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INTRODUCTION

• Globalized environment

• Externally induced change

• Mind set of managers
Managers to act as culture builders to foster innovation via support mechanisms and promote a new vision (McCrnimmon, 2010).
LITERATURE

- Shift in the management paradigm
- How managers can drive the desired org. culture & culture shift?
For effective culture change (Childress, 2009), top managers need to eg.

• have group/team experience (new culture)
• obtain the views of eg. customers, clients,

Building a winning culture
Old paradigm: is eg. dominant, centralized,
New paradigm: highlights trust, decentral.

Old culture: eg. hierarchies
New culture: eg. networking
management paradigm has shifted
and
new management roles and competencies are needed.
• The organizational culture framework (CVF) (Cameron and Quinn (1999))

• By using the “Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)” Cameron and Quinn (1999), the profile of an org can be identified as clan, hierarchy, adhocracy and market.
Figure 3: Competing Values Framework: Models of organisation and management theory and leadership roles

Old management assumptions

New assumptions

Way managers operate
OBJECTIVES

• To recognise need for evolution of management thought.
• To shows how the management can drive the desired organizational culture.
• To emphasize ‘what’ leaders must do and ‘how’.
METHODOLOGY

• Sample – 202 managers from a population of 400 – stratified random sampling – managerial level – (top, 19.8%; senior, 41.9%; middle, 38.4%).

• Adequate sample:
  ✓ Sekaran (2003) – pop 400 = 196 sample
  ✓ Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (0.788) and Bartlet’s Test of Sphericity (2975.330; p = 0.000) . Normality & homoscedasticity.
METHODOLOGY

Measuring Instrument

• Self-developed, closed-ended, precoded questionnaire.

Section A - biographical data (managerial level) - nominal scale, precoded option categories.

Section B – eight leadership roles (mentor, facilitator, innovator, broker, producer, director, co-ordinator, monitor) based on CVF – 40 Likert scale items (Table 1).

Determine dominant leadership roles and from that, derive dominant leadership model (HR, Open systems, Rational Goal, Internal Process), which provide insight into the prevailing organizational culture.

• Recurring themes, in-house pretesting, pilot testing.
METHODOLOGY

Psychometric Properties

☑ Validity (Factor Analysis)
☑ Principal component analysis.
☑ 8 factors – latent roots >1 – 1.9 to 4.52
☑ Reliability - Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha
☑ Overall 0.893 – high level – with item reliabilities ranging from 0.887 to 0.894.

Analysis of Results

☑ Descriptive stats (freq, %, means, std. dev.)
# RESULTS

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics: Assessing Prevailing Leadership Roles of the Management Cadre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ROLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR MEAN</th>
<th>s²</th>
<th>STD DEV.</th>
<th>% TO WHICH ROLE IS BEING FULFILLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>3.2563</td>
<td>3.1637</td>
<td>3.3489</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>65.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>3.6593</td>
<td>3.5795</td>
<td>3.7391</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>73.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>3.6269</td>
<td>3.5551</td>
<td>3.6986</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>72.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>3.6129</td>
<td>3.5359</td>
<td>3.6899</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>72.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>3.3950</td>
<td>3.3064</td>
<td>3.4836</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3.2766</td>
<td>3.1787</td>
<td>3.3745</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>65.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>3.5497</td>
<td>3.4617</td>
<td>3.6378</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>70.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>3.7990</td>
<td>3.7183</td>
<td>3.8797</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>75.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS: FREQUENCY ANALYSES

Strengths:

Monitor role:
- Critical thinking allows leaders to formulate clear arguments (95%).
- Leaders are able to construct statements and react to that of others effectively (89.6%).
- Leaders do not lose sight of outputs (81.7%).

Innovator role – creative thinking – new ideas (82.2%).

Broker role – networking used as impt skill at all levels (89.1%).

Co-ordinator role – use specific skills to plan/monitor projects (87.1%).
RESULTS: FREQUENCY ANALYSES

Weaknesses:

 Leaders not convinced that:
- Most decision in org are by negotiations (23.8%) (BR).
- Org. strives to optimize time & minimize stress mngt (21.8%) (PR).
- Org provides effective team-building environ. (21.8%) (FR).
- Individ. work productively (20.3%) (PR).
- Participatory decision-making takes place (19.8%) (FR).
- Every effort made to translate org goals into sub-goals at various levels of org (15.9%) (DR).
- Employee compet. by deleg & feedback (14.4%) (MeR).

 Leaders felt that routine shifts focus away from possible outcomes (21.8%) (IR).
RESULTS

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics: Assessing Prevailing Leadership Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Means for Quadrants of the CVF showing Leadership Models</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations Model (Facilitator and Mentor Roles)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Systems Model (Innovator and Broker Roles)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Goal Model (Producer and Director Roles)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Process Model (Coordinator and Monitor Roles)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4: Cultural location of the Public Sector Organisation
RESULTS

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics: Assessing Prevailing Leadership Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Means depicting focus and orientation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal/External</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal focus &amp; integration (Ment, Fac, Mon, Co-ord)</td>
<td>3.5561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External focus &amp; differentiation (Inn, Brok, Prod, Dir)</td>
<td>3.4779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility/Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility &amp; discretion (Fac, Ment, Inn, Brok)</td>
<td>3.5383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability &amp; control (Ment, Co-ord, Dir, Prod)</td>
<td>3.5051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Cultural dimensions (focus and orientation) prevailing in a public sector organisation.
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS: Leadership roles displayed

- Managerial roles and balance competing demands.
- Engaging in behavioural complexity and being ambidextrous not enough.
- Need to overcome chronic problems plaguing organizations (Covey, 1991), to continuously learn in the context of practice (McGregor, 2000) and learn how to uncover people’s commitment and develop capacity to learning throughout the organization (Senge, 1990).
- Know what the leadership has to do, but how?
Motivation (leaders need to recognize inner drive patterns & to structure work to best capture that energy; design system to allow expression of inner needs – secure positive motivation or design system to smother desire to contribute)

Competition (survival through co-operation, not compet. – time spent on designing & developing teams – thrives through co-operation & reduction of conflict – innovation, customer feedback – in touch with workforce)

Facilitator

Knowledge & learning (challenge mental models; knowledge acquired & developed through PDSA cycle)

Variation (reduce upstream variation & conflict; inherent & special variation; system stability)

Dynamic systems (delay between action & results, improvement leverage in parts of the system that tend to limit growth)

Complexity theory (results due to range of influences: major issues unmeasurable; system can only be improved, not optimized; reduce variation/conflict/instability to inputs, create self-organizing systems – less need for leaders to be kept informed/to interfere)

Thinking – the sub-conscious (retains memory of past events & feelings, engage in radiant thinking & power of association [diagrams, flow maps, mind maps, cause & effect diag.], ensure thinking patterns or paradigms don’t reject new thinking)

Thinking – Adversarial versus Parallel (never one answer – a truth – design best solution by using everyone’s contribution, use thinking models like lateral thinking, six thinking hats, brainstorming – positive mindset & creativity)

Work – enabling culture (Innov. & develop opportunities – ideas from total intelligence of company)

Systems (leaders design systems to enable staff to perform – employees determine capabilities of system – gain input by listening: in touch with work face)

Thinking – Analytical versus Holistic (how parts interrelate characterizes the whole – consider interrelationships more than each element to maximize the whole – aids vision, cooperation & teamwork)

Abundance theory (upmarkets: anticipate customers’ future needs)

Action versus Thought (leaders need extensive training & thinking, prepare plans on sound information to get accurate prediction of future, engage in new thinking – pro-active mode, develop creativity of people into dynamic competitive advantage)
RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION

• Constant change – need to charter new way forward.
• Cannot be trapped.
• Leaders need to harness a proactive, enabling culture – constant improvements.
• Create superior designs of systems - capture employees’ thinking potential, challenge creativity – commitment to goals & achieving a dynamic corporate advantage: win-win situation.