization doesn’t value
their contributions or care about them, and accordingly they might be less likely to put forth
their best efforts on behalf of their organization” (p. 1438). Affective cynicism and behavioral
cynicism tend to be more obvious as emotional reactions arise (e.g., irritation, anxiety) and
manifest in behaviors such as cynical organizational interpretation and pessimism. I have
certainly observed such behaviors in the current Institute Team members and if “readiness is
the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort”
as claimed by Armenakis et al. (1993, p. 681), it could be surmised that the team is resistant to
the change, or at least resistant to those in organizational, positional power. However, an
attitudinal state is not a trait, and therefore can be changed over time and with changing
circumstances, promoting the need for effective leadership approaches and solutions
throughout the change (Armenakis et al., 1993).

1.6 Organizational Change Readiness

By virtue of going through an emerging period of change as discussed above, we—the
Institute Team—are constantly tuning what, why, and how we do things within the midstream
change phase, the Institute Team’s state of readiness is fluctuating. Cawsey et al. (2016) assert
that readiness for change is “determined by the flexibility and adaptability of the organizational
culture; the openness, commitment, and involvement of leadership in preparing the
organization for change; and member confidence in the leadership” (p. 106). Armenakis et al.
(1993) claim “readiness is the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or
support for, a change effort” (p. 681). Figure 1.4 is predominantly a combination of
Armenakis et al.’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s
(1980) Organizational Congruence Model. It highlights the importance of the alignment
between specific features (i.e., internal factors, external factors, people, performance, structures
and processes) and their potential effect on cynicism and readiness. For example, if there is a
lack of alignment between the factors affecting change and the people component, cynicism could result, negatively affecting readiness.

Kim et al. (2009) posit that “cognitive cynicism exists when employees believe that their organization doesn’t value their contributions or care about them, and accordingly they might be less likely to put forth their best efforts on behalf of their organization” (p. 1438).

Stemming from the external factors in Figure 1.4 (“unheard voices,” “multiple value exercises,” and the “command and control culture”), the Institute Team is cynical to the organization, or at least resistant to those leaders in positional power, therefore do not display a readiness for change. These external factors also signify the ‘flexibility and adaptability of the organizational culture’, or lack of, in this case. Specifically, the command and control culture reduces the flexibility, whilst particular leaders (i.e., the Governing Board) attempt to maintain the conservative culture, within the neo-liberal, standards driven context.

Credibility is an essential attribute for leaders as they seek support and commitment from their teams, and according to Kim et al. (2009) it is in short supply. Recognizing that the Institute Team is now in midstream change phase, the importance of reducing resistance to organizational leadership and improving leadership credibility going forward is significant. It is apparent in the PoP that the “involvement of leadership in preparing the organization for change” has not been successful, due to the demotivation. Since resistance is an attitudinal state and not a trait, it can therefore be changed over time and with changing circumstances (Kim et al., 2009). Thus, the role of the leader in this change phase is about improving “member confidence in the leadership” (Cawsey et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2009). Leader trustworthiness and competence are dimensions of credibility and Kim et al. (2009) empathize that “leaders can benefit from knowing the types of behavior that generate perceptions of competence and trustworthiness” (p. 1454). Nadler and Tushman (1989) reference the “Magic Leader Principle” and proposes the following characteristics: distinctive behaviors (envisioning, energizing, enabling), ability to create a sense of urgency, guardianship of
themes, and a mix of leader styles. Whereas Armenakis et al. (1993) reference “Influence Strategies” that include: persuasive communication, active participation, and management of external sources of information. Upon synthesizing both sets of behaviors, it is clear that a leader who wants to build credibility, and hence readiness for change, will need to: be part of the change with the team (i.e., model behaviors that they expect the team to demonstrate), be a complete advocate of the change, and encourage active participation (collaboration) throughout the change. This supports the notion of the change facilitator role and application of the relevant discussed in previous sections 1.2 and 1.6, and is represented in the “leadership approach, role and credibility” element of Figure 1.5. This will be discussed further in chapter 2 of the OIP, when possible solutions are discussed.

Of equal influence toward readiness for change are individual attitudes, preferences for working in teams, and the relationship between individuals: the internal factors. The internal factors represented in Figure 1.4 (“unilateral team behavior”, “team growth”, and “team expertise”) have also affected team cynicism, reducing openness and commitment within the team. Kim et al. (2009) claim “employee cynicism has been shown to be negatively related to individual motivation and team performance” (p. 1437). Eby et al. (2000) emphasize “interpersonal and social dynamics within one’s work group (team) may impact organizational readiness for change” (p. 426). It can be surmised that the internal factors described above have negatively affected the team’s readiness for change, and strategies to encourage interdependence within the team are crucial to promote individual readiness as well as team readiness. These could include: analysis and sharing of individual motivational drivers, lateral coordination of team meetings and task forces to acknowledge individual expertise, and team building activities.

In summary, the negative impact of the external factors influencing the internal factors has created a state of low organizational readiness. For change efforts to be successful, team members need to trust each other as well as trusting the leader and the organization. Chapter 2
of this OIP addresses the possible solutions and leadership approaches related to these two states of readiness and subsequent individual and team needs. These next steps are addressed in chapter 2, but before this is considered, it is important to consider the gap between present and future states, so that the appropriate solutions and approaches are employed to close the gap.

1.7 Leadership-Focused Vision for Change

There is a gap between present and envisioned future state across the three varying levels of the Institute Team, the organization, and the broader federal context. The vision for the training institute is not only to serve the interests of the organization but also the Government and the external customers and schools across the UAE. Federally, the training institute is of seminal influence across the country, supporting their vision to increase the percentage of high quality teachers and leaders across all schools in the region. The Governing Board’s interests are to be served commercially, in terms of revenue. My ultimate aim and leadership vision is to develop a truly collaborative and motivated team that support each other across the different roles and responsibilities, as we transition from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state), to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state).

There are different organizational, contextual and leadership visions for change, however the team have gone through significant change over the last 24 months, and a degree of frustration and cynicism has resulted. For the purpose of this OIP, the priority is the Institute Team itself, with future consideration to the wider set of stakeholders: the customers (organizationally and federally). Nonetheless, these visions can be merged to provide effective solutions so that the commercial goals can be met whilst enhancing the Institute Team’s quality of performance and motivation. In terms of my leadership agency and scope of influence, there are therefore two main specific goals that pertain to the core PoP of this OIP. Goal one is to increase individual and team motivation, in order to achieve goal two, which is for the Institute to be commercially profitable by year 3 of operation, as depicted at the right side of Figure 1.4.
Although we are still presently going through the continuous change, it is important to consider the wider, long term goals, as well as the immediate, short terms goals apparent in the PoP. This is so that we can develop an integrated culture of sustainability, that will in turn permeate to our customers, and aim to meet the future commercial vision. Fullan (2006) states that “sustainability requires continuous improvement, adaptation and collective problem solving in the face of complex challenges that keep arising” (p. 119).

Thomas-Hunt and Phillips (2001) described teams within dynamic organizations as “complex entities” (p. 128), and Park, Spitzmuller and DeShon (2013) describe team motivation as having a “complex nature” (p. 1365). Within dynamic organizations, there is heightened emphasis on each individual’s potential to contribute to the team (Thomas-Hunt & Phillips, 2001). “The success of teams in dynamic organizations relies on liberal exchange and open discussion of team member knowledge and expertise” (Thomas-Hunt & Phillips, 2001, p. 116). It is posited that by utilizing these aspects, organizations and teams hope to increase access to task-relevant skills (i.e., domain-specific expertise); strengthen ties between individuals (i.e., acknowledgement of personality traits and learning and performance goals); increase motivation and reduce cynicism (i.e., motivational preferences and leadership approaches); and subsequently enhance buy-in into the final outcome (i.e., through adjustment and flexibility).

In summary, the immediate gap and priority for change is the level of motivation within the Institute Team, but attention to the wider envisioned future state of the Institute being commercially profitable will be maintained, through continuous improvement, adaptation and collective problem solving as Fullan (2006) suggests.

In conclusion to this section, Bolman and Deal’s Human Resource Frame (2013) is closely aligned to Nadler and Tushman (1980) Congruence Model in the centrality of the people component. The influencing motivational factors, team member expertise and employee cynicism have significant resonance to the internal contributing factors particularly. It is clear,
that the next step is to consider how leaders can promote individual and team motivation, and hence positively impact change. Such consideration leads to possible solutions for overcoming the factors affecting the problem of practice and these are proposed in chapter 2.

1.8 Chapter 1 Summary

Chapter 1 highlighted the significance of the organizational context in which the PoP sits, and how the liberal Institute Team is demotivated and cynical as a result of a conservative, command and control organizational culture, within a wider neo-liberally driven context. A number of external and internal factors have contributed to this, including: marginalization, multiple value exercises, and command and control culture; unilateral team behavior; team growth and team expertise, respectively. These factors seem to demonstrate positional power (external) and personal power (internal factors). The result of which is affecting the people within the Institute Team. People are behaving in relation to what they see, by aiming to advance their own interests, hence increasing mistrust and cynicism (Morgan, 2006). These factors affect the congruence of the people, work, informal and formal structures within the Institute Team amidst the strategic change—as depicted in Figure 1.5—demanding leadership approaches and solutions through the human resources frame.

Chapter 2 will plan a solution proposal for my PoP, by presenting the conceptual model (Figure 1.5) as the organizational framework for change and analyzing organizational information and data to select the best leadership and change approaches.

2.0 Chapter 2 Introduction

With respect to my leadership agency as a change facilitator, the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) will be employed in chapter 2 as the key driver in leading emergent change, whilst harnessing a combination of servant, distributed, and transformational leadership behaviors and approaches, in order to improve the Institute Team’s individual and team motivation, and reduce their cynicism. The combination of leadership approaches is presented as a new model of leadership named Trianalogous Leadership and is synthesized...
with the interdependent solution. The chapter concludes with a discussion communicating the need for change, of which will lead into the change implementation and communication plans in chapter 3.

### 2.1 Framework for Leading the Change Process

In this section, Bolman and Deal’s (2013) human resource frame is discussed as the frame for leading the change in the PoP, whilst considering the relevance of the frame with respect to organizational change and the midstream phase of the emergent change process. The specific leadership approaches—servant, distributed, and transformational—that demonstrate resonance to my leadership agency as change facilitator are then aligned to the human resource frame, in order to guide the proposed solutions and leadership approaches discussed later in this chapter.

#### 2.1.1 Process, phase and type of organizational change

When looking at organizational change, the process, phase and type can be considered. With specific relevance to this OIP, I surmised that the change occurring in the PoP resonates with emergent change process because a great deal of ambiguity and challenge exists (Cawsey et al., 2016). This is due to the active involvement of the Governing Board implementing organizational directives to the Institute Team in an inconsistent manner. When considering the phase and type of organizational change, it can be surmised that we—the Institute Team—are predominantly moving into the midstream change phase, as we are technically 24 months into the phase, albeit the transition still continuing as I write this OIP. Due to this, I conclude that we are presently within the tuning type of change, characterized as continuous and anticipatory. The tuning type of change is defined by the following features: Middle management role where implementation is the major task, focus is on individual subsystems, and there is a need for internal alignment (Cawsey et al., 2016). These features resonate well to the PoP in that there is a need to implement a plan to transition from a cost center to a profit center, whilst maintain focus on the internal Institute Team (i.e., the subsystem) amidst the
larger organizational context. The need for internal alignment feature of the tuning type of change significantly resonates with the need for aligning the people component of Bolman and Deal’s (2013) human resource frame within Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model. The human resource frame was chosen as the key driver in leading the change central to this OIP, and the next two sub-sections aim to use this framework to explain specific approaches for the leading the process of change.

2.1.2 Framing theories of organizational change

As discussed in section 1.5, Bolman and Deal (2013) theorize four frames to help leaders understand their organizations through multiple perspectives or lenses, in order to gain clarity and find strategies that make a difference (Sowell, 2014; Lyon et al., 2014). Two of the frames—political and human resource—were considered when framing the PoP, but the human resources frame emerged for leading the change process as a strategy to “make a difference” (Sowell, 2014, p. 212). Despite the power relations existing within the PoP prompting the political frame lens to be contemplated, the people component of the core congruence model significantly emerged as a specific focus for the OIP in chapter 1, therefore the Human Resource frame was chosen as the key driver in leading the change. Bolman and Deal’s (2013) human resource frame focuses on how an institution or a leader within the institution aligns the needs of the individuals and the organizational needs (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Lyon et al., 2014; Sowell, 2014). The focus for alignment between the individuals and the organization, also correlates with the need for alignment between people, performance and processes (formal and informal) within Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model, as explained in section 1.5. This notion will form the basis of the solution proposal and chosen leadership approach throughout chapter 2.

According to Bolman and Deal (2013), the human resource frame positions people as the most important asset in organizations, and according to Mabey (2003), it emphasizes the exchange between organizational needs and individual offerings. However, I would argue that
in accordance with the Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model, the human resource frame should emphasize the exchange between individual needs initially and then the organizational offerings, and whilst I appreciate this can be very difficult in such a neoliberal, marketized environment, it is where I will act with leadership agency. Figure 1.5 depicts the leadership approach and role (red colored area), surrounding the core team and their congruence, acting almost like a shield to the external and environmental factors, of the organization and the federal bodies. I will need to adjust my leadership approach according to whether I’m leading up or leading across, with the Governing Board and Institute Team respectively. However, as stated in section 1.6, my priority lies with the Institute Team for the purpose of this OIP, and in order to improve their motivation a different leadership approach is required to that of the command and control approach by the conservative Governing Board.

Another factor increasing the complexity of the person-organization relationship is globalization, propelling businesses in an intensely competitive world. In such a dynamic, changing environment as the context of the PoP, I would expect there to be greater consideration for how people are changing within that organization, particularly if they “can make or break an organization” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117), reiterating my point above. Recent literature surrounding human resources in organizations is recognizing that talent and motivation are seen as business entities and are a powerful source of competitive advantage, therefore leaders are needed who work hard to engage employees (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004; Mabey, 2016; Osborne & Hammoud, 2017). This certainly holds resonance to the dynamic nature of the PoP and OIP context and will be where I ground my leadership approaches and solutions.

2.1.3 Specific approaches and models for leading the process organizational change

As stated earlier, the human resource frame emphasizes the interdependence between people and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004) and for the human resource frame to function successfully, I will aim to symbiotically align the needs of both the
Through such alignment of the needs of individuals and organizations, whilst engaging people’s talent and energy, Bolman and Deal (2013) would claim that “the enterprise profits” (p. 117). Bolman and Deal (2013) posit human resource frame leaders as process-oriented who serve as facilitators and consensus-builders, which supports my agency as change facilitator and employment of the applicable interpersonal skills—self-awareness, emotional maturity, and behavioral support. In addition, Cawsey et al (2016) posit change facilitators are significant within the tuning type of change, further promoting my leadership agency. In order to improve the Institute Team’s individual and team motivation, and reduce their cynicism, I will harness a combination of servant, distributed, and transformational leadership behaviors and approaches, resonant to the above interpersonal skills, tuning type of change, and my leadership values as described in section 1.2. By employing these three leadership approaches, I aim is to identify individual motivational drivers, promote individual expertise of team members, and overcome power relations within the team and the organization, in order to navigate the team toward the future vision. The possible solutions and an expansion of how to employ leadership approaches to achieve the above aim will be explained in the following sections of chapter 2 (2.3 and 2.4).

In summary to this section, although we are still presently going through an emerging period of change, constantly tuning what, why and how we do things within the midstream change phase, it is important that integrity, transparency and collaborative leadership ensues, maintaining the Institute Team at the core. The next section will analyze the core congruence of the Institute Team, using Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model, in order to ensure that the approaches suggested are fully informed and connected to the PoP at a deeper level.

2.2 Critical Organizational Analysis

This section will focus attention on the transformation within the core of the model: organizational coherence (Nadler & Tushman, 1999). Nadler and Tushman’s (1980)
Organizational Congruence Model was designed as an organizational analytical tool and “puts the greatest emphasis on the transformation process and specifically reflects the critical system property of interdependence” (p. 39) between the organizational components of task, people (individuals), formal structures and processes, and informal structures and processes. In chapter 1, the environmental, external and internal factors affecting the PoP were positioned in the conceptual model (Figure 1.5) as contributing factors to the Institute Team’s demotivation. These will be revisited in this section, leading to a more in-depth analysis of the components within the core of the congruence model.

2.2.1 Conceptual Model

The conceptual model created and adapted in chapter 1 (Figure 1.5) is a combination of Armenakis et al.’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model, created for the purpose of this OIP. The model highlights the environmental, external and internal factors that are attributional to the PoP and illustrates how the inputs can be transformed into outputs. The inputs predominantly include the Governing Board’s commercial strategy and the federal regulations (environmental influence); and the outputs include the commercial gain and quality PLD services, referenced earlier as the future state in the PoP. Nadler and Tushman (1999) emphasized the notion that “organizations are most effective when their design characteristics match their environment…and the organization’s capacity to understand its environment and to make the right kinds of strategic changes at the appropriate point in the cycle will determine its competitive strength” (p. 46). If we are to consider the larger organizational context of the PoP, the projected future state to be a commercial training institute certainly resonates with the neo-liberal, marketized culture surrounding it. Therefore, if we accept Nadler and Tushman’s (1999) notion of competitive strength there is potential for the organization to be effective, but it would be dependent on the people within the organizational context, particularly since the
PoP is viewed through the human resource frame. This could raise a challenge, since many of the people in the Institute Team are behaving in the political frame, with personal power.

Of most significance is the transformation within the core of the model: organizational coherence (Nadler & Tushman, 1999). Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model was designed as an organizational analytical tool and “puts the greatest emphasis on the transformation process and specifically reflects the critical system property of interdependence” (p. 39). A poor fit between the organizational components of people, performance (task), formal structures and processes, and informal structures and processes, will lead to problems and dysfunctions (Nadler & Tushman, 1980). As stated in chapter 1, the model was chosen as it demonstrates how the combination of the external and internal factors influence the organizational components. The lack of alignment between the factors affecting change and the people component has resulted in the dysfunction of demotivation, negatively affecting team readiness for change.

In section 1.7 of Chapter 1, it was claimed that the Institute Team’s state of readiness is fluctuating, due to the nature of the emergent change, and the demotivating effect of the external and internal factors on the people within the Institute Team. Readiness for change is “determined by: the flexibility and adaptability of the organizational culture; the openness, commitment, and involvement of leadership in preparing the organization for change; and member confidence in the leadership” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 106), and “readiness is the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort” (Armenakis et al., 1993, p. 681). Aligned to the specific external and internal factors positioned in the conceptual model, the above determinants were highlighted in section 1.7 also, and their effect on the level of congruence between the organizational components of performance or work, people (individuals), formal structures and processes, and informal structures and processes, has become more apparent.
As a result of the external factors (unheard voices, multiple value exercises, and the command and control culture), the Institute Team is feeling demotivated toward the organization, or at least resistant to those leaders in positional power, therefore do not display a readiness for change. Specifically, the command and control culture signifies the lack of “flexibility and adaptability of the organizational culture”, whilst particular leaders (i.e., the Governing Board) attempt to maintain the conservative culture, within the neo-liberal, standards driven context. It is apparent in the PoP that the “involvement of leadership in preparing the organization for change” has not been successful since demotivation has resulted. Thus, the role of the leader in this change phase is about improving “member confidence in the leadership” (Cawsey et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2009). Leader trustworthiness and competence are dimensions of credibility and Kim et al. (2009) empathize that “leaders can benefit from knowing the types of behavior that generate perceptions of competence and trustworthiness” (p. 1454). Those behaviors to build trust and credibility are anchored within my leadership values of integrity, authenticity and transparency and manifest through the leadership approaches of servant, distributed and transformational leadership, discussed in greater depth in section 2.4.

The internal factors in Figure 1.5 (unilateral team behavior, team growth, and team expertise) have also affected team motivation, resulting in cynicism and hence reducing “openness and commitment within the team”. Kim et al. (2009) claim “employee cynicism has been shown to be negatively related to individual motivation and team performance” (p. 1437). It can be surmised that the internal factors described above have negatively affected the team’s readiness for change, and strategies to encourage interdependence within the team are crucial to promote individual readiness as well as team readiness. The next section concentrates on these internal factors and specifically how the components of the congruence model have been affected and what changes are needed.
2.2.2 Organizational Analysis and Diagnosis

Figure 2.1 below focalizes the congruence section of the conceptual model (Figure 1.5) and outlines the critical features for analyzing the organizational components of the congruence model. The organizational components are people, performance, informal structure and processes, and formal structure and processes.

![Diagram of Organizational Components](image)

- **Performance** component can be defined as the ‘work done by the organization’.
- **People** component can be defined as the ‘characteristics of individuals within the organization’.

The critical features for analysis could be:
1. Degree of uncertainty associated with the work – integrated or individual
2. Constraints of performance demands on the work – i.e. strategy
3. Skills and knowledge of the work demands, or duties of particular positions.
4. Background factors.
5. Perceptions and expectations

Figure 2.1. Critical features for analyzing the organizational components of the congruence model (Cawsey et al., 2016; Nadler & Tushman, 1980).

The above figure is adapted from the transformation process within the core of the Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model.

In Figure 2.1, each organizational component (people, performance, formal structures and processes, informal structures and procedures) is defined, with the relevant critical features listed, culminating in a key question pertaining to the change process. These critical features impelled me to analyze them directly to the organizational context and respond to the key question in order to exemplify the lack of congruence within the PoP. Figure 2.2 below, therefore demonstrates an analysis of the critical features affecting the level of congruence...
between the organizational components (performance, formal structures and processes, informal structures and procedures, people) according to the external and internal factors, as well as the determinants of change readiness. Since I view the PoP through Bolman and Deal’s (2013) human resource frame, I have consistently positioned the individual team members or the team itself within each component analysis. This connection to the critical features of each component provide a deeper analysis to how the external and internal factors are affecting the organizational context.

![Figure 2.2. Analysis of factors affecting the level of congruence between the organizational components.](image)

*The above figure is adapted from the transformation process within the core of the Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model.*

The next sub-sections will discuss each component sequentially, discussing the gap analysis and what needs to changed whilst positioning myself as the leader throughout.

As quoted by Cawsey et al. (2016), change facilitators “identify processes and content change issues and help resolve these, by fostering support, alleviating resistance and providing
other participants with guidance” (p. 26). This will be the perspective from which I suggest changes and potential solutions. Due to the human resource frame being the driver of the change, I will start with the people component, as highlighted in Figure 2.2, as it predominantly considers the internal factors, and hence is influenced by the congruence of the other components (performance, formal structures and processes, informal structures and procedures). The potential suggestions at the end of each sub-section will help drive the next section (2.3), where solutions to address the PoP and the applicable resource implications will be addressed.

2.2.2.1 People

A poor fit between these organizational components will lead to problems and dysfunctions (Nadler & Tushman, 1980), resulting in the team members being demotivated and cynical. The specific dysfunctions include inadequate consideration of varying team expertise, team member needs not being met, and poor communication between the team.

Due to the rapid growth of the team (300%) recently, and also the rapid change and development of the Training Institute, performance pressure exists as the need to meet the commercial goal is increasing. Performance pressure leads a team to rely more on general expertise and less on the domain-specific expertise, and individuals tend to rely on low risk and proven solutions, that therefore limits team’s ability to draw effectively on the full range of knowledge and expertise (Gardner, 2012). This knowledge and expertise are channeled across the key functions of the Institute inappropriately in some cases, particularly due to the time pressure to increase income and the lack of “perceived” time to effectively review suitable individual expertise for specific roles. In addition, in situations of outcome accountability, individuals tend to operate to more stereotypical standards and engage in self-protective behavior that is easily defensible and justifiable (Gardner, 2012), and this is seen among Institute Team members, particularly as mistakes are starting to be made across the functions. Team members have therefore started to operate more unilaterally to protect themselves, but
this is not going unnoticed, causing unrest and frustration between and across team members and functions, respectively. This is significantly affecting team culture, as the accumulated shared learning that Schein (2017) promotes, is of a negative nature, and the team are starting to disband with poor communication and minimal collaboration.

From this analysis, it would seem that time needs to be found to identify and understand individual knowledge, skills and expertise in order to effectively align the organizational functions of the Institute. From this point, specific communication channels between the functions, or collaborative planning time could be scheduled, to help bring the team together and align individual needs to that of the team needs, as promoted by the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

2.2.2.2 Performance

In terms of the required ‘work to be done’, the Institute Team is encountering a sense of ambiguity. According to the human resource frame, there is a distinct lack of interdependence between the Institute Team members and the organization. The Governing Board still require the Institute Team to work with the schools that are owned by the private education organization at the same standards and quality of service prior to the change (multiple value exercise – external factor), whilst also pursuing work with other individual customers and schools outside of the organization to meet the demands of the commercial objectives and move to be a profit-making institute. This increases the demands on team capacity to meet the organizational strategy but without clear communication and strategizing of how this will work in reality, linking with the point above regarding time pressure to increase income and the lack of “perceived” time to effectively review suitable individual expertise for specific roles. A lack of clarity therefore exists, as to what the priority is and how the Institute Team’s work time is managed. As such, individuals tend to operate to more stereotypical standards and engage in self-protective behavior that is easily defensible and justifiable as described above.
Therefore, a significant gap exists between the expected outcome and the current reality, demanding clear strategy or an action plan of how to get there, which does not exist at the moment. If I could initiate specific communication channels between the functions, or schedule collaborative planning time as suggested for the people component above (2.2.2.1), a coordinated and collective action plan could be created.

2.2.2.3 Formal Structure and Processes

Six organizational functions or pillars, as referenced by the Institute Team, have been created within the new institute. The core functions of three of the pillars are built upon what existed previously but have been developed further. As a result of such, the Institute’s organizational chart and roles have changed on at least three different occasions during the change process and continues to change due to team members exiting and new members being recruited. Moreover, new roles are also being recruited to and the team growing rapidly (internal factor) to accommodate the change that is happening in real time. The team is constantly in a state of flux and minimal stability exists. There have been attempts at formalizing particular policies and structures, however, a number of factors have prevented this coming to fruition. Firstly, the disbandment of the team and lack of accountability, makes this difficult for relevant team members to take ownership and complete their particular part of a policy. Secondly, with each new team member coming in, they have their own opinion of how to do things, and as such, very little becomes embedded. Until now, the change leader has not made an attempt to formalize such structures or establish the team’s ways of working, so that a culture can successfully embed.

In addition, the Human Resource management systems, involved in recruitment, are still dictated by the larger organizational context and Governing Board, emphasizing the command and control culture (external factor). When new members of the team are recruited, there is regularly a mismatch between their expectations of their role as communicated to them by those within the Governing Board, and that of the team’s expectations of the new member’s
role. As such, there is a misalignment when the new member starts in the team creating an immediate level of frustration. With respect to the human resource frame, the Institute change leader, and myself as change facilitator, need to consider that people could make or break the organization as Bolman and Deal (2013) suggest.

If we, as a team, were able to formalize structures, policies and team ways of working, this would make the induction of new staff more efficient and each time a new team member enters the team, there is clarity and a greater sense of purpose. This is something that I need to encourage with respect to my agency as change facilitator. I could plan and schedule one day whereby the team comes together as a group, such as an ‘away-day’, to establish and agree on the Institute’s structures, policies and team ways of working. This would need to be in agreement with the change leader, but I feel I could provide the case for such action. This day could also be focused on creating the strategic plan for this Institute too, as suggested in the previous performance component (2.2.2.3), so that the whole team are involved. Involving the whole team promotes that people are the most important asset in organizations, as promoted by the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

2.2.2.4 Informal Structure and Processes

Interestingly, despite the people component being at the core of the OIP, it would seem that the above issues filter through to impact on the informal structure and processes component. Specific policies and procedures for the Institute are currently not formalized, and since they are predominantly unwritten as described above, informal working arrangements ensue, compounded by the lack of stability within the formal structure. An example of this is working hours and presenteeism in the office. Although we have set working hours, set by the wider organizational policies, it would not be unusual for some team members to work from home for a day. However, the rest of the team would only find out on that particular day and should they have planned to discuss something with that particular team member, the discussion then has to wait until another day. Although I am not an advocate of presenteeism
per se, I am an advocate of transparent communication and openness which seems to be lacking. There is no formal procedure, despite suggesting one, of applying to work at home.

Exacerbating the poor team communication is the marginalization and unheard voices from the Governing Board, and the ambiguity and lack of clarity with regards to the work (performance) demands as described above. This in turn impacts intragroup relations, as also intimated in the people component analysis (2.2.2.1) earlier.

Communication from the Governing Board is via command and control (external factor), creating low trust and incorrect assumptions tend to be made, encouraging further demotivation. A specific example of this links to our evaluation processes. We have evaluation processes associated to each organizational function of the Institute, of which we need to report to the Governing Board on a regular basis. In an attempt to save time, team member A had asked team member B for access to the evaluation form she uses, so it could be efficiently replicated and to also promote consistent practice across the functions. Team member B was extremely reluctant to share this, and protective of her own evaluation data. There was a fear and mistrust of allowing team member A to access the data, despite her only wanting to replicate the format of the form. This example further illustrates the unilateral behavior, team disbandment and lack of trust.

Similar to previous suggestions for closing this gap of disbandment, I believe it is important that as a leader, I encourage the team to start to come together more often to build trust, perhaps through collaborative planning time and team-building activities.

In summary, due to the ambiguity with performance or work components, and an altering of informal and formal structures without due consideration to the history, clarity of communication, or acknowledgments of new norms, the dynamics within the team and between individuals, i.e., the people, are dysfunctional. This deeper organizational analysis seems to demand a specific shift or clarity in direction from leadership. Suggestions of what needs to be changed have included finding time to identify and understand individual
knowledge, skills and expertise; specific communication channels and collaborative planning time within and across the organizational functions; an away-day to formalize structures, policies and team ways of working; and team building activities.

In the next section, I aim to discuss possible solutions building on those suggested in this section with an aim to promote the alignment of individuals with the team and the organization, as the human resource frame suggests.

2.3 Possible Solutions to Address PoP

As I consider my own future and leadership vision, the ultimate strategic aim would be to develop a truly interdependent, collaborative, and motivated team that support each other across the different roles and responsibilities (organizational functions), in order to achieve the organizational and federal visions. With respect to my leadership agency as a change facilitator, the human resource frame will be employed during this emergent change.

Recognizing that the congruence between the people component (i.e. the Institute Team) and the organization (i.e. strategy, structures and procedures, and performance) is at the core of the OIP, the solutions to address the motivation of the team need to focus toward the individuals within the team. Nadler and Tushman (1980) would argue that the most critical aspects to consider include the “nature of individual knowledge and skills (domain-specific or general expertise), the different needs or preferences that individuals have (motivational factors), the perceptions they develop (employee cynicism), and other background factors (positional and personal power relations)” (p. 44). Osborne and Hammoud (2017) would agree with the aforementioned and suggest that improved employee motivation and engagement is a byproduct of leaders who have a direct relationship with employees, through fairness and integrity, promotion of collaborative practice, effective communication of vision, and understanding of intellectual capital.

As the emerging theme of this OIP, strategies to encourage interdependence within the team are crucial to promote individual readiness as well as team readiness (Gronn, 2002;
These could include: analysis and sharing of individual motivational drivers, team building or bonding activities, and lateral coordination of team meetings and task forces to acknowledge individual expertise and encourage collaboration (Bolman & Deal, 2013), as per the suggestions from the previous section.

Considering the suggestions from Osborne and Hammoud (2017), Gronn (2002), and Morrison (2013) above, the following three solutions have been synthesized and are described separately in the following sub-sections:

Solution 1. Collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers
Solution 2. Team building and bonding activity (‘away day’)
Solution 3. Promotion of collaborative practice

Bolman and Deal’s (2013) Human Resource frame focuses on how an institution or a leader within the institution aligns the needs of the individuals and the organizational needs (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Lyon et al., 2014; Sowell, 2014). This focus for alignment correlates with the need for such within the congruence model. Therefore, the solutions described below have been immersed into the congruence model (Figures 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5). In addition, I will describe the resource needs of each solution. Chapter 3 of this OIP aims to analyze these resource implications (section 3.1) so that the communication plan demonstrates how to overcome them (section 3.4).

2.3.1 Solution 1: Collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers

Within section 1.5, motivational theories of individual team members were considered, as well as individual personality traits, and individual expertise within a team performance context. To quote, “the success of teams in dynamic organizations relies on liberal exchange and open discussion of team member knowledge and expertise” (Thomas-Hunt & Phillips, 2001, p. 116). By utilizing these aspects, I hope to increase access to task-relevant skills (i.e., general or domain-specific expertise); strengthen ties between individuals (i.e., acknowledgement of personality traits and learning and performance goals); increase
motivation (i.e., motivational preferences and leadership approaches); and subsequently
enhance buy-in into the final outcome (i.e., through adjustment and flexibility).

I would like to encourage all individual team members to conduct personality or
motivational preference assessments, so that they could understand their own personality facets
and motives and hopefully become more self-aware. An example of a personality or
motivational preference assessment could be the MBTI (Myers Briggs Type Indicator -
Personality Inventory). MBTI Personality Styles determine preferences and motivation tactics
of each individual, by reviewing four common traits: personal contact with others, application
of realism, ability to apply logic, and influences of judgment.

A second self-assessment that I could then ask individual team members to conduct is a
360 assessment of their expertise (general or domain-specific) aiming to increase individual team
member self-awareness further. A set of work-related tasks, competencies and standards across
of the organizational functions and pillars of the Training Institute could be created into a rubric
and then used as a self-assessment tool. Taylor and Bright (2011) support this notion as they
state an organization administering 360-degree feedback processes will choose the metric (i.e.
competencies) to fit the organizations’ self-interested agenda, and there is an assumption that
knowledge of self and an understanding of one’s impact on larger organizational dynamics is
essential to effective performance. In creating such processes, I would therefore try to integrate
the aims to meet individual (improving motivation and interdependence) and organizational
goals (commercial gain) to demonstrate consistency and mutual benefit.

When applying this solution to the congruence model (Figure 2.1), it would align to the
“people” component of the model, specifically the critical features: knowledge and skills, and
background factors. However, when considering the links to the other components of the
congruence model, this solution would have significant influence toward the critical features
of: intragroup relations in the “Informal Structure and Processes” component, organizational
design and roles and work environment in the “Formal Structure and Processes” component,
and skills and knowledge of the work demands, or duties of particular positions in the “Performance” component. Figure 2.3 below demonstrates such alignment.

Figure 2.3: Application of Solution 1 (Collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers) to the congruence model.

The suggested solution therefore considers how to gain an understanding of team member knowledge and expertise, and then how to share it in a conducive and effective manner, so that the team can develop intragroup relations and a shared culture of accumulated learning (Schein, 2017), it may also help to align individual knowledge, skills and expertise to the relevant organizational functions. As the leader, I must take the time to understand how every individual is motivated, in order to help increase motivation, but not without understanding myself first. If I were to ask the individuals within the team to do this, I would have to model this myself demonstrating my own self-awareness and being able to share this
with my colleagues, demonstrating transparency and integrity. These are all features of servant leadership, of which I would be committed to displaying.

In both activities I would need to be aware that some individual team members may refuse to conduct such assessments, and as change facilitator, I would not have the agency to force them to do these. This would need to be an optional exercise and only when individuals feel comfortable would they complete this. Naturally, this raises an issue of time, but as with servant leadership, a longer-term approach may be needed here giving people time to adjust to the idea and the process.

Once this data is collated for each person, I could then provide individual feedback and also conduct a triangulation of the data from both assessments, so as to gain a holistic understanding of the team. If particular team members don’t feel comfortable with me, it could be that other team members are trained on how to conduct this process, and the feedback is then distributed. At this point, providing the team is comfortable, an informal forum could be created, so that individual team members could discuss their personality facets and motivational drivers, and promote a culture whereby individual team members understand how to work effectively with each other.

However, there could be ethical considerations depending on how the team feels about sharing their personal information. It cannot be assumed that each individual in the team is comfortable sharing personal data about themselves, particularly in light of the factors affecting the current internal culture. With reference to Schein’s (2017) levels of culture, this consideration refers to level three: basic underlying assumptions. Basic assumptions are generally non-confrontable and non-debatable, such as a person’s values and also their personality, and as such to learn something new in this realm requires a reexamining and possible change which can intrinsically release anxiety (Schein, 2017). In this case, Schein (2017) suggest a third party could help bring implicit assumptions to the surface, therefore a
third party could be utilized to administer the assessments, provide the feedback, and to also share with the group. This will have further resources implications as indicated below.

Giving consideration to the fact that some individual team members may refuse to take part in the self-awareness and motivational preference assessments, prior to this solution I may need to utilize solutions to build individual team member and collective team relationships. Solutions two and three in the following sections (2.3.2 and 2.3.3) focus on these elements.

2.3.1.1 Resource Needs for Solution 1

The two main resource implications I foresee with solution 1 are finance and time. The financial cost of the personality tests and also for the training on how to administer, analyze and feedback the tests need consideration. The time implications relate to time it takes the individuals to complete the test and for the administrator analyze the test and then provide feedback. Within such a dynamic organization, in a neo-liberal context, finding such time may be difficult, particularly for the leader if they have to feedback to each person on the team. In essence, this could be costed at one day CTC (cost to company) for two people. It would be estimated that this would be at a projected cost of AED 3,000-5,000 / CAD 1000-2000, per day.

If validated and tested personality inventories are to be implemented, they need to be bought from licensed providers, and this would need approval from the change leader, and potentially the Governing Board. Additionally, specific individuals need to be trained by licensed providers to be able to administer, analyze and feedback effectively. Selection of who these people are, would also need liaison with the change leader. The approximate, inclusive cost of setting this up could be AED 20,000 / CAD 7000, plus a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 / CAD 4000-7000, per day for the full team CTC. If a third party was to be used to administer, feedback and support collective sharing, significant cost implications could be borne. The approximate cost of one person per day in this field would be projected at AED 4,000-6,000 / CAD 1400-2100, per day.
2.3.2 Solution 2: Team Building and Bonding Activity

Due to the dynamic nature of the emergent change occurring whilst I write this OIP, certain solutions are being implemented, but as the change unfolds, these are being reviewed and evaluated, with improved solutions emerging. For example, the change leader and I have already conducted an ‘away day’ for the team. The aim was to improve collective team motivation and enthusiasm within the midstream change phase, by being transparent and open about the current state of change; build team relationships; obtain feedback and challenge any misconceptions with respect to the organizational vision; and clarify a final vision statement with new ways of working for the team, by facilitating collaboration and encouraging ownership, rather than compliance. By working with the team to “clarify new organizational roles, structures and systems”, we harnessed the power of face to face communication as Cawsey et al. (2016, p. 321) suggest, aiming to influence the culture.

When applying this solution to the congruence model (Figure 2.1), it would align to the “informal structure and process” component of the model, specifically the critical features: The norms accepted by the people and how it informs the culture. However, when considering the links to the other components of the congruence model, this solution would have significant influence toward the critical features of: work environment in the “Formal Structure and Processes” component, Perceptions and expectancies in the “People” component, and constraints of performance demands on the work – i.e. strategy in the “Performance” component. Figure 2.4 below demonstrates such alignment. As with Figure 2.3, linking this solution to the congruence model, helps to visually demonstrate alignment from within the team.
Connolly et al. (2011) stated that if change capacity is to be sustained, the right culture needs to be put in place. Three cultural conditions are posited: integrated (wide consensus); differentiated (subcultures in opposition to others); and fragmented (little or no consensus). I believe it is vitally important to gain an integrated consensus of norms within the Institute Team first, and then we can move to engaging the wider stakeholder community – i.e. the customers. Fullan (2006, p. 119) states that “sustainability requires continuous improvement, adaptation and collective problem solving in the face of complex challenges that keep arising”. By aiming for integrated consensus of the norms accepted and collective problem solving as suggested by Connolly et al. (2011) and Fullan (2006) respectively, the espoused beliefs and values of Schein’s (2017) second level of culture could become more congruent. Schein (2017) claimed that “until the group has taken some joint action and together observed the outcome of
that action, there is not yet a shared basis for determining whether what the leader wants (me in this case) will turn out to be valid” (p. 19).

As opposed to communicating directly to the team, we aimed for a greater sense of involvement and participation through consultation and collaborative group work activities. The team collaboratively agreed on a vision, and a set of structures that they can take ownership for, visibly taking joint action. This “pull tactic” or strategy resonates well with Cawsey et al.’s (2016, p. 324) influencing strategies of “facilitation and support” and “negotiation and agreement”. However, it is important that this strategy does not now lead to compliance rather than wholehearted support of change, as Cawsey at al. (2016) warn is possible during this influence. Therefore, I have suggested that we arrange another team away day. We will be welcoming two new leaders into our team within the next few months, and it will be a good opportunity to induct them into the team, but also to allow the rest of the team to reflect on our progress since the last away day: aiming to avoid “compliance”. The focus this time could be specifically on the strategic plan, or action plan as suggested in the performance component analysis earlier (section 2.2.2.2). Naturally, the away-day in itself has resource implications.

2.3.2.1 Resource Needs for Solution 2

When considering the resource needs for this solution, there are three main elements that surface: the financial cost of the away day or team building activities, trying to align everyone’s calendars and time, and further time requirements for maintaining the impetus of agreed goals and actions from the away day.

If the away day is going to be in a location away from the office, then it is necessary to book a suitable venue, which will assume financial cost for venue hire and catering. In addition, if another company were to be consulted and recruited to provide team building activities so that the whole team can be involved, then this would assume additional cost too.
The cost would approximately be AED10,000 (Arab Emirate Currency) / $CAD3500 (Canadian Dollars), and this would need approval by the change leader.

When we conducted the previous away day, it took considerable effort to try and select a day that all members of the team were available, but the day would also assume a time cost of an office day, so team member workload accomplishment could be set back.

Finally, as part of away day activities, agreed goals and actions are normally a result, that tend to increase workload demand of some, if not all, members of the team. An additional time cost is then borne, post away day, but these goals would be a way to measure the impact of the away day. The financial cost of the away day or team building activities (AED 10,000 / CAD 3500). If we were to also factor in the CTC for all staff being out of office for one day, this would be a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 / CAD 4000-7000. In addition, trying to align everyone’s calendars and time could be difficult, giving the team’s current unilateral behavior. Further time implications for maintaining the impetus of agreed goals and actions from the away day.

2.3.3 Solution 3: Promotion of Collaborative Practice

Considering the notion that “motivation is not designated by a leader to a team member; instead, motivation is internal to each team member and derived from a team member’s desire to achieve a goal, accomplish a task, or work toward expectations” (Peterson, 2007, p. 60), there is an importance of creating an environment conducive to team collaboration and promoting peak team motivation and performance, as opposed to trying to motivate each individual directly.

Collaboration is a practice of distributed leadership (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002) and is defined as the “ability of a team to work well together in which team members can stay problem focused, listen to and understand one another, feel free to take risks, and be willing to compensate for one another” (Northouse, 2016, p. 370). As stated in section 1.2, in my current agency as change facilitator, I aim to consistently model effective collaborative practice
through regular meetings with my team and the extended team of stakeholders. The meetings are mostly aligned to the organizational functions of the Training Institute and used to review current programs, products and practices, and I always ensure I explain the ‘why’ of certain decisions, before we collaboratively agree on the ‘how’, maintaining transparency. However, this also aids collective distribution in which leaders work interdependently, but separately (Diamond, 2015). In line with the current trajectory of the Training Institute, we are at a significant stage of business development and planning, of which demands a specific commercial strategy. The strategy is a key focus that the team could collaborate on, laterally and vertically across the organizational functions. Aligning the strategy to the vision (established in the away day) will allow for focused collaboration.

When applying this solution to the congruence model (Figure 2.1), it would seem to align to the “informal structure and process” component of the model, specifically the critical feature: the grouping of organizational functions and job design. However, when considering the links to the other components of the congruence model, this solution would have significant influence toward the critical features of: degree of uncertainty associated with the work – integrated or individual in the “Performance” component, needs and preferences in the “People” component, and leader behavior, intragroup relations and communication and influence patterns in the “Informal Structure and Processes” component. Figure 2.5 below demonstrates such alignment. It can be seen that this alignment of features within the congruence model is very similar to that of Figure 2.4, solution 2. However, solution 2 is based on one day, whereas I differentiate solution 3 as a longer-term strategy that would demand greater consideration to leadership approach. This is discussed in the following section (2.4).
The Performance component can be defined as the ‘work done by the organisation’.
The critical features for analysis could be:
1. Degree of uncertainty associated with the work – integrated or individual
2. Constraints of performance demands on the work – i.e. strategy
3. Skills and knowledge of the work demands, or duties of particular positions.

Does change demand necessary shifts in key tasks?

The People component can be defined as the ‘characteristics of individuals within the organization’.
The critical features for analysis could be:
1. Knowledge and skills
2. Needs and preferences
3. Perceptions and expectancies
4. Background factors.

Does the change impact the employees? Are there key leaders to facilitate the needed changes?

The Formal Structure and Processes component are formally created to get individuals to do perform tasks, in pursuit of strategic objectives.
The critical features for analysis could be:
1. Grouping of organizational functions and job design
2. Organizational design and roles
3. HR management systems
4. Information systems
5. Work environment.

How can the current structures facilitate the change and how do they influence people’s behavior?

The Informal Structure and Processes component are the emerging arrangements – structures, processes and relationships. The critical features for analysis could be:
1. The norms accepted by the people and how it informs the culture
2. Leader behavior
3. Intergroup relations
4. Informal working arrangements
5. Communication and influence patterns.

What are the useful and dysfunctional norms and dynamics?

Figure 2.5: Application of Solution 3 (Promotion of collaborative practice) to the congruence model.
The above figure is adapted from the transformation process within the core of the Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model.

Similar to solution one however, for collaboration to be successful, a trusting culture does need to be established, based on honesty, openness, consistency, and respect (Northouse, 2016). Culture has been a recurring theme throughout chapter 1 and chapter 2, comparing the conservative, command and control organizational culture within the organization, and how that is affecting the internal culture of the Institute Team. If we consider Schein’s (2017) definition of culture, shared in chapter 1, he stated that culture is “the accumulated shared learning of that group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration; which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, feel, and behave in relation to those problems” (p. 6). As per the previous sub-section, the espoused beliefs and values of Schein’s (2017)
second level of culture could become more congruent, whereby he promotes that the group should take some joint action and together observed the outcome of that action.

I believe a trusting culture can be achieved whilst collaborating and agreeing on particular ways of working (essential agreements), so that shared learning is accumulated through joint action. There are various ways of achieving this, namely through effective leadership approaches. These leadership approaches will be discussed further in the next section (2.4), but for the purpose of the above example, distributed leadership could be employed as a practice by rotating roles within each organizational function, and individual team members could contribute specific agenda items to each meeting rather than it being leader led and agreed ways of working for team collaboration could help promote colleagues listening to each other.

2.3.3.1 Resource Needs

The two main resource implications I foresee connected with promoting collaborative activity are time and the human resource. Finding time to collaborate effectively is important so that agenda items are not rushed and appropriate time is given for discussion, problem-solving, and listening to individual members. With respect to human resources, it is important that individuals share an understanding of what collaboration is, the purpose of collaborative activity, and why it is chosen as a method of communicating with other team members. That level of transparency—explaining the why—will help seek commitment to the solution; therefore, it is important that this be integrated into meetings from the outset.

Short-term and long-term financial implications need consideration. Specific sessions to promote the understanding of collaborative activity need to take place, but this may impact on other workload commitments. Depending on the time taken to introduce the concept, the financial implication would be calculated at the CTC (cost to company) rate per person, depending on their salary. It would be estimated that the specific sessions to promote collaboration would be at a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 (Arab Emirate Currency) /
CAD 4000-7000 (Canadian Dollars) per day for the full team. However, the long term financial gain from incorporating such a strategy could be more beneficial; for example, the need to recruit and induct new team members might be reduced if team members were retained through enhanced motivation, and team functionality might be improved by members working collaboratively instead unilaterally. The long-term gain would need to be communicated within the financial forecasts and budget documents to support the justification and, hopefully, secure the funding from the change leader. This is referred to in the communication plan (section 3.4).

2.3.4 Interdependent Solution

Despite the “People” component being at the core of the OIP, I believe the most prominent and sustainable solution for this OIP is solution 3: Collaborative Practice. Although this specific solution resides in the “Informal Structures and Processes” component of the congruence model, the act of collaboration is one that can facilitate sustainable change, affect the Institute culture, and influence team member behavior in the longer term. However, I propose that all three of the solutions can be applied interdependently, through the combined effort of the three leadership approaches discussed in chapter 1. When considering the process of transformational leadership for example, solution 1 and 2 can be used in the short term to promote the longer-term solution of collaboration, predominantly led through distributed leadership practice and modeled through servant leadership behavior. I believe a combined leadership approach is required to implement this interdependent solution effectively so that the shorter-term norms become embedded as espoused belief and values as Schein (2017) promotes. If the interdependent solution is to be enacted successfully, the leader must approach the solution in the correct way to ensure buy-in, support, and commitment by individual team members. The next section aims to synthesize the interdependent solution with the chosen leadership approaches (interdependence of servant, distributed and transformational leadership), whilst chapter 3 will provide greater detail of how the solutions can be integrated interdependently.
2.4 Leadership Approaches to Change

Credibility is an essential attribute for leaders as they seek support and commitment from their teams (Kim et al., 2009). Leader trustworthiness and competence are dimensions of credibility and it was concluded in the final section of Chapter 1 (1.7) that a leader who wants to build credibility, and hence readiness for change, will need to: be part of the change with the team (i.e., model behaviors that they expect the team to demonstrate), be a complete advocate of the change (promoting the vision), and encourage active participation (collaborative practice) throughout the change.

As discussed in section 1.2, my leadership values are integrity, authenticity, and transparency, and I believe that the main role of a leader is to develop and motivate others to be the best they can be. In order to credibly enact such values and beliefs and to aim to promote a trusting team culture, I believe that an interdependence of servant, distributed and transformational leadership approaches resonate most strongly, operating through the human resource frame. Just as the human resource frame emphasizes the interdependence between people and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004), a leadership model has been created that demonstrates the interdependence of the three leadership approaches—synergistic to the interdependent solution—resulting in a specific leadership approach for the purpose of this OIP. I have named this specific leadership approach Trianalogue Leadership.

2.4.1 Trianalogue Leadership

In the conclusion of section 1.2, it was claimed that the three leadership styles of Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985) and Distributed Leadership (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2005) are complementary ideologies (Taylor et al., 2007; Stone et al., 2004), resting on the authenticity and true value of empowering others. However, in contrast to each other, Northouse (2016) positions servant leadership as behavioral, and transformational leadership as a process, whilst Spillane (2005) would position distributed leadership as being first and foremost about leadership practice. Trianalogue
Leadership is demonstrated in Figure 2.6 below and demonstrates how the specific features of each leadership style—Process, Behavior, and Practice—combine to create a potentially powerful leadership approach that is central to the people component of the Human Resource Frame, and also congruent to the interdependent solution of collaborative practice (section 2.3) aimed at addressing the PoP.

![Figure 2.6. Leader Approach specifically created for the purpose of this OIP: Trianalogous Leadership.](image)

*The above figure is influenced by the research of Bass (1985, 1995); Breevaart, Bakker, Hetland, Demerouti, Olsen, & Espevik (2014); Choudhary & Akhtar (2011); Diamond (2015); Greenleaf (1977); Gronn (2002); Liden, Wayne, Liao & Meuser (2014); Morrison (2013); Northouse (2016); Russell (2001); Russell & Stone (2002, 2004); Spears (2004); Spillane (2005); Stone, Russell, & Patterson (2004); Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, & Jinks (2007).*
As referenced earlier, section 1.2 has significant resonance to this section in that the three leadership styles were defined, identifying their key processes, behaviors, and practices, and alignment to my personal leadership values. As depicted in Figure 2.6 above, the key processes identified for transformational leadership include: articulating the vision (big picture and main elements), setting clear and high standards, and encouraging followers (Bass, 1985, 1995; Breevaart et al., 2014; Choudhary & Akhtar, 2011; Northouse, 2016; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). The key behaviors identified for servant leadership include: modeling genuine care for others, integrity and stewardship, and putting followers first (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2014; Northouse, 2016; Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002, 2004; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). The key practices identified for distributed leadership include: the distribution of functional responsibilities and objectives, collaboration, and leaders specifically working with the team (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013; Spillane, 2005). These key processes, behaviors, and practices of each leadership style will be discussed in more detail below, focusing on how these leadership practices can be enacted, in order to realize the Trianalogous Leadership approach.

2.4.2 Transformational Leadership

As promoted in chapter 1, learning should be transparent in all areas, and the development of interdependence, sustainability and capacity building should be paramount, so that the collective can sustain success (Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013). One distinctive feature of transformational leadership is that the leadership of teams can be collectively transformational (Gronn, 2002). This would support my ultimate strategic aim (i.e., my leadership vision) of developing a truly interdependent and collaborative team that support each other across the different roles and responsibilities, in order to successfully meet the organization’s commercial objectives.

In such a transient and changing context as in this OIP, dynamic times require dynamic leadership. Transformational leadership is often seen as a dynamic form of leadership and is
the linchpin for additional theories (Taylor et al., 2007). This style operates as a *pre* and *post* to the other styles, which is why I am discussing this style first in this section. As mentioned in section 2.1, a transformational leader’s focus is directed toward the organization, and it is their behavior that can emphasize intrinsic motivation and build follower commitment toward organizational objectives (Northouse, 2016; Stone et al., 2004). Stone et al. (2004) support this further by quoting that “the transformational leader articulates the organizational vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in the followers, leads by example, and empowers followers to achieve the vision” (p. 352). The organization in this instance is that of the Institute, and the Institute Team are the followers. My leadership agency is to ensure I communicate successfully with the team in a compelling and collective manner to promote the ultimate aim (i.e., my leadership vision).

However, in order to build my credibility, I feel it is necessary that the team understand my values, motives and vision initially. I aim to communicate these to the team through solution 2 (away-day) and solution 3 (collaborative practice and team meetings). This is further synthesized in chapter 3 when discussing the implementation and communication plans. The intention is that by sharing my own values, motives and vision, I am promoting my own high expectations, as well as advocating the change, hence aiming to build credibility. Once I lead the way in this, confidently and optimistically as promoted by Stone et al. (2004), I will be able to *encourage* the team to understand and share their own values and motives, so that they can build a collaborative culture in which they can then collectively strategize toward meeting the organizational commercial objectives. This supports Northouse (2016)–quoted earlier in section 1.2–who stresses the importance of transformational leadership is “to understand and adapt to the needs and motives of followers” (p. 190).

Choudhary and Akhtar (2011) however, claim that transformational leaders use and convert the values and motives of followers and articulate them to promote the vision and goals
of an organization. Such consideration to and sharing of individual team member values and motives will mean that I, as the leader, acknowledge the needs and expertise of each team member (Breevaart et al., 2014), whilst also aiming to align them to the organizational goals and vision so they are analogous. This promotes the successful functioning of human resource frame, whereby the needs of both the individual and the organization are aligned symbiotically so a “good fit benefits both” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117).

As well as understanding individual team member values and motives, it will also be important to measure team member preferences for expertise (domain-specific or general) and their motivational preferences as discussed in section 1.5 (i.e., solution 1), in order to employ transformational leadership in an informed manner. This supports the work of Thomas-Hunt and Phillips (2001)–quoted earlier in section 1.6 and when discussing solution 1 in section 2.3–who claimed “the success of teams in dynamic organizations relies on liberal exchange and open discussion of team member knowledge and expertise” (p. 116). By working more closely and collectively with team members, I will develop a greater appreciation and understanding of each team member, their expertise and motivations, allowing me to overcome one of the challenges of personal bias, as discussed in section 1.4 and to avoid any negative underlying basic assumptions to be made (Schein, 2017). This correlates with solution one and is discussed further in chapter 3, but also resonates with solution three of collaboration, and the practice of distributed leadership.

2.4.3 Distributed Leadership

Diamond (2015) stated that distributed leadership focuses on two related aspects – the leader-plus aspect and the practice aspect. “The leader-plus aspect of a distributed view recognizes that leadership work involves multiple leaders—both formally designated and informal leaders—who don’t necessarily always pull in the same direction. While the leader-plus aspect is vital, it is insufficient on its own” (Spillane, 2005, p. 385). The practice aspect highlights how leaders work together with teams. In the Institute Team, individuals are hired
and positioned according to their skill set and areas of passion (i.e., predominantly domain-specific expertise). Previously, this led to individuals feeling empowered and resulted in positive educational outcomes, specific to the autonomous areas of expertise. As the Institute Team has recently grown and the accountability of creating a for-profit training institute increases, there appears to be a fear of blame, should business projections not be met. As a result, some members of the Institute Team seem to be taking steps to ensure they protect themselves unilaterally, as positioned in section 1.3 and 2.1. For example, they ensure that all the work they do is clearly recorded and shared with significant leaders, but without necessary due consideration to how others are communicating, i.e. they are not pulling in the same direction. The team is starting to disband and become less motivated to work together. As discussed in section 1.2 and 3.2, I am passionate about collaboration, in order to develop my own and others learning, so that a successful culture of learning and mutual respect can ensue. Being a practice of distributed leadership, I feel collaboration needs to be implemented to encourage a successful balance of leader-plus aspect and practice aspect (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002). The leader-plus aspect could be promoted by encouraging role designation or rotation during collaborative activities, so particular individuals take a lead on particular organizational functions within each of the organizational functions of the institute, but collaborative decision making could be promoted to support buy-in across the team, and also encourage team commitment and motivation toward all of the pillars, not just the one they may be taking a lead in. In line with servant leadership below, this distributed leadership approach will need modeling successfully over a period of time, so that the practice becomes embedded.

By working with the team to clarify new organizational roles, structures and systems, I can harness the power of face to face communication as Cawsey et al. (2016) suggest. As opposed to communicating directly to the team, I will aim for a greater sense of involvement and participation through consultation and collaborative practice activities. This “pull tactic” or strategy resonates well with Cawsey et al.’s (2016) influencing strategies of facilitation and
support and negotiation and agreement. However, it is important that this strategy does not now lead to compliance rather than wholehearted support of change, as Cawsey et al. (2016) warn is possible during this influence. I would assume that wholehearted support of change needs a longer-term strategy and leadership approach. This is where I see the importance of servant leadership because “at its core, servant leadership is a long-term transformational approach” (Spears, 2004, p. 7). Within the complex, fast-moving context of the OIP, servant leadership may take some time to fully embed into the team culture as “accumulated shared learning” (Schein, 2017, p. 6), but if sustainability and capacity building should be paramount so that the collective can sustain success (Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013). As stated at the start of this section, I also need to consider a long-term vision and approach, such as servant leadership, as well as short term approaches and solutions, as posited in section 1.4.

### 2.4.4 Servant Leadership

The human resource frame has significant resonance to servant leadership, as it positions people as the most important asset in organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Historically, Greenleaf (1977) defined servant leadership, claiming “a great leader is seen as servant first” (p. 19). He took “a fresh critical look at the issues of power and authority, and stated people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creative supporting ways” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 20). This quote exemplifies the PoP and the intended transition from the Institute Team’s internal power issues (political frame), to a longer term trusting culture of collaboration and support (human resource frame), whereby espoused beliefs and values are developed through joint action (Schein, 2017). This is why in my Leadership Position Statement (section 1.2), servant leadership was discussed first, as the most resonant style of leadership to my values, but this is why it is also at the core of the Trianalytic Leadership model (Figure 2.6). Process and practice are the external components connecting and uniting with behavior, as the human component.
In terms of my behavior and enacting a servant leader, I need to be consistently self-aware and clearly model that I am part of the change with the team, a complete advocate of the change, and I will aim to encourage active participation (collaborative practice) throughout the change, by modeling the behaviors that I expect the team to demonstrate. For example, during any collaborative practice I will ensure that any agreed ways of working are adhered to and ensure that I consider all points of view of each member of the team, in an attempt to demonstrate genuine care. In order to be genuine though, consistency is important as well as transparency and integrity. By being open and honest about my own values, motives and vision for collaboration, I aim to be transparent, but if I am to demonstrate integrity I must do what I say I will do. This reiterates the need to be consistent and also relentless in my vision for promoting collaborative practice.

Despite the demotivating effect of the external factors (Figure 1.5), it is important that all of the team value our own and others’ work. Spears (2004) states stewardship uses openness and persuasion, or what I would refer to as transparency, to assume a commitment to serving the needs of others. Ultimately, regardless of whether we become more commercial in our organizational objectives, the core of our work is focused on the service we provide to schools, aiming to improve their teaching and leadership. This needs to continue to be regularly reiterated with the team as mentioned in section 1.2. Although the Institute Team do not feel their voices are heard by the Governing Board, it is important to highlight and celebrate the positive feedback they received from participants within and across the schools to promote their motivation. Continued effective use of evaluation data from our training programs and regular feedback on our collaborative practice will aim to maintain the team’s motivation. I must ensure that I draw out the key headlines from this data, and share openly in our weekly team meetings, and the data can then be discussed in a collaborative manner, to really motivate the team to celebrate success and also make relevant improvements as appropriate to ensure further achievement. The data can then be shared as headlines in the Governing Board
meetings in the conservative style they would expect. The same data can be used multiple times, despite the different purposes.

As a member of the Institute Team’s SLT, I aim to enact my leadership agency by leading by example (with authenticity) and evoking trust (through integrity and transparency) both with the Institute Team and Governing Board, demonstrating my ability to lead up and lead across, but this behavior must be maintained with consistency and regularity in order to build credibility.

In summary to this section, the combination and interdependence of the three leadership approaches—transformational, distributed, servant—will help to capture the effective features of each, so that they can combine into one approach named Trianalogous Leadership. Servant leadership is behavioral, transformational leadership as a process, distributed leadership is practice (Northouse, 2016; Spillane, 2005) and Trianalogous Leadership demonstrates how the specific features of each leadership style—Process, Behavior, and Practice—combine to create a potentially powerful leadership approach that is central to the people component of the Human Resource Frame, and also congruent to the interdependent solution of collaborative practice (section 2.3) aimed at addressing the PoP. This section has demonstrated that all three of the solutions can be applied interdependently, through the combined effort of the three leadership approaches—Trianalogous Leadership. When considering the process of transformational leadership, solution 1 and 2 can be used in the short term to promote the longer-term solution of collaboration, predominantly led through distributed leadership practice and modeled through servant leadership behavior. The next section will summarize how I will build an awareness for this planned change, which in turn will lead into the change implementation and communication plans in chapter 3.

2.5 Communicating the Need for Change

If I link back to the beginning of the previous section (2.4), it was claimed that a leader who wants to build credibility, and hence readiness for change, will need to: be a complete
advocate of the change, be part of the change with the team (i.e., model behaviors that they expect the team to demonstrate), and encourage active participation (collaboration) throughout the change. I feel this correlates agreeably to the process, behavior and practice components of the Trianalogous Leadership model. With reference to my leadership agency as change facilitator, I aim to effectively articulate the vision (advocate the change) as a transformational leader, regularly facilitate collaborative responsibilities promoting active participation through distributed leadership practice, and consistently model genuine care with the team as a servant leader. It is therefore hoped that the team members will begin to participate in genuine collaboration, hence increasing their individual and team motivation.

As presented and referenced earlier in the OIP, Figure 1.5 depicts the leadership approach and role (red colored area) surrounding the core team and their congruence, acting almost like a shield to the external and environmental factors of the organization and the federal bodies. I will need to adjust my leadership approach according to whether I’m leading up or leading across with the Governing Board and Institute Team, respectively. However, as stated in section 1.6, my priority lies with the Institute Team.

The Institute Team are those that I would communicate with in the first instance. This is where I need to position myself and act. I feel it would be useful to share my organizational analysis with them and the models that have been created, particularly Figure 2.5, so that the team can see the potential effect that collaboration can have on their motivation toward the change. We are at a pivotal point now within our emergent change, whereby specific internal strategies are beginning to be discussed and planned. This is an ideal time to promote the values and behaviors I need to model through Trianalogous Leadership approach and to promote the need for collaboration and joint action. The promotion of collaboration through the Trianalogous Leadership approach will encourage team members to work together and to begin to take responsibility for motivating each other, i.e., the followers becoming the leaders as Bass (1985) claims. Chapter 3 will discuss further how the interdependent solution and
leadership approach will be specifically planned, monitored and communicated, so that any change is effective and sustainable.

2.6 Chapter 2 Summary

Chapter 2 has allowed me to take a much deeper look into my organization and consider the effect that the internal and external factors are having on the Institute Team, but to also consider how various solutions and leadership approaches can be implemented to aid the promotion of motivation. Viewing my OIP through the human resource lens has empowered me to feel that I can “make a difference” (Sowell, 2014, p. 212). By emphasizing the interdependence between the Institute Team and the wider organization (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004) and acknowledge the needs of both the individual and organization so “good fit benefits both” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117), I aim to “align the needs of individuals and organizations, engaging people’s talent and motivation through collaboration, while the enterprise profits” as Bolman and Deal (2013; p. 117) assure.

The deeper organizational analysis in this chapter demonstrates a demand for a specific shift or clarity in direction from leadership. Due to the ambiguity with performance or work components, and an altering of informal and formal structures without due consideration to the history or acknowledgments of new norms, the dynamics within the team and between individuals, i.e., the people, are dysfunctional. Suggestions of what needs to be changed have included finding time to identify and understand individual knowledge, skills and expertise; an away-day to formalize structures, policies and team ways of working; and ongoing collaborative practice. The leadership approach created for the purpose of this OIP—Trianalagous Leadership—aims to meet that demand for a specific shift and clarity in direction.

Chapter 3 will provide specific detail as to how the interdependent solution and approach will be planned, monitored and communicated, so that any change is effective and sustainable.
3.0 Chapter 3 Introduction

As the culminating chapter of this OIP, chapter 3 is connected to chapter 1 and chapter 2, so that there is coherence and flow from the initial introduction of the PoP, through to the organizational analysis, whereby subsequent solutions to the PoP are presented into the change plan. The PoP central to this OIP poses the question: “How can team motivation be enhanced in a training institute of a private educational organization, whilst going through a period of rapid change and transition from one operational style (service-oriented) to another (commercial oriented)?” My PoP is grounded within a perceived neo-liberal context (Apple, 2001), of an international, for-profit, private education organization that owns 52 schools in the UAE and Qatar. We—the Institute Team—are transitioning from an internal PLD department (cost center) with service-orientation (current state), to an external training institute (profit center) with commercial-orientation (future state). The Institute Team have gone through significant change over the last 24 months, and a degree of demotivation and cynicism has resulted.

Chapter 3 aims to demonstrate a clear implementation plan, that is inclusive of clear monitoring and evaluation tools and measures that could be used to track change, gauge progress and assess whether the change has been successful. At each stage of the plan, ethical commitments are considered for the relevant stakeholders, and then a clear and persuasive communication plan is shared. Figure 3.1 below demonstrates the main sub-sections of this chapter, and how each section links to the next.
3.1 Change Implementation Plan

In this section, a summary of the OIP goals are highlighted, demonstrating how the organizational analysis conducted in chapter 2 has led to the integrated, interdependent leadership solution. The change implementation plan discusses how the leadership approach–Trianalogous Leadership (combination of transformational, servant, and distributed leadership)–is aligned to this solution, through process, behavior and practice. Resource needs for the solutions outlined in chapter 2 are then implicated into this section. Suggestions of how to overcome these are subsequently detailed in section 3.4 of this chapter.

3.1.1 Summary of Goals and Priorities of the Planned Change

There are two specific goals that pertain to the core PoP of this OIP. Goal one is to increase individual and team motivation, in order to achieve goal two, which is for the Institute to be commercially financially profitable by year 3 of operation.

As presented in chapter 1, at a Federal level, the Training Institute will be of seminal influence across the country, supporting the UAE’s vision to increase the percentage of high quality teachers across all schools in the region. The Governing Board’s (the organization)
interests would be served commercially, in terms of revenue from selling numerous
development and qualification programs. My personal leadership goal, and the central goal of
this OIP, is to develop a truly interdependent, collaborative, and motivated team that support
each other across the different roles and responsibilities, in order to achieve the organizational
and federal visions. Therefore, the Institute Team (16 people) are at the core of the central goal.

3.1.2 Organizational Analysis

In chapter 1, a conceptual model was created, that was then used as a framework for
organizational analysis in chapter 2. The model is a combination of Armenakis et al.’s (1993)
model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational
Congruence Model (Figure 1.4). The model illustrates how the inputs can be transformed into
outputs, and highlights the environmental, external and internal factors that are attributional to
the PoP. The inputs predominantly include the Governing Board’s commercial strategy and the
federal regulations (environmental influence); and the outputs include the commercial gain and
quality services. If we are to consider the larger organizational context of the PoP, the
projected future state to be a commercial training institute (i.e., to achieve the commercial goal
two), certainly resonates with the neo-liberal, marketized culture surrounding it.

Of most significance however, particularly with respect to the PoP and goal one, is the
transformation within the core of the model: organizational coherence (Nadler & Tushman,
1999). Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model was designed as an
organizational analytical tool and “puts greatest emphasis on the transformation process and
specifically reflects the critical system property of interdependence” (p. 39). It is through this
notion of interdependence that the leadership approach and solution have been proposed. A
poor fit between the organizational components of task (performance), people (individuals),
formal structures and processes, and informal structures and processes, will lead to problems
and dysfunctions (Nadler & Tushman, 1980), as identified in section 2.1. Figure 2.2
demonstrates how the combination of the external and internal factors has influenced the core
organizational components. The lack of alignment between the factors affecting change and the people component, has resulted in the dysfunction of demotivation, negatively affecting team readiness for change. Readiness for change is “determined by the flexibility and adaptability of the organizational culture; the openness, commitment, and involvement of leadership in preparing the organization for change; and member confidence in the leadership” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 106), and “readiness is the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort” (Armenakis et al., 1993, p. 681). As described in chapter 2, the Institute Team’s state of readiness is fluctuating, due to the nature of the emergent change, and the demotivating effect of the external and internal factors.

As a result of the external factors (unheard voices, multiple value exercises, and the command and control culture), the Institute Team is feeling demotivated toward the organization, or at least resistant to those leaders in positional power, therefore do not display a readiness for change. Specifically, the command and control culture signifies the lack of “flexibility and adaptability of the organizational culture”, whilst particular leaders (i.e., the Governing Board) attempt to maintain the conservative culture, within the neo-liberal, standards driven context. Thus, my agency as a leader in this change phase is about improving “member confidence in the leadership” (Cawsey et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2009).

The internal factors (unilateral team behavior, team growth, and team expertise) have also affected team motivation, resulting in cynicism and hence reducing “openness and commitment within the team”. Kim et al., (2009) claim “employee cynicism has been shown to be negatively related to individual motivation and team performance” (p. 1437). It can be surmised that the internal factors described above have negatively affected the team’s readiness for change, and leadership approaches to encourage interdependence within the team are crucial to promote individual readiness as well as team readiness.
In order to therefore address and improve team readiness, member confidence in leadership and to encourage interdependence, the next section will outline the leadership approach and solution central to this PoP.

3.1.3 Leadership Approach and Solution

In chapter 2, the three proposed solutions were combined into one interdependent solution, with the longer-term aim of promoting sustained collaborative practice. The act of collaboration is one that can facilitate sustainable change, affect the Institute culture and influence team member behavior and motivation (i.e., the people component) in the longer term (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002; Northouse, 2016; Savage, 1991). I believe that as a member of the Institute’s SLT, I have the leadership agency and responsibility to support the development of a collaborative culture, through my approach of Trianalogous Leadership. Schein (2017) defines culture as “the accumulated shared learning of a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration” (p. 6), and collaboration is defined as the “ability of a team to work well together in which team members can stay problem focused, listen to and understand one another, feel free to take risks, and be willing to compensate for one another” (Northouse, 2016, p. 370). By the virtue of the term collaboration, group or team members problem solve and learn together, hence creating a culture, as per level two of Schein’s (2017) level of culture. As quoted in section 2.3, Schein (2017) claimed that “until the group has taken some joint action and together observed the outcome of that action, there is not yet a shared basis for determining whether what the leader wants (me in this case) will turn out to be valid” (p. 19), supporting my aim and intended culture change.

If the interdependent solution is to be enacted successfully, it is important that I, as the leader, approach the solution in a shared and problem focused manner, to ensure individual team member buy-in, support and commitment. Figure 3.2 demonstrates how my specific role (Head–Internal Quality and Management) and leadership agency spans across all
organizational functions of the Training Institute. These elements are highlighted in red on the organizational chart.

Figure 3.2. Organizational Functions of the Training Institute Structure.

With respect to my leadership agency as a change facilitator (Cawsey et al., 2016), the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) will be employed as the key driver in leading emergent change holding the individuals within the team at the core, whilst harnessing an interdependent combination of servant, distributed, and transformational leadership approaches–Trianalogous Leadership–in order to promote collaborative practice and improve the Institute Team’s individual and team motivation, and reduce their cynicism.

Trianalogous Leadership–an interdependent combination of servant, transformational and distributed leadership–was created and presented in chapter 2 (Figure 2.6). Figure 2.6 demonstrates how the specific features of each leadership style–process, behavior, and practice–combine to create a potentially powerful leadership approach that is central to the people component of the Human Resource Frame. As explained in chapter 2, Northhouse (2016)
would position transformational leadership as a *process* that changes and transforms people, and servant leadership as *behavioral*. Collaboration is a *practice* of distributed leadership (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002). If I effectively articulate the vision, consistently model genuine care for the team, and regularly facilitate collaborative responsibilities respectively, it is hoped that the Institute Team members will begin to participate in collaboration, hence increasing their individual and team motivation.

Collaboration is defined as the “ability of a team to work well together in which team members can stay problem focused, listen to and understand one another, feel free to take risks, and be willing to compensate for one another” (Northouse, 2016, p. 370). Collaboration can also contribute to a trusting culture (Connolly et al., 2011), and if conducted correctly—through *process* and *behavior*—it could provide an effective starting point for solution 1, particularly. Team members may liberally exchange and openly discuss team member knowledge, expertise and motivational drivers more readily in a trusting culture. I will model this myself first, through my servant leadership approach. “Servant leaders *model* the way through personal example and dedicated execution and attract followers into commitment, into dedication, into motivation, and into excellence” (Russell & Stone, 2004, p. 149). However, it would be naïve to think that my leadership approach to collaboration would benefit all team members, therefore I believe I need to draw on the other solutions. In Johnson’s (2003) study, he identified “grounds for concern about the use of collaborative teams to ‘silence’ dissent and debate to promote conformity with majority and practice” (p. 349). This resonates strongly with the PoP, as I believe it would only exacerbate the unilateral behavior as identified in Figure 1.4, as an internal contributing factor.

Solution 2 could be an effective strategy to avoid ‘silencing’ and bring everyone together for one day to support the understanding and analysis of the team qualities to a greater extent. The day would hopefully allow an environment for the culture change of collaboration to be initiated, promoting agreed practices and ways of working. Transformational leadership
approach is key here. Stone et al. (2004) summarize that “the transformational leader articulates the organizational vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in the followers, emphasizes values and symbolic actions, leads by example, and empowers followers to achieve the vision” (p. 352). As a transformational leader, I will therefore present the vision of a collaborative culture and persuade the team members of the benefits of collaboration, via a presentation. Merely presenting or communicating the vision will not be enough on its own. Bass (1985) defines the transformational leader as someone “who provides a model of integrity and fairness with people and also sets clear and high standards of performance, and he encourages followers with advice, help, support, recognition, and openness” (p. 468). The activity post away day, would then need a sustainable solution for collaboration to maintain the impetus and embed the culture.

I am therefore going expand on how the leadership approaches can be implemented to align my interdependent leadership approach, with the interdependent solution strategy, into the change implementation plan. Figure 3.3 below is a developed version of Figure 2.6, and demonstrates this interdependence, by expanding further on the leadership approaches mentioned above.
Figure 3.3 identifies three leadership roles with respect to process, behavior and practice. With respect to Transformational Leadership, my role is to communicate the big picture and advocate the need for collaborative practice (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden, Wayne, Liao & Meuser, 2014; Northouse, 2016; Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002, 2004; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). I will articulate the vision of increasing motivation through collaborative practice (solution 3), by encouraging followers with a clear rationale of
why collaboration is beneficial (drawing on chapter 2). By working with the team collaboratively, I aim to establish and embed clear and high standards in relation to the ways of working for collaboration. If the team creates formal structures and policies collaboratively through the away-day (solution 2) for example, there is more chance that the practice can become embedded, because they have been empowered to take ownership. This is supported by Cawsey et al. (2016) who states that stakeholders can exist on a change continuum from awareness, to interest, to a desire for action, and finally to taking action. Once fully informed and involved in the process, stakeholders can move from feeling like the change is being ‘done to’, to ‘done with’, increasing empowerment and the desire to take action (Savage, 1991). Therefore, once the team is fully informed and involved in the process through collaboration, they can move from feeling like the change is being “done to,” to “done with,” increasing empowerment and the desire to take action (Savage, 1991). All of the above could take place at a team ‘away day’, to draw on solution 2, as further suggested in the communication plan (section 3.4) and providing the funding can be available (costs outline in section 2.3 and 3.1). Following the away day, I will therefore aim to generate an open culture whereby team members can feedback on the effectiveness of collaboration and what practices are working, and not working, as detailed in section 3.2. This practice will aim to prevent the ‘silencing’ as Johnson (2003) warns against.

With respect to Servant Leadership, my role is to model collaborative behaviors, consistently with integrity (Bass, 1985, 1995; Breevaart et al., 2014; Choudhary & Akhtar, 2011; Northouse, 2016; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). I will aim to demonstrate consistent care for others throughout collaboration (solution 3), by ensuring feedback is attained at each communication stage. Spears (2004) states stewardship uses interpersonal skills such as openness and persuasion, or what I refer to as transparency, to assume a commitment to serving the needs of others. I will model the process of collaboration first, maintaining my behavior to the established ways of working and then share key information
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about myself to allow others to follow when they feel comfortable enough to do so (solution 1). I have already gone through the relevant personality tests myself, and I am more than willing to share the results of those initially, being transparent in what I share about myself and my leadership.

With respect to Distributed Leadership, my role is to facilitate the informal practice with the team, whilst promoting it as a formal practice so that the culture can be embedded (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013; Spillane, 2005), and the practice becomes an artifact, as promoted by Schein (2017) as his level one of culture. As a practice, when collaborating (solution 3), I will facilitate the group so they stay problem focused, listen to and understand one another (through the created ways of working-process). I will work with the team during this process demonstrating the practice-aspect of distributed leadership (Diamond, 2015). I aim to consistently model effective collaborative practice through regular meetings with the Institute Team and the extended team of stakeholders. The extended team of stakeholders that we work with as a Training Institute include: School Principals, Professional Learning and Development Leaders in each school, trained coaches and mentors, trained facilitators and trainers, program participants. The meetings referred to above, are mostly aligned to the organizational functions of the Training Institute (Professional Learning and Development (PLD); Pre-service Teacher Training (PTT); School Leadership and Management (SLM)) and are used to quality assure and review current programs, products and practices. As Figure 3.2 demonstrates, I have leadership agency across the pillars and I always ensure I explain the ‘why’ of certain decisions, before we collaboratively agree on the ‘how’, maintaining transparency, but then I would then share the decision with my line manager, whereby I am leading up. However, this also aids collective distribution in which leaders work interdependently, but separately (Diamond, 2015). In line with the current trajectory of the Training Institute, we are at a significant stage of business development and planning, of which demands a specific commercial strategy. The strategy is a key focus that the team would
benefit from collaborating on, laterally and vertically across the organizational functions. Aligning the strategy to the vision will allow for focused collaboration, so the two main goals described in section 3.1.1. can also be aligned interdependently.

The solutions and leadership approaches themselves, actually become the mode of communication and are integral within the communications plan in section 3.4 of this chapter. I have outlined the communication plan in Table 3 in section 3.4, defining the key questions of who, what, why and how. The leadership approaches are explained in further detail, specifically outlining how the interdependent leadership approach itself becomes the communication channel, to enact the interdependent solution effectively.

Not only does the communication plan outline how the leadership approach and solutions will be enacted, but it also outlines how the resource implications – detailed below – can be overcome in order to successfully implement the relevant solutions.

3.1.4 Resource Implications

For each solution proposed, specific resource implications exist. The resource needs were outlined in chapter 2, however this chapter aims to analyse and balance the implications, so that the communication plan (section 3.4) demonstrates how I plan to overcome them.

3.1.4.1 Resource implications: Solution 3

The main resource implications I foresee with promoting collaborative practice are time, finance, and the human resource. Finding time to collaborate effectively is important, so that agenda items aren’t rushed and appropriate time is given for discussion, problem-solving and listening to individual members. With respect to human resources, it is important that individuals have a common understanding of what collaboration is, the purpose of collaborative practice, and why it is chosen as a method of communicating with other team members. As a training institute, we will be able to do this work as in-service. That level of
transparency, explaining the why, will help seek commitment to the solution, therefore it is important that this is integrated into meetings from the onset.

Despite the in-service practice, short-term and long-term financial implications still need consideration. Specific sessions to promote the understanding of collaborative practice need to take place but this will impact team workload functioning. Depending on the time taken to introduce the concept, the financial implication would be calculated at the CTC (cost to company) rate per person, depending on their salary. It would be estimated that this would be at a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 (Arab Emirate Currency) / CAD 4000-7000 (Canadian Dollars), per day for the full team. Approval would be needed by my line manager (the change leader) for this, however, the long term financial gain from incorporating such a strategy could be more beneficial—e.g., the need to recruit and induct new team members may be reduced if team members are retained through enhanced motivation; team functionality may be improved by being collaborative instead of people operating more in a more individualized or unilateral way. The long-term gain would need to be communicated within the financial forecasts and budget documents to support the justification, and hopefully secure the funding. This is referred to in the communication plan (section 3.4).

If solution 1 and 2 are going to mediums used to promote and develop collaborative practice further, then there will be additional resource implications as below.

3.1.4.2 Resource implications: Solution 1

The two main resource implications I foresee with solution 1 are finance and time. The financial cost of the personality tests and also for the training on how to administer, analyze and feedback the tests need consideration. The time implications relate to time it takes the individuals to complete the test and for the administrator analyze the test and then provide feedback. In essence, this could be costed at one day CTC (cost to company) for two people. It would be estimated that this would be at a projected cost of AED 3,000-5,000 / CAD 1000-
2000, per day. Approval would be needed by my line manager (the change leader) for this too. This is built into the communications plan in section 3.4.

If validated and tested personality inventories are to be implemented, they need to be bought from licensed providers. Additionally, specific individuals need to be trained by licensed providers to be able to administer, analyse and feedback effectively. The approximate, inclusive cost of setting this up could be AED 20,000 / CAD 7000, plus a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 / CAD 4000-7000, per day for the full team CTC.

As the leader of such, there are particular individuals who would need to be contacted and liaised with. I would need to liaise with the external organization to firstly arrange for the training on the personality tests, and then select other potential leaders in the team (e.g., SLT) whom would be trained. I would do this in collaboration with my line manager (the change leader) to ensure approval is provided. Once trained, as a group of administrators, we would need to ensure that the analysis of personality tests and also how the feedback is given is moderated. We would want to ensure that all team members were receiving similar experiences, so as to make sure the experience is positive and solution 1 can be successful.

There is a risk, that if someone is not happy with their personality profile results, the feedback session would have to be handled with care. However, the powerful nature of conducting such personality profiles will allow the team to increase awareness of the collective strengths and areas for development, and where team members complement each other so that the whole team, the collective, can benefit. As promoted in chapter 1 and 2, learning should be transparent in all areas, so that the collective can sustain success (Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013).

With reference to a timeline, I would anticipate that this process would take 3-4 weeks for one person. Should three administrators be trained, the whole process could realistically take up to 6 months for the entire team to be profiled, analysed and receive feedback. However,
since solution 1 is going to be implemented once collaborative practice has been established and embedded, this timeline could be appropriate.

3.1.4.3 Resource implications: Solution 2

The two main resource implications I foresee with solution 2 are finance and time. The financial cost of the away day or team building activities (AED 10,000 / CAD 3500). If we were to also factor in the CTC for all staff being out of office for one day, this would be a projected cost of AED 12,000-20,000 / CAD 4000-7000, for the one day.

In addition, trying to align everyone’s calendars and time could be difficult, giving the team’s current unilateral behavior. Further time implications for maintaining the impetus of agreed goals and actions from the away day. As a member of the SLT, I have the agency to lead on this initiative as I have conducted one previously. The first day of our working week, which is Sunday in the UAE, is the day our team is scheduled to be in the office and that is the day we plan all of our meetings. This could be a suitable day, whereby we divert our calendars to an away day.

As this day would be potentially be transformational in terms of sharing the vision and setting the expectations for practice, the long-term benefit should outweigh the short-term input of one day away. By being transparent in my approach, I aim to persuade the team that despite the initial input of time for communicating the plan and vision and establishing collaborative ways of working, this will encourage greater efficiency in the future, and will embed the proposed, positive culture so that we all feel motivated in our work environment. Larger input of time now, will reduce the need for lengthy meetings in the future, hence reducing the time implication in the future.

The expected outcomes after implementing such solutions would include: improved collaborative and trusting culture within the Institute Team, and improved individual and team motivation, within the Institute Team. I would anticipate that this would improve staff retention and create more time efficient ways of working, as measured by team member feedback. Both
factors would then contribute to the Training Institute being a commercially profitable operation. The goal to improve and/or maintain motivation will always be ongoing by virtue of PoP, but one academic year to demonstrate improvements would be appropriate in such a fast-paced, highly regulated environment, and would align with the yearly practices and processes embedded within the training institute. With respect to the commercial goal, the Institute is expected to be a profitable business entity by year 3 (we are now in year 2).

In order to measure whether collaborative ways of working are being embedded by existing and new members of the Institute Team and expected outcomes are being achieved, a clear monitoring and evaluation plan is required. This is discussed in the next section.

3.2 Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation

Throughout this systematic change, I propose an evaluation model to monitor and assess where the team is at the start of the change, and how they shift in their motivation as the leadership approach and solution are employed, within the constantly changing and moving context. This therefore demands a model that involves stages or levels of evaluation over time and also in terms of depth of evaluation. A Monitoring and Evaluation (M-E) model is proposed and explained below.

3.2.1 M-E Model


Table 1 below displays a simplified version of both models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants’ Reactions</td>
<td>1. Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participants’ Learning</td>
<td>2. Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participants Use of New Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of EVALUATION MODELS
5. Student Learning Outcomes

Note. Guskey’s (2000) model has been directly compared to Kirkpatrick’s (1959) model.

Table 1 exemplifies the similarity of Level 1 and 2 in both models, of which I will maintain in the modified evaluation model. They will be named “Reaction” and “Learning” respectively, as per the Kirkpatrick (1959) model. When considering the differences between the two models, Guskey’s (2000) use of level 3, “organizational support and change” is absent in the Kirkpatrick model. However, I will maintain this level in the modified model as I believe it is of significance to the OIP. Due to the organizational contributing factors, internal and external, I believe it is imperative to evaluate the “organizational support and change” as the Institute Team transition through the change. Level 4 and level 5 will focus on the output of the relevant change management processes. If I refer to Figure 1.4, the conceptual model that was derived from an amalgamation of Armenakis et al.’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model, the two outputs (blue box) were named “Team Goals” and “Commercial Goals”. These will represent level 4 and 5 respectively.

Therefore, the combined and modified model that will be used for the purpose of this OIP has 5 levels. These 5 levels have been illustrated Figure 3.4, and in addition, the levels of evaluation have been aligned to Figure 1.4, the conceptual change model (refer to Figure 3.5 below).
Figure 3.4. Modified Evaluation Model.  
Adapted from Kirkpatrick (1959) and Guskey’s (2000) Evaluation models.

Figure 3.5. Modified Evaluation Model aligned to the Change Model.  

Figure 3.5 above represents the alignment of the conceptual change model to the M-E model, demonstrating the linkages between the organizational analysis and the points at which key facets will be monitored and evaluated. Level 1–Reaction represents to what degree do team members react to the current change process and vision, such as the “internal” factors
depicted in Figure 1.4. Level 2–Learning aligns to the leadership approach, role and credibility, and the solution used throughout the change management process, affecting the “congruence” as depicted in Figure 1.4. Level 3–Organization support and change links to the organizational variables that may change throughout such efforts, such as the “external” factors depicted in Figure 1.4. Level 4–Results 1–Teams Goals represents goal one focusing on team motivation levels as a result of the leadership approach and the solution in level 2 and 3, and Level 5–Results 2–Commercial Goals represents goal two focusing on the extent to which the intended commercial vision has been achieved.

3.2.2 M-E Techniques/Tools

Table 2 below displays a plan of the M-E Techniques/Tools that can be used throughout the OIP, at relevant times according to the OIP component and level of evaluation, as per the modified evaluation model explained above. This table also explains how the techniques and tools will be used, who is responsible, and why they would be used to support implementation.

Table 2

*M-E TECHNIQUES/TOOLS throughout OIP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-E technique or tools</th>
<th>When would it/these be used?</th>
<th>How would it/these be used?</th>
<th>Who will be responsible?</th>
<th>Why would it/they be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team demographic questionnaire</td>
<td>Pre-application of solution 1 and also to framing population/people component of PoP.</td>
<td>Basic demographic questionnaire administered to all team members. Personality Assessment administered to team members (confidentiality/ethical clause – used only for purposes of OIP, not for assessment or open sharing purposes). This would be a voluntary practice for team members, but it would be strongly encouraged so that all team members are collaboratively contributing to the whole</td>
<td>I would be responsible for administering and collecting the questionnaire data from each Team member. This would be stored on a private and protected digital platform, whereby I and the individual team member would only have access, until the individual team</td>
<td>To capture team demographics, work experience, perceived specialisms or generalist foci. Psychometric data to be used as a comparative analysis to motivation and cynicism data. This data may support understanding toward unilateral team behavior and effects of team growth. This evaluation tool is also directly aligned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception and Contextual analysis questionnaire. Components evaluated will include:</td>
<td>Team Member interviews and observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section A:</strong> Perception of organizational readiness</td>
<td>During the change solutions, as ongoing feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B:</strong> Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Level 2 of modified M-E model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Cynicism</strong></td>
<td>Subjective and qualitative data collected at regular intervals throughout change management process, from all team members and certain members of the Governing Board. This data may be retrospective and/or current.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>This would be a voluntary practice for team members, but it would be strongly encouraged so that all team members are collaboratively contributing to the whole team goals (the communication plan in section 3.4 aims to address this).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the start of the change to understand the organizational context and PoP. Questionnaire administered to all team members. It would be a multi-pronged questionnaire combining a number of specific tools to focus on the relevant components. For example: Allen and Myer’s (1991) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkhar (1998) Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS).

Again, this would be a voluntary practice for team members, but it would be strongly encouraged so that all team members are collaboratively contributing to the whole team goals (the communication plan in section 3.4 aims to address this).

I would be responsible for collecting this data. This would be stored on a private and protected digital platform, whereby I and the Institute Team’s SLT would have confidential access. This would only be shared after screening and analysis conducted by the SLT.

Any anecdotal observational data will be shared with specific team members as applicable, and providing the team member gave permission, it can then be analyzed and shared with the wider team.

To capture team perception of organizational factors, and also their individual level of commitment and motivation as a starting point (Level 1) and after change has progressed (Section B - Level 4) – i.e., pre and post measure.

These M-E techniques will glean information about the leadership approach and solutions employed, including their effect on team motivation–goal one. Analysis of the data from such interviews and observations would aim to answer the following questions:

- Is motivation affected by inter team relationships?
- Is motivation affected by leadership?
- Is motivation affected by larger organizational factors?

member chose to share with others. solution 1 and the information can be used to support the collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers.
Key performance indicators (KPI’s) of business
Output of OIP – Level 5 of modified M-E model.
Quantitative, performance data, respective of business plan and key performance indicators. These would be comparable to original goals, and goals that may have been modified.
The change agent and Governing Board would be responsible for dictating the KPI’s.
This information would demonstrate whether the change management (OIP vision) was a success, in terms of commercial goals–goal two.

Note. Linkages are made to the levels of the M-E model. Adapted from Kirkpatrick (1959) and Guskey’s (2000) Evaluation models.

In terms of a strategy to measure the progress of the leadership approach and solution, the model, outlined in Table 2, demonstrates that there are three main levels of analysis. These include: Pre and post team analysis (motivation survey, team culture survey, and observational data / anecdotal reflections); pre and post context analysis (surveys measuring organizational readiness, organizational commitment, and organizational cynicism and motivation); and commercial analysis (key performance indicators and commercial goal two–profit).

Considerations have been made regarding the voluntary nature of the measures, where the data will be held so that confidentiality is maintained, and also access and permission issues so that ethical issues are controlled. However, ethical considerations and challenges exist when the leadership approach and solution are being implemented. The next section will outline these considerations, discussing how they may be overcome.

3.3 Leadership Ethics and Organizational Change

As posited by Northouse (2016), “ethics is central to leadership because of the nature of the process of influence” (p. 337). In chapter 2, a specific leadership model was created for the purpose of this OIP in order to help improve motivation and influence the behavior of the Institute Team members. The three leadership approaches of servant, transformational and distributed leadership were demonstrated in an interdependent model, creating a new leadership approach named Trianalogous Leadership (Figure 2.6). The model depicts how process, behavior and practice can come together synergistically to increase individual and team motivation (Figure 3.3). However, in order to ethically change and transform people, it is vital that I ensure the processes, practices and behaviors are enacted with the utmost integrity.
The purpose of this section is to identify the strengths and challenges surrounding the change implementation plan and consider how these will be addressed ethically.

3.3.1 Ethics and Strengths of the Change Implementation Plan

I appreciate how the plan and suggested solution aligns to the original PoP. The PoP central to the OIP poses the question: “How can team motivation be enhanced, whilst going through a period of rapid change and transition from one operational style (service-oriented) to another (commercial oriented)?” The plan discussed in section 1 of this chapter aims to meet the intended future state, not only for the improvement of team motivation, but also to be able to meet the commercial goals. Therefore, the solution is twofold, ethically balancing the individual and team goals, with that of the organization, promoting the human resource frame, whereby a good fit benefits both (Bolman and Deal, 2013). If we are employed by the organization, I believe it is ethically just to honor the organizational goals too. The aim of promoting collaborative practice is to improve individual and team motivation but can also be used as an embedded practice so that the team is aligned in meeting the commercial goals and work together to do so.

In addition to this, I feel that the collaborative practice will have a positive influence on the Institute Team culture. The development of a constructive, trusting team culture should positively affect the internal factors (unilateral team behavior, team growth, and team expertise) that currently are contributing to the PoP. By virtue, the chosen leadership styles recruited to do this—servant, transformational and distributed leadership—are based on altruistic principles. “Altruism is an approach that suggests that actions are moral and ethical if their primary purpose is to promote the best interests of others” (Northouse, 2016, p. 335), and not only do I believe a strength of this OIP is that the plan, solution and approach aligns to the original PoP, but I believe the PoP is altruistic in its own right. I am aiming to support the team as we go through this change, but my ultimate strategic aim would be to develop a truly interdependent, collaborative, and motivated team that support each other across the different
roles and responsibilities, hence promoting the best interests of others, and subsequently acting ethically.

However, despite the expected outcomes and strengths discussed above, there are challenges and potential obstacles. I will explain how I aim to mitigate these ethically in the following sub-section.

3.3.2 Ethics and Challenges of the Change Implementation Plan

Given the multitude of contributing factors internally and externally to the PoP, a significant potential challenge within this OIP could be my leadership agency, not only with the team per se, but also in managing those in positional power (i.e., leading up and leading across). I am the longest standing member of the Institute Team, and therefore have the historical knowledge, but I ethically need to be careful that my personal biases do not pose a significant issue to the plan. I need to ensure that the feeling of demotivation is not something I am projecting onto other team members by highlighting it as an issue. Should this happen, I would be demonstrating ethical egoism, posited as an ethical theory by Northouse (2016). I need to ensure that the message is about maintaining and improving motivation to meet team goals. This is something I need to conscious about and employ regular self-awareness.

In addition, I have established relationship dynamics with particular members of the team, and I may need to monitor these and their effect on the whole team. I openly share my own expertise and motivational preferences to these particular members but I ethically need to do so more readily with all members of the team to establish broader relationships and connections, creating a greater sense of equity. This is essential if I am to model servant leadership behaviors effectively as explained in section 2.4 and 3.1. I feel this is ethically important, particularly if I am aiming to encourage others to do so. Ethical factors also arise as potential challenges when individuals in the team do share their personal details, whether that be their personality or 360 assessment results, or whether it is their own personal preferences and motives. It is important that the information is collected with total confidentiality and
stored in a secure online environment. It should be only at the discretion of the individuals as to what is shared with other members of the team and what is not. It is hoped that with greater trust, team members may liberally exchange and openly discuss team member knowledge, expertise and motivational drivers more readily, and hence reduce the unilateral behavior. The team will then be able to utilize team member expertise more effectively, aligning to the specific work demands more efficiently.

As discussed in chapter 1 of the OIP, another significant challenge within the PoP is the continuous change, surrounding the actual change process. In such a dynamic organizational context, consistency becomes difficult (Thomas-Hunt & Phillips, 2001). During the time of this OIP, the wider organization has changed in terms of growth and staff turnover, as has the Institute Team. With the transient nature of the UAE, team members change relatively regularly, and so a challenge will be to try and establish the intended culture that is stable enough to retain team members, but also despite new ones joining, maintain a culture that is able to adapt to further change. As a ‘start-up’ business entity, this is difficult, as the culture needs to be founded for the new institute, whilst a degree of legacy culture has transitioned from the original (although smaller) PLD department. Although I have recognized the promotion of collaborative practice, and hence a collaborative culture, as an informal structure and process indicated in Figure 2.5 and in section 3.1, formal policies and procedures may need to documented and established, so that the intended collaborative ways of working are embedded within the Institute’s processes, behaviors and practices (i.e., the culture). As cited by Schein (2017) in the previous chapters, “the culture of a group can be defined as the accumulated shared learning of that group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration; which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, feel, and behave in relation to those problems. This accumulated learning is a pattern or system of beliefs, values, and behavioral norms that come to be taken for granted as basic assumptions and eventually drop
out of awareness” (p. 6). Therefore, in order to be able to ethically teach new members the “correct” ways, I would argue formal policies and procedures are needed as introductory documents to support their induction before these new members fully accumulate their learning into behavioral norms and patterns. This again, is to avoid ethical egoism as Northouse (2016) posit.

When considering the formal policies and procedures, I will draw on the literature regarding the development of collaborative culture, building on from chapter 2, so that I am in a position to be an advocating leader of collaborative practice. Drawing on such literature will allow me to communicate with and engage team members about the notion of collaboration in a more substantial and ethical way, so that I can aim to convince them fully about the informed benefits, both in the long-term and the short-term. Capturing the benefits of the collaborative practice from within the Institute Team, can then be used to leverage and promote such practice more widely in the organization. The next section (3.4) outlines how this communication could take place, in a planned and systematic manner.

In summary, the ethical considerations include: the balance of team and organizational goals, promoting the human resource frame; that chosen leadership approaches are altruistic and promote the best interest of others; the avoidance of ethical egoism by being conscious and self-aware of any potential bias or projection and by formalizing policies and procedures to gain consistency in practice; ensuring the confidentiality of any individual team member data; and ensuring all communication promoting collaboration as a practice is informed by theory and literature and not personal preference.

3.4 Change Process Communications Plan

The aim of this section in particular, is to connect the implementation plan and change process, through the M-E plan, by acknowledging the ethical commitments to all relevant stakeholders into the communication plan (see Figure 3.5 below).
Figure 3.6. Connection of the chapter sections into the change process communication plan.

The communication plan aims to demonstrate a strategy to communicate clearly and persuasively to relevant audiences, in order to address the PoP.

As stated earlier in this chapter, a conceptual model (Figure 1.4) was created for the purpose of this OIP, to frame the PoP and analyze the organization respectively. The model is an adaption of Armenakis et al.’s (1993) model for Creating Readiness for Change and Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model. The model identifies the key audiences as internal and external, representing the Institute Team and the Governing Board respectively. However, although the Institute Team is demonstrated as internal contributing factors to the PoP, they are also the Team at the core of the congruence model, within the transformation process. Nadler and Tushman’s (1980) Organizational Congruence Model was designed as an organizational analytical tool and “puts the greatest emphasis on the transformation process and specifically reflects the critical system property of interdependence” (p. 39). A fit between the organizational components of task, people (individuals), formal structures and processes, and informal structures and processes, will lead
to effective functionality and ultimately congruence (Nadler & Tushman, 1980). This is the purpose of the change implementation plan and suggested solutions.

The people component of the core congruence model has significantly emerged as a specific focus for the OIP, therefore the Human Resource frame was chosen as the key driver in leading the change. Bolman and Deal’s (2013) Human Resource frame focuses on how an institution or a leader within the institution aligns the needs of the individuals and the organizational needs (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Lyon et al., 2014; Sowell, 2014). This focus for alignment correlates with the same need for alignment within the congruence model.

The human resource frame emphasizes the interdependence between people and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Israel & Kasper, 2004) and for the human resource frame to function successfully, the needs of both the individual and organization need to be aligned symbiotically, so “good fit benefits both” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117). I aim to “align the needs of individuals and the organization, engaging people’s talent and energy” within this communication plan (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 117). Bolman and Deal (2013) posit human resource-frame leaders as process-oriented who serve as facilitators and consensus-builders. With respect to my leadership agency as a change facilitator, I plan to combine servant (behaviors), distributed (practices), and transformational (processes) into the Triangular Leadership approach, in order to communicate and build initial consensus for collaboration itself, and then maintain consistency for collaborative practice in order to embed the practice that is focused on the organizational goals (Liden et al., 2014; Northouse, 2016; Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007).

Cawsey et al. (2016) state that change facilitators are significant within the ‘Tuning’ type of change and are said to effectively use their interpersonal skills to work with teams or groups. The effectiveness of their role comes from managing the consequences of decisions and creating desired results, highlighting that the role is important and needed in organizations so a sustained integrated approach can be followed (Cawsey et al., 2016). My aim is to
therefore, identify individual motivational drivers, promote individual expertise of team members, and overcome power relations within the team and the organization, in order to navigate the team toward the future vision, hence the interdependent leadership approach—Trianalogous Leadership—an interdependent combination of servant, transformational and distributed leadership, and interdependence of the three specific solutions below as detailed in the change implementation plan:

Solution 1. Collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers
Solution 2. Team building and bonding activity (‘away day’)
Solution 3. Promotion of collaborative practice

The solutions and leadership approach themselves, actually become the mode of communication and are integral within the communications plan. Section 3.1 also outlined the resources implications to each of these solutions. The purpose of the communication plan is to also outline how to overcome these implications in order to successfully implement the relevant solutions. I have outlined the communication plan in Table 3 below, defining the key questions of who, what, why and how. In addition, I have aligned each part of the communication plan to the levels of monitoring and evaluation, as detailed in section 3.2 and Figure 3.4.

Table 3

**COMMUNICATION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>How (where, when)</th>
<th>Level of M-E Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute Team</td>
<td>Share PoP and organizational analysis. Past, present and future.</td>
<td>This will set the scene for the change to provide insight into why the solutions have been chosen, as encouraged by Cawsey et al. (2016). In addition, this will allow feedback to be elicited ensuring the organizational.</td>
<td>Communication through solution 3. The conceptual model of change and organizational analysis to be shared at an ‘away day’.</td>
<td>1 (Reaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governing Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposal and approval of financial costs for the solutions.</strong></td>
<td>For the solutions to be implemented successfully, it is imperative that these resources implications are presented and benefits proposed, so that stakeholders are in agreement, particularly the budget implications.</td>
<td><strong>3</strong> (Organizational Support and Change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute Team</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposal and approval of time implications. Share the plan for the implementation of the three solutions.</strong></td>
<td>By being transparent in my approach, I aim to persuade the team that despite the initial input of time for communicating the plan and vision and establishing collaborative ways of working, this will encourage greater efficiency in the future, and will embed the proposed, positive culture so that we all feel motivated in our work environment. Larger input of time now, will reduce the need for lengthy meetings in the</td>
<td><strong>2</strong> (Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication through solution 3. The conceptual model of change and organizational analysis to be shared at an 'away day'. Alternatively, as the Institute Team meets weekly, I could schedule an extra hour to share and discuss the plan. As a member of the SLT, I have the agency to do this, providing I give enough notice (at least one week) to the team so they can schedule it in their calendars. I would encourage feedback on each solution in order to inform any adjustments or changes required, hence modeling...
future, hence reducing the time implication in the future. collaborative ways of working, but also giving the team members a voice on an ethical level.

I will be an advocating leader of collaborative practice. Drawing on research surrounding collaborative cultures will allow me to communicate with and engage team members about the notion of collaboration in a more substantial way, so that I can aim to convince them fully about the benefits, both in the long-term and the short-term.

| Institute Team | Implementation of solutions | Enacting the three leadership approaches and values: Transparency, Integrity, and Authenticity. The aim will be to encourage team members to work together, and begin to take responsibility for motivating each other, i.e., the followers becoming the leaders, as Bass (1985) claims. It is anticipated that through consistency in these approaches, structured collaborative time will develop into more natural and open collaboration, as advised by Johnson (2003). | Solution 3: Through an ongoing, transparent model of collaborative practice, it is hoped that team members will develop trust with each other, and therefore be more willing to take a risk by sharing information and cooperating with their team members (Barczak, Lassk, & Mulki, 2010), i.e., solution 1. Ethically, team members will only be encouraged to share when they feel comfortable enough to do so. | 4 (Team Goals) |

| External stakeholders (i.e., The extended team of stakeholders that we work with as a Training Institute include: School Principals, Professional Learning and Development) | Integration of other stakeholders that influence the congruence model, beyond the core team – i.e., the personnel that we are dependent on to make our programs work. | The extended team were discussed in chapter 1 when describing the PoP. It is important that their voices are heard as they influence our practices. This will allow me and the Institute Team to frame the ongoing approaches and solutions in ways that | Solution 3: Collaborative workshop. I aim to consistently model effective collaborative practice through regular meetings with the Institute Team and the extended team of stakeholders. Figure 3.2 demonstrates how my specific role and leadership agency spans across all organizational | 3 (Organizational Support and Change) |
Leaders in each school, trained coaches and mentors, trained facilitators and trainers, program participants, as referred to in Chapter 1). have greater chance of generating needed support as Cawsey et al. (2016) promote. functions of the Training Institute.

**Note.** Linkages made to the change implementation plan solutions and levels of M-E plan.

The plan in Table 3 demonstrates key stakeholders within the communications plan; Institute Team, Governing Board, and the extended team. Cawsey et al. (2016) state that stakeholders can exist on a change continuum from awareness, to interest, to a desire for action, and finally to taking action. Once fully informed and involved in the process through collaboration, stakeholders can move from feeling like the change is being ‘done to’, to ‘done with’, increasing empowerment and the desire to take action (Savage, 1991). Modeling such practice consistently through my behaviors and servant leadership part of the Trianalogous leadership model, I aim to embed practice over time. The communication plan aims to do just that, so that all three proposed solutions, leadership approaches and levels of evaluation are shared in a sequential, transparent and ethical manner so that the ‘culture’ can be embedded. However, in terms of limitations, these solutions and practices will take time to fully embed. By ensuring the approaches are consistent however, and communication continues to be transparent, I will aim to position myself and act, as change facilitator. The next section will summarize this chapter, and identify the next steps and future considerations, as I progress forward in an attempt to fully embed the intended culture.

### 3.5 Chapter 3 Summary

Chapter 3 demonstrated a clear implementation plan, inclusive of clear monitoring and evaluation tools and measures, and considered ethical commitments for the relevant stakeholders, and then present a clear and persuasive communication plan. These elements were consistently aligned to the core goals of the OIP. Goal one is to increase individual and
team motivation, in order to achieve goal two, which is the commercial goal of the Institute to be financially profitable by year 3 of operation. As this chapter has progressed, it became clear that the theme that has emerged throughout this chapter has been interdependence. The interdependent leadership approach of Trianalogueous Leadership, has been aligned with the interdependent solution strategy of collaboration, collective understanding of individual expertise and drivers and team building.

Figure 3.3 identified three leadership roles with respect to process, behavior and practice. With respect to Transformational Leadership, my role is to communicate the big picture and advocate the need for collaborative practice (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden, Wayne, Liao & Meuser, 2014; Northouse, 2016; Russell, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002, 2004; Spears, 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). My role in terms of Servant Leadership is to model collaborative behaviors, consistently with integrity (Bass, 1985, 1995; Breevaart et al., 2014; Choudhary & Akhtar, 2011; Northouse, 2016; Stone et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2007). With respect to Distributed Leadership, my role is to facilitate the informal practice with the team, whilst promoting it as a formal practice so that the culture can be embedded (Diamond, 2015; Gronn, 2002; Morrison, 2013; Spillane, 2005). The solutions and leadership approaches themselves, actually became the mode of communication and are integral within the communications plan in section 3.4 of this chapter, in order to enact the interdependent solution effectively.

1.6 Next Steps and Future Considerations

3.6.1 Next Steps

From the onset of this OIP the context has changed rapidly and continues to change as described above, therefore I may need to operate with short-term goals, with a long-term vision. The transfer of change from service-orientation to commercial orientation needs to be carefully and systematically managed at an appropriate pace, so that commercial goals can be met successively without compromising the Institute Team’s performance and motivation.
This is why I feel that creating a collaborative culture is a more sustainable solution, whereby it becomes embedded as an institutional practice (informal structures and procedure), into formal structures and processes, regardless of the changing people component.

As a member of the Institute Senior Leadership Team (SLT), I feel I have the leadership responsibility and agency to support the development of a collaborative culture, and the solution aligns to my leadership values and interdependent Trianalogous Leadership approach, allowing the solution to be executed and modelled with integrity, transparency and authenticity. Collaboration is an activity I am already a full advocate of, but to plan and develop that further with the team will allow me to extend my leadership practice from a PoP based approach. I have rarely used collaboration as a practice from a problem-based approach, but more from a development of new products perspective, so this experience will be beneficial to expand my experience. In addition, the solution is inclusive across all organizational functions of the Training Institute, and all team members. If successful, the results of such could be shared with the wider organizational context in order to impact change more widely.

As mentioned in chapter 1, next steps would be to also apply the congruence model to the wider organization and investigate the concept of ambidexterity further.

3.6.2 Future Considerations

Sharing with the wider organizational context would certainly be a future consideration, and one that I believe would have greater impact. However, a more sequential leadership approach would be needed to help shift the deeply rooted conservative culture. In addition, since I wouldn’t have the leadership agency in the wider organization as I do in the Institute Team, a consultative role would need to be adopted. Although this would remove the challenge of potential bias, a different set of leadership ethics would need to be considered.

On a personal note, with reference to future considerations, I would like to extend my voice further and possibly write a book focusing Trianalogous leadership and how the interdependence of the three leadership styles can be applied in a number of situations and
contexts. For this to come to fruition, I would therefore need to conduct research on how it can be implemented into different contexts, so that my book is informed through practice.
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