



North-West University Business School
MBAD 821
LEADERSHIP

Contact 6

Theme 6: Substitutes of Leadership

Prof. Dr. L.T.B. Jackson (MBA; MA; PhD)

Registered Industrial Psychologist



Module information

Module code	MBAD 821
Module credits	16
Module name	Leadership
NQF	9
Qualification	MBA
Name of lecturer(s)	Prof. Dr. L.T.B. JACKSON
Office telephone	018 285 2040
Email address	Leon.Jackson@nwu.ac.za
Building and Office nr	K14 Room,G12
Consulting hours	Make an appointment (e-mail)

Module outcomes

- **After completion of the Leadership module, the student will:**

- Provide and integrate specialist knowledge to enable engagement with, critique current leadership research or practices, and practically apply a *comprehensive and systematic knowledge base* of key terms, principles and theories on leadership;
- Use a wide range of specialised skills in identifying, conceptualising, designing and the *use of methods, techniques and technologies of enquiry*, to address, complex and challenging real world issues appropriate to leadership and write up a *research report*;
- Design and implement a *strategy for processing and managing information*, in order to conduct a comprehensive *review of leading and current research*, use the resources of academic and professional or occupational discourses to communicate and defend substantial ideas that are the products of research or development, and use a range of advanced and specialised skills and discourses appropriate to the field of leadership, to communicate effectively in a multi-cultural environment and with people at different levels of knowledge or expertise; and
- Have the capacity to *operate independently and take full responsibility for his or her own work, account for leading* in applying introspection and reflexivity and initiate processes and implement systems, ensuring responsible leadership through effective, efficient and ethical governance practices.

Topics

- The substitutes for leadership model proposed by Kerr and Jermier (1978);
- The relationships among substitutes for leadership, job satisfaction, and performance outcomes;
- Distributive leadership;
- The two different communities of researchers that began conversations on the new concept of shared and distributed leadership;
- The three forms of distributed leadership according to Spillane and colleagues (2006);
- The two different kinds of distributed leadership according to Gronn (2002);
- The difference between and approaches to shared and distributed leadership;

Study outcomes

- **After studying this study unit, you should be able to:**
 - Discuss the substitutes for leadership model proposed by Kerr and Jermier (1978);
 - Explain the relationships among substitutes for leadership, job satisfaction, and performance outcomes;
 - List the concepts used to explain distributed / shared leadership;
 - Discuss the two different communities of researchers that began conversations on the new concept of shared and distributed leadership;
 - Discuss the three forms of distributed leadership according to Spillane and colleagues (2006)
 - Distinguishes between the two different kinds of distributed leadership according to Gronn (2002);
 - Distinguishes between shared and distributed leadership;
 - Distinguish in a table between the four distinct approaches on shared and distributed leadership

Study material

- Fitzsimons, D., James, K. T., & Denyer, D. (2011). Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 313-328
- Xu, X. D., Zhong, J. A., & Wang, X. Y. (2013). The impact of substitutes for leadership on job satisfaction and performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 41(4), 675-685.

Self-assessment: Substitutes of leadership

- Complete the questionnaire by using the following scale

* Response choices to each item include:

(5) Almost always true or almost completely true,

(4) Usually true, or true to a large extent,

(3) Sometimes true, sometimes untrue or true to some extent,

(2) Usually untrue, or untrue to a large extent, and

(1) Almost always untrue or almost completely untrue.

Xu, X. D., Zhong, J. A., & Wang, X. Y. (2013).
The impact of substitutes for leadership on
job satisfaction and performance. *Social
Behavior and Personality: an international
journal*, 41(4), 675-685

The impact of substitutes for leadership on job satisfaction and performance.

Introduction

- The term ***substitutes of leadership*** refers to a wide variety of
 - individual, task, and organizational characteristics
 - identified as factors that influence
 - the relationship between a leader's behaviour and a subordinate's job satisfaction (Kerr & Jermier, 1978).
- Substitutes of leadership appear to influence
 - the leadership style that motivates and directs followers (Podsakoff, Niehoff, et al., 1993).
- Individual, task, and organizational characteristics may either replace or neutralize the leader's behaviour (Ken & Jermier)

Substitutes of leadership

- In this model the authors analyzed **13 characteristic variables**
 - that **displace leaders** in **output effectiveness**,
 - with the **focus of the model** on **three dimensions**:
 - subordinate , task , and organization .
- The variables in the **subordinate dimension** are as follows:
 - individual ability,
 - experience,
 - training, and knowledge;
 - indifference toward organizational rewards;
 - professional orientation;
 - need for independence.

Substitutes of leadership

- Variables in the **dimension of task** are:
 - intrinsically satisfying;
 - providing its own feedback concerning accomplishment;
 - unambiguous and routine.
- The **dimension of organization** the variables are:
 - formalization;
 - inflexibility;
 - close-knit,
 - cohesive work groups;
 - peer support;
 - spatial distance between superior and subordinates; and
 - organizational rewards not within the leaders' control.
- These factors can effectively **act as substitute** for leadership to **varying degrees**.

Substitutes of leadership: Correlates

- Researchers have identified **significant relationships** among
 - substitutes for leadership, **job satisfaction**, and **performance outcomes**.
- Jernigan and Beggs (2010) found that
 - **organizational formality, tasks characterized as intrinsically satisfying, and tasks providing direct feedback** to employees were all associated with **increased job satisfaction**.
- Conversely,
 - **tasks characterized as unambiguous, routine, and methodologically invariant, and also the presence of close-knit, cohesive work groups** were all associated with **decreased job satisfaction**.
- Muchiri and Cooksey (2011) demonstrated the **significant positive effects** of
 - substitutes for leadership on **performance outcomes**.
 - **Similar results** were reported by Kunzle, Zala-Mezo, Kolbe, Wacker, and Grote (2010).

Substitutes of leadership: Correlates

- Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that
 - perceived organizational support had a positive effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
- It has been shown that both
 - high cohesion and the support of colleagues play positive roles in job satisfaction within a work group (Kwak, Chung, Xu, & Cho, 2010; Tekleab, Quigley, & Tesluk, 2009).
- Job satisfaction is also affected by
 - effective feedback, and by
 - task characteristics.
- Good work, group cohesiveness, and high mutual support can
 - often lead to better job performance and job satisfaction,
 - which, in turn, often have a high correlation with work activities.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Analysis of the Effects of Substitute Factors on Satisfaction and Performance

Factor item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Satisfaction	Task performance	Contextual performance
Knowledge training capacity	4.00	.54	.22*	.42**	.38**
Indifference to money attitude	3.13	.62	-.40**	.02	-.17
Need for independence	3.83	.56	.08	.43**	.15
Professional orientation	3.28	.71	.09	.19*	.19
Subordinate substitute dimension			-.02	.42**	.22*
Provides own feedback	3.96	.51	.38**	.42**	.28**
Intrinsically satisfying	3.20	.81	.61*	.11	.57**
Unambiguous and routine	3.38	.79	-.09	-.04	-.11
Task substitute dimension			.52**	.23*	.45**
Formalization	3.06	.84	.34**	.24*	.05
Inflexibility	3.28	.75	.02	.11	-.01
Highly cohesive work group	3.71	.66	.43**	.36**	.39**
Peer support	3.27	.69	.43**	.13	.47**
Reward outside leader control	2.60	.59	.07	-.04	-.05
Spatial distance between supervisors and subordinates	2.56	.84	-.05	-.04	-.11
Organization substitute dimension			.43**	.27**	.25*

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 2. *Regression Analysis for Leadership Substitute Dimensions*

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Unstandardized coefficients B	Standardized coefficients β	<i>t</i>	Adjusted R^2	<i>F</i>
Subordinate	Satisfaction	-.028	-.019	-.193	-.010	.037
Substitute	Task performance	.603	.421	4.684**	.169	21.936**
	Contextual performance	.351	.221	2.298*	.040	5.280*
Task substitute	Satisfaction	.726	.522	6.118**	.265	37.425**
	Task performance	.317	.229	2.385*	.043	5.688*
	Contextual performance	.676	.454	5.178**	.199	26.815**
Organization	Satisfaction	.645	.428	4.670**	.175	21.806**
Substitute	Task performance	.395	.267	2.775**	.062	7.701**
	Contextual performance	.396	.245	2.531*	.051	6.405*

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 3. Regression Analysis for Substitute Factors

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Unstandardized coefficients B	Standardized coefficients β	t	Adjusted R^2	F
Indifference to money attitude	Satisfaction	-.346	-.396	-4.416**	.189	12.735**
Knowledge, training, experience, ability		.212	.215	2.401*		
Independence need	Task performance	.308	.328	3.671**	.261	19.182**
Knowledge, training, experience, ability		.304	.317	3.550*		
Knowledge, training, experience, ability	Contextual performance	.405	.383	4.213**	.139	17.749**
Intrinsically satisfying	Satisfaction	.365	.552	7.189**	.427	38.604**
Provides own feedback		.290	.275	3.583**		
Provides own feedback	Task performance	.437	.413	4.606**	.163	21.211**
Intrinsically satisfying	Contextual performance	.379	.536	6.649**	.348	28.727**
Provides own feedback		.213	.189	2.350*		
Highly cohesive work group	Satisfaction	.224	.284	3.099**	.299	14.966**
Peer support		.232	.287	3.161**		
Formalization		.147	.226	2.595*		
Highly cohesive work group	Task performance	.288	.366	3.939**	.126	15.514**
Peer support	Contextual performance	.325	.380	4.233**	.276	20.210**
Highly cohesive work group		.233	.275	3.059**		

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Fitzsimons, D., James, K. T., & Denyer, D.
(2011). Alternative approaches for studying
shared and distributed leadership.
*International Journal of Management
Reviews, 13(3), 313-328*

**Alternative approaches for studying
shared and distributed leadership.**

Distributive leadership: Introduction

- Over recent years, **interest has grown** within management and organization studies
 - in **alternative models of leadership** in which
 - leadership is **not limited to the formally appointed leader**.
- This change **reflects workplace shifts** for which
 - **individual heroic models** are **less representative** (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003; Gronn 2002, 2003; Seers et al. 2003).
- Increased **complexity and ambiguity** coupled with the **need to respond faster to complex market conditions** has led to
 - new **emerging patterns** of **accountability**,
 - **inter-dependency** and **co-ordination** which constitute
 - a **shift in the division of labour** within organizations (Gronn 2003).

Distributive leadership: Introduction

- This **increased ambiguity and complexity**, arises in the face of a number of **adaptive challenges** such as
 - increased domestic deregulation,
 - global economic integration,
 - multiple and competing stakeholder environments,
 - new technology and
 - increased rates of change (Avolio et al. 1996; Houghton et al. 2003; Seers et al. 2003).
- In such conditions, senior leaders **may not have 'sufficient and relevant information'**
 - to **make highly effective decisions in a fast changing and complex world'** (Pearce and Conger, 2003, p. 2).
- Differing **expectations and specialized expertise of knowledge workers** in the post-industrial era
 - may also contribute to the **emergence of shared leadership** (Carson et al. 2007; Cox et al. 2003; Fletcher and Kaufer 2003; Pearce and Manz 2005; Seers et al. 2003).

Distributive and shared leadership: Schools

- Two **different communities of researchers** began **conversations on the new concept** of S/D leadership
 - as a **reaction to the traditional top-down leadership formulations.**
- In the **team-based literature**, the conversation was about
 - how to **develop from self-led teams** (no leader) to
 - **collective leadership in the team** (everyone a leader).
- In the **education sector**, the challenge was to
 - **move leadership away** from the top of the organization
 - to **create leadership practices throughout** the organization.
- These **two separate** conversations (literatures) **did not cross over**
 - until **Gronn's (2002) paper**, by which time
 - **different evolutions of the concepts** of S/D leadership with
 - **different ontological assumptions** had occurred.

Distributive and shared leadership: Schools

- **Shared leadership** is studied as an emergent phenomenon within
 - what is term the **team based shared-leadership** literature.
 - With **some exceptions** and occasionally as a **grammatical device** to avoid repetition,
 - this literature uses the term **‘shared leadership’**.
- A **second strand** of research activity developed primarily
 - in the **education literature** concerned with **distributed leadership**;
 - **in this literature**, the term **‘distributed leadership’**
 - is clearly **distinguished from** **shared leadership** (Spillane 2006, p. 3).

Distributive and shared leadership: Early influence

- **Follett's Law of the Situation (1924):**
 - leadership could stem from the individual with the most relevant skills in a particular situation.
- **Benne and Sheats (1948):**
 - leadership is to do not with an individual, but with functions, and
 - that several individuals could take up differentiated roles in relation to these functions.
- **Gibb (1954, 1969):**
 - leadership is best thought of as existing on a continuum
 - from focused or individual leadership to a distributed pattern.
- **Stogdill (1950):**
 - leadership is based on role differentiation
 - related to influencing the goal setting and goal achievement behaviours of others.
- **Bowers and Seashore (1966):**
 - leadership can come from peers and that this could have a positive impact on outcomes.
- **Katz and Kahn (1978):**
 - espouse the potential competitive advantage that can accrue
 - in which reciprocal influence is widely shared.

Distributive and shared leadership: Early influence

- Hodgson et al.'s (1965) exploration of 'the executive role constellation' of
 - three leaders of a hospital,
 - co-leadership (Heenan and Bennis 1999),
 - strategic leadership (Hambrick and Mason 1984) and
 - collective collaborative leadership (Denis et al. 1996)
 - all propose a model of leadership in which leadership
 - can come from group /organizational members other than the designated leader.
- Two studies of social movements
 - in which traditional leadership structures did not emerge (Brown 1989; Brown and Hosking 1986)
- Social Exchange Theory (Festinger 1954; Homans 1958), and
- Studies that explore subordinates' roles in decision-making (Vroom and Yetton 1973)
- And the concept of 'empowerment' (Blau and Alba 1982; Conger and Kanungo 1988).
- Leader Member Exchange Theory and
- Substitutes for Leadership (Kerr and Jermier 1978)
- Manz and Sims (1980) proposed a model of 'self-management' as a substitute for leadership.

The Development of Shared Leadership

- Shared leadership can be traced to
 - a transition in the self-leadership, super leadership constructs (Manz and Sims 1989, 1991) from individuals self-leading,
 - to the conceptualization of self-leadership at the team level (Neck et al. 1996).
- The mandate of super-leadership
 - to 'lead others to lead themselves' thus evolved
 - from a focus on helping individual followers to self-lead
 - through mechanisms of self-management (Cox and Sims 1996)
 - to one which focused more on a team level of self-leadership
 - which attempted to integrate work
 - emanating from the system psychodynamic school such as
 - 'group-as-a-whole' (Wells 1985) and
 - the 'group mind' (Bion 1961).

The Development of Shared Leadership

- In the conceptual model centered on the related **constructs of super-leadership and self-leadership** (Houghton et al. 2003; Manz and Sims 1989, 1991, 2001)
 - the **role of the formal leader is central**
 - to the **emergence of shared leadership**.
- **Self-leadership is defined** as a
 - ‘**process through which people influence themselves to achieve**
 - **the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform**’ (Houghton et al. 2003, p. 126).
- It is through the **enhancement of self efficacy perceptions** and
 - **subsequent performance outcomes** that self-leadership **is theorized**
 - to **create conditions in which individuals will engage in sharing leadership roles**.
- Super-leadership is **often contrasted** with **three other leadership types**
 - the Strongman, the Transactor, and the Visionary Hero (Manz and Sims 1991, 2001).
- These **three types of leadership can be shared among team members**
 - **leaving the fourth type** – the Empowering leader –
 - to be taken up by the vertical super-leader.

Shared leadership: Defined (team-based)

- Team **process where leadership** is **carried out by the team** as a **whole**,
 - rather than solely by a single designated individual.
- To this end, **vertical leadership** is dependent upon the **wisdom of an individual leader**
 - whereas **shared leadership** draws from the knowledge of a collective.
- Further, **vertical leadership takes place through a top-down influence process**,
 - whereas **shared leadership** flows through a collaborative process. (Ensley et al. 2006, p. 220)

Shared leadership: Correlates

- Avolio et al. (1996) found **shared leadership** in undergraduate students doing community volunteer work to be
 - **positively correlated** with self-reported **ratings of effectiveness**.
- Pearce and Sims (2002) found **shared leadership** to be **more predictive** than vertical leadership of
 - the **effectiveness** of **Change Management Teams** **responsible for implementing innovation**.
- Ensley et al. (2006) demonstrated that measures of **shared leadership** **accounted for a significant amount of the variance**
 - in **new venture performance** beyond that **accounted for by measures of vertical leadership**.

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- DL, has a **pragmatic focus on leadership** as a practice and
 - focuses on the school as the unit of analysis, rather than the team.
- DL **addresses questions related** to discovering **how leadership practice is enacted in schools** by asking
 - ‘who takes responsibility for leadership work’ and
 - ‘how do individuals get constructed as leaders?’
- Spillane (2006) found that **‘followers’ also contribute to leadership.**
- However, **distributed leadership goes beyond acknowledging**
 - that **multiple individuals are involved in leadership practice** (termed ‘leader plus’ or shared leadership),
 - by also **exploring the interactions between individuals and**
 - **investigating the situation in which leadership is enacted** (distributed leadership).

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- Spillane and colleagues identify **three forms of distributed leadership** – **collaborated, collective and co-ordinated distribution** (Spillane 2006).
- **Collaborated distribution** involves leadership practice
 - stretched over the work of two or more individuals
 - working in the same space and time.
- **Collective distribution** is **similar to collaborated** except that
 - individuals are working separately but interdependently.
- **Co-ordinated distribution** refers to
 - leadership practice that has to be performed in sequence.
- Of these three, Spillane suggests that **collaborated distribution**
 - requires more attention to what he calls 'the affective dimension'

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- In asking the **question how collaborated distribution is achieved**,
 - Spillane **refers to the work of** Weick and Roberts (1993) and
 - **their concept of heedful interrelating or mindfulness.**
- From this, Spillane **develops a description of**
 - **how intelligent practice can be achieved.**
- He **makes no further attempt to explore the ‘affective dimension’,**
 - **although complex work in organizations, particularly organizational transitions,**
 - **are likely to raise anxiety because**
 - **identities, loyalties and commitments are threatened** (Gronn 2003).
- Such **challenges constitute adaptive challenges and demand** that
 - **leaders are able to respond and contain the powerful emotions**
 - **that such learning entails** (Heifetz and Laurie 1997, 1999).

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- In this model, **elements of the situation** are **considered**
 - to define and be defined by **distributed leadership practice** (Spillane 2006).
- This is **based on the concept of**
 - **distributed cognition** and **activity theory**
 - which **emphasize how social context**
 - is an **integral constitutive part of intelligent human activity.**
- Based on **aspects of distributed cognition** (Hutchins 1995) and **Activity Theory** (Leontiev 1981), **distributed leadership emphasizes**
 - how **human cognition is both held between individuals and aspects of the situation** and
 - thus **cognitive activity** is '**stretched over**' both **human actors** and **aspects of the context they are in.**

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- **Context** is not merely a stage on which humans act,
 - but is an integral part of what meaning-making can emerge
 - as complex tasks are engaged with.
- **Individual sense-making** is not merely a function of the individual's mental capacity,
 - but is enabled by the situation itself (Spillane et al. 2001).
- **Definitions of the situation** in this model therefore
 - go beyond contingency descriptions
 - in which the situation and objects within it
 - constitute a passive recipient of the actions of leaders.
- Instead, **this model sees aspects of the situation**
 - such as organizational 'routines' (such as 'the Breakfast Club') as actively
 - constituting and shaping leadership practice in a reciprocal relationship.

The development of distributed leadership(DL)

- Gronn describes **three spontaneously emerging types** of **concertive distributed leadership**
 - all of which are **characterized by** what he **calls conjoint agency**.
 - spontaneous collaboration,
 - intuitive working relations and
 - institutionalized practice.
- Together, they **represent an increasing degree of institutionalization**
 - ranging from **unplanned emerging collaborations**
 - which may be **short term to formalized organizational structures**
 - such **as the senior executive team**
 - **which functions as a leadership team for the whole organization**
- These **distinctions are similar** to **Spillane's description** of
 - **collaborated, collective and co-ordinated distribution.**

The key characteristics of S&D leadership

Shared leadership

Leadership often emanates from the designated leader plus other group members who share leadership roles (e.g. Strongman, Transactor, Visionary hero and Super-leader).

Leadership involves several individuals leading themselves and allowing others to lead them through a reciprocal influence process.

Cognition is shared by members of the group.

Advantage is offered through the aggregate of attributed influence in a group (collective influence).

Distributed leadership

Leadership is not only held by those with designated, formal leadership roles but is enacted by multiple individuals in the organization.

Leadership practice is constituted and shaped by the interactions between leaders and followers and the organizational context.

Cognition is 'stretched over' both human actors and aspects of the context they are in.

Advantage is offered by developing a capacity to act by means of 'concertive action', 'co-performance' or 'conjoint agency'.

Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership

	Relational–entity	Relational–structural	Relational–processual	Relational–systemic
The nature of leadership	Leadership is shared/ distributed between discrete minds/entities (leaders) who perceive, evaluate and make decisions including how and when to act in pursuit of goals.	Leadership is shared/ distributed in a system or pattern of relations. These networks are cognitive structures in the minds of nodes/egos (leaders) and opportunity structures that facilitate and constrain action.	Leadership is a practice constantly being constituted within the flow of a set of social processes that take place in particular cultural, historical and political contexts.	Leadership is a function of a collective and involves conscious and unconscious psycho-social processes that are systemic in nature and particular to a specific context. Thus leadership is always shared or distributed.

Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership

	Relational–entity	Relational–structural	Relational–processual	Relational–systemic
The nature of relationship	Relationships are inter-personal and formed and acted upon by knowing subjects for instrumental purposes.	Relationships are real and can be measured	Relationships are formed by concertive units (pairs, teams, cross-departmental groups) within ongoing social processes.	Patterns of relating often reflect systemic and unconscious strategies for managing the Collective anxieties associated with adaptive learning

Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership

	Relational–entity	Relational–structural	Relational–processual	Relational–systemic
The role of context	Little emphasis since shared / distributed leadership is dependent on the skills, attributes and behaviours of individual leaders aggregated to the group level that can be applied in multiple settings.	Context is important in that effective shared or distributed leadership is dependent on accurately perceiving and leveraging the structure of social ties in the organization.	Strong emphasis on context since, in contrast to contingency theories, elements of the situation are considered constitutive of shared / distributed leadership practice.	Strong emphasis, since no statement about leadership from this perspective is possible without reference to how group level phenomena link individuals and groups to their contexts.

Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership

	Relational–entity	Relational–structural	Relational–processual	Relational–systemic
How leadership is studied	Variance methods are often employed to seek explanations of leadership, with independent variables acting upon and causing changes in dependent variables.	Social network methods are often employed to study the individual's position in the larger networks within which the individual is located..	Eclectic designs are used to identify or reconstruct the process through which leadership emerges and changes over time.	Action research and ethnographic designs are employed to explore systemic emotional dynamics and unconscious group processes and how these unfold within a particular task context.

I Thank you