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Abstract

This thesis examines the key leadership elements that influence successful organisational change, in addition to investigating the role of leadership in fostering organisational identity and organisational identification during change. Management of organisational transformation can be challenging, and change implementation failure is more prevalent than publicly reported (e.g. Carleton & Lineberry, 2004; Kotter, 1996; Snyder-Halpern, 2002; Tannenbaum, 2006). Such failures are often attributed to the degree of effectiveness of organisational change management strategies, including cultural integration, people engagement and leadership (e.g. Bijlesma-Frankema, 2001; Cartwright & Cooper, 1993; Glendinning, 2003). While the leadership of change has been given extensive attention in existing literature, many organisations and leaders still struggle with change implementation. In particular, more research is needed to better identify the competencies and behaviours associated with successful change, including how to ensure employees retain a sense of connection to organisations undergoing transformation.

Given these gaps in the literature and the importance of reducing failures of organisational change initiatives, this research sought to achieve two broad objectives. The first objective was to review and synthesise the existing research on the relationship between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change. The second objective was to identify the elements of leadership that most influence successful organisational change within a leadership competency framework. These two overarching objectives were addressed by five specific aims. The first aim was to provide a systematic review and integration of research on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, within the context of organisational change. The second aim was to estimate the correlation between leadership effectiveness and followers’ organisational identification using a range of different leadership models. The third aim focused on identifying the key elements of leadership that contribute to successful service integration, an emerging form of
organisational change. The fourth aim was to obtain the perspectives of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts on the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change. And the fifth and final aim of this thesis was to develop a leadership competency framework generalisable to the leadership of organisational change in all forms (i.e. beyond service integration, and including mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures). To achieve these aims, four studies were conducted.

Addressing Aim 1, Study 1 was a systematic review of existing literature on leadership, organisational identity, organisational identification and organisational change. As anticipated, leadership was found to be positively related to both organisational identity and organisational identification across studies, regardless of whether the research was conducted using quantitative, qualitative, or conceptual methodologies. Across all studies ($k = 104$), organisational identity was measured qualitatively, whilst follower’s organisational identification was measured quantitatively. While organisational change provided the context for a number of studies, only a subset of studies included in the systematic review specifically focused on the construct.

Addressing Aim 2, Study 2 was a meta-analysis that estimated the correlation between followers’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness and followers’ organisational identification. The meta-analytic correlation after correcting for attenuation was 0.47 ($k = 62, N = 22,893$). This supported the theory that leaders can play an important role in fostering employees’ sense of connection to their organisation. Further, as expected, seven of the eight leadership models examined in the meta-analytic review were positively related to followers’ organisational identification.

Addressing Aim 3, Study 3 was undertaken within an Australian consortia integrating their services. The study examined the leadership competencies involved in successful service integration—a contemporary approach to amalgamation where organisations combine some (or all) of their functions and activities (Fulop, Mowlem, & Edwards, 2005; G. King & Meyer, 2006; Lewis, Rosen, Goodwin, & Dixon, 2010). A preliminary
leadership competency framework focused on facilitating effective service integration was developed. The preliminary framework consisted of 13 competencies within five competency domains: (1) Leadership and governance in service integration, (2) Relationship management and communication skills, (3) Management of people, organisational systems and procedures, (4) Practice knowledge, and (5) Personal characteristics and capabilities.

Addressing Aim 4 and Aim 5, Study 4 sought to integrate the findings from Studies 1, 2 and 3. Utilising the Delphi Technique, the perspectives of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts were canvassed regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective for fostering organisational identification during change. Consistent with Studies 1 to 3, Study 4 revealed the importance of leadership behaviours rather than a specific leadership model per se, when nurturing employees’ connection to their organisation during change (including fostering employee organisational identification). Four key themes emerged regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when encouraging organisational identification during change: (1) effective communication, (2) focus on relationships, (3) stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking, and (4) management of self. In Study 4, the group of senior leaders and leadership experts were also consulted to verify, refine and extend the preliminary leadership competency framework to focus on the leadership of organisational change. The final framework consists of 12 competencies within four competency domains: (1) Leadership and governance in organisational change, (2) Relationship management and communication skills, (3) Management of people, organisational systems and processes, and (4) Personal characteristics and capabilities. Both competency frameworks are presented in detail.

This thesis combines findings from empirical research with the insights of senior leaders and leadership experts operating in corporate settings. It makes a theoretical contribution by presenting the first systematic review to examine the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, organisational identification, and organisational change jointly, as well as the first meta-analytic review to focus on a range of leadership styles and follower
organisational identification. The empirical findings were triangulated with senior leaders and leadership experts and, across the four studies, the key elements of leading successful organisational change were identified as follows: a strategic perspective; a commitment to (and ability to clearly articulate) the case for change; exemplary communication and relationship management skills, including the ability to engage in challenging conversations regarding change; an open and accessible management style; and personal attributes including integrity, self management skills, and an ability to retain a sense of perspective in challenging times. The final leadership competency framework—detailing observable and measurable behaviours—has practical applications in the selection and development of leaders tasked with navigating organisational change.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Overview

This chapter provides an overview of the structure and foundation of the thesis. After introducing the topic, it presents the rationale, objectives, and aims for the thesis, together with the research approach, the research questions, and the methodology adopted. Specifically, this chapter describes the two broad objectives of this thesis, as well as the five aims and 11 research questions, which are addressed in four separate studies.

1.2 Introduction, Objectives, and Aims

Australian organisations share the experiences of their international counterparts where, paradoxically, organisational change is considered a constant feature of organisational life (Argyris, 1992; Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Burnes, 2004; Kotter, 1996; Senior, 2002; Todnem By, 2005; Waddell, Creed, Cumming, & Worley, 2014). However, given the complexity of organisational changes such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures and strategic alliances, many organisations achieve only partial implementation (Alexander, Weiner, Shortell, Baker, & Becker, 2006; Callaly, von Treuer, van Hamond, & Windle, 2011), or are unsuccessful with their endeavours (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Nag, Corley, & Gioia, 2007; Sastry, 1997). Further, implementation failure is probably more common than is publicly reported (Snyder-Halpern, 2002; Tannenbaum, 2006).

The failure of many organisational change initiatives has been attributed to a lack of employee and cultural integration (Callaly, von Treuer, Dodd, & Berk, 2010; Kotter, 1996; Snyder-Halpern, 2002; Tannenbaum, 2006) and a lack of leadership (Glendinning, 2003; Haleblian, Devers, McNamara, Carpenter, & Davison, 2009; Junni & Sarala, 2014). The cost of such failures is far-reaching and has both financial and non-financial repercussions for organisations, staff and their families, clients, stakeholders, and their broader communities (Badrtalei & Bates, 2007; Saat & Himmelsbach, 2014). As such, there have been calls to better understand the organisational and leadership determinants of successful organisational change, both in Australia and abroad (e.g. Appelbaum, 2007a; Appelbaum,
As key agents of change, leaders have been shown to undertake a pivotal role in assisting members to traverse altered organisational arrangements (Aitken & von Treuer, 2014; Benton & Austin, 2010; Frączkiewicz-Wronka, Austen-Tynda, & Wronka, 2010; Guo, 2009; Junni & Sarala, 2014). Organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and other strategic alliances necessitate formal and informal—and frequently unanticipated—changes to the identities of participating organisations and their members. Whilst such changes can be liberating for some, others find them destabilising, particularly those employees being absorbed or transferred into larger or more dominant organisations that require them to relinquish their affiliation with their former organisational identity (Corley & Gioia, 2004; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Larsson, Driver, Holmqvist, & Sweet, 2001; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Reissner, 2010). Consequently, there have been appeals for senior and local-level leaders to more fully understand—and leverage—the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification, in order to foster their followers’ connection with their organisation during times of change.

The impetus to minimise change implementation failure in Australia and abroad, by contributing to the body of knowledge associated with the leadership of change, formed the basis of the two overall objectives of the thesis, which guided the more specific aims:

**Objective 1:** To review and synthesise the research that has focused on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change.

**Objective 2:** To identify the key elements of leadership that influence successful organisational change, within a leadership competency framework.

### 1.2.1 The relationship between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification during change

An organisation’s identity and its followers’ organisational identification are seen as key considerations when planning organisational change. As ‘entrepreneurs’, ‘custodians’ and ‘impresarios’ of organisational
identity (Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; Haslam, Reicher, & Platow, 2011; Howard-Grenville, Metzger, & Meyer, 2013; Reicher, Haslam, & Hopkins, 2005; Schinoff, Rogers, & Corley, 2016; van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016). Leaders play an important role in providing clarity and guidance regarding the ‘fundamental essence’—the identity—of a changing organisation, together with the corresponding implications for organisational members in terms of their own identities, expected conduct and performance, and psychological bonds with the organisation (Ashforth & Mael. 1989; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Nag et al., 2007; Pratt, 2003; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; D. van Knippenberg, 2016).

Although many studies have focused on the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and follower organisational identification within the context of organisational change (Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; He & A.D. Brown, 2013), to date the joint examination of these constructs has not been the subject of a systematic review. As such, there is an opportunity to integrate, present and examine the breadth of research pertaining to these four key research constructs, which led to the first aim of this thesis:

**Aim 1:** To provide a systematic review and integration of research on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, within the context of organisational change.

Research has established that leaders can have a significant influence on followers’ identification with their organisation (e.g. Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003; D. van Knippenberg, 2016; D. van Knippenberg, B. van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004), which impacts on their willingness to embrace and support change efforts (Giessner, 2011; Paviglionite, 2007; Tienari & Vaara, 2016). This relationship has been noted in numerous studies that have examined the correlations between various models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification (e.g. Anand, Prasad, Sinha, & Prahkya, 2013; DeConinck, 2011; Effelsberg, Solga, & Gurt, 2014a, 2014b; Epitropaki, 2013; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Humphrey, 2012; Jian, 2015; Monzani, Braun, & van Dick, 2016; Sluss, Klimchack, & Holmes, 2008; Zhao, Liu, & Gao, 2016). However, to date there is only one published meta-analytic study that has examined these
research constructs (i.e. Horstmeier, Boer, Homan, & Voelpel, 2016), and this has focused on only one model of leadership—transformational leadership—and its impact on followers’ organisational identification. The absence of meta-analytic studies examining a range of leadership styles and their impact on follower organisational identification led to the second aim:

**Aim 2:** To estimate the correlation between leadership effectiveness and followers’ organisational identification using a range of different leadership models.

1.2.2 Effective leadership of service integration, an emerging form of organisational change

Whilst the organisational change involved in mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures has received extensive attention in existing literature (Hartley, 2002; Jacobs, van Witteloostuijn, & Christe-Zeyse, 2013; Todnem By, 2005), little research has focused on service integration. Service integration is one common method that organisations have used to create better organisational efficiencies while improving or maintaining service quality for consumers (Allen & Stevens, 2007; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). It reflects the degree to which organisations that were previously distinct amalgamate their functions and activities, with the aim of optimising their resources (G. King & Meyer, 2006).

The ethos and change management methodologies associated with service integration have their origins in those employed during joint ventures, mergers and acquisitions (Appelbaum et al., 2007a, 2007b; Bert, MacDonald, & Herd, 2003; Bijlsma-Frankema, 2001; Callaly et al., 2010). However, integration of services between agencies is often more fluid and susceptible to multiple interpretations, as agencies with different identities, cultures, professional affiliations, client bases, organisational structures and service delivery models integrate some—or all—of their services (Lewis, Rosen, Goodwin, & Dixon, 2010).

In Australia, attempts at service integration have become increasingly prevalent as a means to facilitate collaboration and address improvements. As an emerging form of organisational change, service integration is gaining favour within the health sector where reform is on the agenda (McGorry et al., 2008), and healthcare leaders are required to balance the task of improving the
provision of quality services at the same time as improving efficiency (Allen & Stevens, 2007; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). There is a need for greater insight into the key elements of leadership that determine successful service integration, together with the definition of leadership competencies to guide leaders in their integration endeavours. This led to the third aim of this thesis:

**Aim 3:** To identify the key elements of leadership that contribute to successful service integration.

1.2.3 Australian perspectives on the leadership of organisational change

There is scant Australian-based research focusing on the leadership competencies and behaviours deemed most effective when fostering employee organisational identification during change; throughout my preliminary reading I identified only one study (i.e. S.K. Schneider, George, Carroll, & Middleton, 2011) set within an Australian context. There is also little available research focusing on how such leadership competencies and behaviours are operationalised during organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures, either within Australia or abroad. This led to the fourth aim of this thesis:

**Aim 4:** To obtain the perspectives of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts on the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change.

To ensure the generalisability of the preliminary leadership competency framework (i.e. Aim 3), it is desirable for the focus of the framework to extend beyond the leadership of service integration, to the leadership of organisational change more broadly. This led to the fifth aim:

**Aim 5:** To refine the preliminary leadership competency framework to ensure its generalisability to the leadership of organisational change in all forms (i.e. beyond service integration).

1.3 Research Approach

To achieve the aims set out above, four studies were conducted.

1.3.1 Study 1. Systematic literature review

To achieve Aim 1, a systematic literature review (Study 1) was conducted. The study reviewed and integrated the research conducted between
January 2005 and May 2017 that focused on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity and employee organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change. The following research questions were addressed:

- **Research Question 1**: What are the summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and follower organisational identification during organisational change, such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures?

- **Research Question 2**: How do the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification converge (and diverge) in their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change?

**1.3.2 Study 2. Meta-analytic review**

To achieve Aim 2, Study 2 used the quantitative findings from the systematic literature review to conduct a meta-analysis to determine the mean correlation between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and follower organisational identification. It also examined the effects of key moderators on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and their organisational identification. This study examined the following research questions:

- **Research Question 3**: What is the size of the correlation between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?

- **Research Question 4**: What are the effects of key moderators on the relationship between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?

**1.3.3 Study 3. Development of leadership competency framework**

Studies 3 and 4 employed action learning methodology to achieve Aims 3, 4, and 5 (Argyris & Schon, 1996; Coghlan & Coughlan, 2010; Patton, 1997; Pedler, 2011). In Study 3, to achieve Aim 3 my supervisors and I collaborated with leaders within health services organisations integrating their
services as part of a consortia. In Study 4, the insights of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts were canvassed to achieve Aims 4 and 5.

Action learning is defined as a strategy by which people learn with and from each other as they attempt to identify and then implement solutions to their problems or developmental issues (McGill & Brockbank, 2003; Pedler, 2011). This is achieved using evaluation cycles that involve planning, action, observation and reflection (see Figure 1.1, Lewin, 1946).

Figure 1.1: Kurt Lewin’s Spiral Model, Action Research Cycle

Three essential features must be present for an activity to be legitimately considered part of an action learning program.

1. There must be action in the real world rather than simulated action.
2. The activity must be conducted in a way that involves others, particularly other participants who are working on the same or different projects.
3. The emphasis must be on learning; not taking action; this is what distinguishes action learning from project team membership (Patton, 1997).

The case study undertaken as Study 3 involved a consortia of health services organisations integrating their services across Australia. The opportunity to work with the consortia arose serendipitously, as the consortia’s leaders sought assistance with the development of a practical list of leadership competencies to assist them to progress organisational development initiatives.
Seven key managers from the consortia were interviewed to elicit information about the leadership and management competencies required for successful service integration. The qualitative data were analysed using thematic analyses (Boyatzis, 1998) to determine key themes associated with leadership competency.

The insights of the consortia managers were augmented by a literature review, which focused on the organisational and leadership determinants of successful service integration. Phase 1 of the literature review elicited contextual material and focused on the organisational competency literature related specifically to service integration, which was expanded to include literature on other organisational change activities such as mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures when it became apparent that there was a dearth of research in this new and emerging area. Phase 2 of the literature review focused on the leadership competency literature related to service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures.

The themes from both the interviews and literature review were consolidated into a preliminary leadership competency framework for successful service integration. To achieve Aim 3, in a real-world context, the leadership competencies required for successful service integration were examined in accordance with the following research question:

- **Research Question 5:** What are the leadership competencies required for successful service integration?

1.3.4 **Study 4. Expert perspectives regarding leadership competency, and the relationship between leadership and organisational identification**

The systematic review and meta-analytic review (i.e. Studies 1 and 2), together with the case study conducted in Study 3, revealed the importance of leadership behaviours—rather than a specific leadership model—when fostering followers’ organisational identification during change. Therefore to consolidate the first three studies of this thesis in a real-world context, in Study 4 the insights of experts (both practising senior leaders and experts in the field of leadership) were sought to confirm the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification, and to gain further understanding of how they were operationalised during
organisational change. The experts were also invited to provide feedback on the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in Study 3 based on their own experience of leading organisations through change.

These expert insights were obtained using the Delphi Technique, a widely used and accepted method for gathering data from respondents within their domain of expertise, with the aim of achieving a convergence of opinion on a specific real-world issue (Brady, 2015; Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007).

Study 4 focused on Aims 4 & 5 and examined the following research questions:

- **Research Question 6**: What emphasis do organisational leaders place on fostering follower organisational identification during organisational change?
- **Research Question 7**: What are the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering follower organisational identification?
- **Research Question 8**: How do these leadership behaviours correspond to leadership competencies?
- **Research Question 9**: How are leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change, to foster follower organisational identification in employees?
- **Research Question 10**: What outcomes (i.e. individual, team and / or organisational) result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering follower organisational identification during change?
- **Research Question 11**: What perspectives do experts (i.e. practising senior leaders and/or experts in the field of leadership) have regarding the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in Study 3?

1.4 Structure of Thesis

The thesis was structured as follows. Chapter 2 presents the systematic review (Study 1). Chapter 3 presents the meta-analysis (Study 2). Chapter 4 presents the case study, which resulted in the preliminary leadership competency framework (Study 3). Chapter 5 presents the expert perspectives
on the role of leadership in fostering organisational identification in followers, and the revised leadership competency framework (Study 4). Chapter 6 provides a general discussion, summarising and integrating the findings across the four studies that form the basis of this thesis. This final chapter also presents an examination of the limitations of the research, implications of the research findings and topics for further research.
Chapter 2: Study 1—A Systematic Review of the Relationships between Leadership, Organisational Identity and Organisational Identification during Change

2.1 Introduction

The current chapter presents Study 1, which focused on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification, particularly during organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and other strategic alliances.

Over the past two decades, the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification have attracted increasing recognition and focus from researchers in the fields of psychology, organisational behaviour, organisational theory, communication, marketing and strategic management, thereby providing insights into the conduct of organisations and their members (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Balmer, 2008; Cornelissen, 2002; Fiol, 2002; Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Pratt et al., 2000; Pratt, Schultz, Ashforth, & Ravasi, 2016; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003; Riketta, 2005). More recent research has examined the relationship between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification with particular emphasis on the impact of leader behaviours on the two constructs (Balser & Carmin, 2009; Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; He & A.D. Brown, 2013; Loi, Chan, & Lam, 2014; Moriano, Molero, Topa, & Lévy Mangin, 2014; D. van Knippenberg, 2016; Zhu, Sosik, Riggio, & Yang, 2012). However, whilst many studies have focused on the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and followers’ organisational identification—a number within the context of organisational change—to date the joint examination of these constructs has not been the subject of a systematic review.

Systematic reviews summarise existing research based on specific research questions by synthesising the results of available studies in a structured, transparent, and reproducible manner (Higgins & Green, 2008; Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). This chapter presents a systematic review
and integration of the research focused on these constructs conducted between January 2005 and May 2017. The year 2005 was seen as an appropriate starting point for the review, as it was the year of Riketta’s (2005) seminal meta-analytic study of organisational identification, which captured prior research.

The systematic review first defines and distinguishes the key constructs—leadership, organisational identity, follower organisational identification, and organisational change. Second, the systematic review procedure is outlined. Third, the review findings are presented and linked back to existing literature regarding these constructs. The conceptual and empirical links between leadership to both organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification, and to organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and other strategic alliances are reviewed. And finally, the literature are integrated to identify opportunities for future research. As Study 1, the systematic review addresses the first aim of this thesis:

**Aim 1:** To provide a systematic review and integration of research on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, within the context of organisational change.

### 2.1.1 Leadership

A great deal of research has focused on the influence of leadership in facilitating effective outcomes, both for individuals and organisations (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Carless, Mann, & Wearing, 1996; Ellemers, De Gilder, & Haslam, 2004; Elliott, 2000; Lord & Brown, 2001; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Leadership as a construct is “complex, difficult to capture and open to numerous definitions and interpretations” (Middlehurst, 1993, p. 7). Nevertheless, in summarizing contemporary literature on leadership, Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe (2002) identified four common themes: “… leadership is a process, involves influencing others, occurs within a group context, and involves goal attainment” (p. 300).

#### 2.1.1.1 Evolution of leadership theory

Until the late 1970s, modern leadership theory and studies had focused on variations of transactional leadership, emphasising the exchange that occurs
between a leader and his or her followers—particularly the exchange of efforts for rewards (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2002; B.M. Bass, Bass, & Bass, 2008; Hartog, Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Spector, 2008). In a summary of the evolution of leadership, Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe (2009) described these variations as three of the five main stages of leadership theory: (1) the trait or ‘great man’ theories of the 1930s, which emphasised the personal attributes of leaders (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948, 1974; Yukl, 1989; Zaccaro, 2007); (2) the behavioural approach, emphasising managerial and leadership competency (McClelland, 1973; Spector, 2008; M.A. Thomas, 2006); and (3) situational and contingency models, which examined the contextual factors that interact with leader traits, behaviours, power and influence (Fiedler, 1978; French & Raven, 1959; House, 1996; House & Mitchell, 1974; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 1989).

A fundamental shift in theoretical focus then occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s when researchers such as Downton (1973), House (1977) and Burns (1978) began to discuss and explore the concepts of ‘charismatic’ and ‘transformational’ leadership (B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Spector, 2008). This stage was described by Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe (2009) as stage four. Burns argued that leadership was about transforming people and organisations, as distinct from motivating people to work for the provision of payment. He defined a transforming leader as one whom: “(1) raises the consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and ways of reaching them; (2) gets followers to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the team, organisation or larger polity; and (3) raises the followers’ level of need on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of need from lower-level concerns for safety and security to higher-level needs for achievement and self-actualisation” (B.M. Bass et al., 2008, p. 619). Through the actions of transformational leaders, Burns advocated that followers were supported to greater heights of achievement and moral development (Burns, 1978; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Spector, 2008; Yukl, 1989). Charismatic leadership was defined more narrowly, implying a leader who possessed divine, unique, almost ‘superhuman’ qualities (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 637; House,
that evoked worship and idolisation in their followers (B.M. Bass, 1985).

Stage five, which focused on ‘engaging’ or ‘post-heroic transformational’ leadership, occurred concurrently to stage four (Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2009; Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2008). A leader who imbues the qualities of engaging leadership is seen to foster an organisational culture based on integrity, openness and placing genuine value in others (Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2009, p. 13). The structure of the engaging or post-heroic transformational leadership model consists of four domains: (1) engaging individuals; (2) engaging the organisation (or team); (3) progressing together (with internal and external stakeholders); and (4) the leader’s personal qualities and core values (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2009, p. 11).

In the late 1980s Avolio, B.M. Bass and colleagues (Avolio, 2007; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1993; B.M. Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; B.M. Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999) made further distinctions of transformational leadership with their exploration of authentic and pseudo-transformational leaders. Their model of ‘authentic leadership’ comprises of the four components of self-awareness, transparency, balanced processing, and moral perspective (Avolio, 2010).

2.1.1.2 Contemporary perspectives on leadership

Further contemporary perspectives on leadership include ‘adaptive leadership’, ‘complexity leadership’, ‘environmental (or green) leadership’, ‘ethical leadership’, a focus on ‘followership’ rather than the leader per se, leader-member exchange (LMX), ‘neuroleadership’, ‘self-sacrificial’ and ‘servant leadership’.

The constructs of ethical, self-sacrificial and servant leadership align with Avolio, B.M. Bass and colleague’s conceptualisations of engaging and pseudo-transformational leaders (referenced above): ‘Ethical leadership’ relates to leadership traits of morality and honesty, justice, fairness and positive regard for others (B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Shu, 2015) which in turn influence and elevate followers’ moral conduct within organisations. ‘Servant leadership’ is defined as a form of leadership that places particular emphasis
on fulfilling followers’ needs to develop, grow and thrive—thus, individuals embodying this style of leadership are seen to be focused on being ‘of service’ to others (Zhang, Kwan, Everett, & Jian, 2012).

Self-sacrificial leadership, a model evolving from transformational and charismatic leadership (B.M. Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), describes when leaders usurp advantages available to them—be they professional or personal—for the benefit of their followers, organisation, or a mission (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999a, 1999b). While the key aim of self-sacrificial leadership is to foster reciprocity in followers, the cascading effects are often enhanced legitimacy and influence of the leader, greater motivation of followers, and galvanised commitment to organisational goals, particularly in times of organisational change or crises (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999a, 1999b; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; De Cremer, van Knippenberg, van Dijke, & Bos, 2006).

Other leadership constructs move the focus away from the leader as an individual, to a focus on the system in which the leader operates: Adaptive leadership considers leadership to be a practice rather than a position. It examines the dynamics between individuals in a broader organisational context (labelled ‘the system’) and is applied in situations without preordained solutions (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009); Complexity leadership applies the concepts of complexity theory to the study and practice of leadership, examining leadership within the context of a complex adaptive system, defined as “interdependent agents who are bonded in a cooperative dynamic by common goals, outlooks and needs” (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009, p. 631).

LMX focuses on the dyadic relationships between leaders and their followers (Ferris et al., 2009; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Loi et al., 2014; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999), placing emphasis on the quality of the relationship between the two individuals, rather than the impact of the leader behaviour (notwithstanding that LMX quality is determined in part by the style and efficacy of the leader).

Placing followers at the centre of the leader-follower relationship, the current decade has also seen the emergence of research into ‘followership theory’ (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Hoption, Christie, & Barling, 2012; S. Thomas, 2010; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). Building on
established leadership theories that see leadership as a process involving leaders influencing others (i.e. followers), ‘followership theory’ places more emphasis on the impact of followers and following in the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 89; Williams, Pillai, Deptula, & Lowe, 2012). Of particular relevance to the current research is the focus on follower identities (Collinson, 2006) and ensuing links to organisational identity and organisational identification (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Other leadership constructs apply other disciplines to leadership theory. With an environmental lens, environmental (or green) leadership focuses on leadership that prioritises nature and ecology and how this impacts on an organisation’s culture and practices (Chen, 2011). Finally, ‘neuroleadership’ applies neuroscientific findings to the field of leadership (The Centre for Learning and Leadership, 2014) by taking into account the physiology of the brain and how it responds to certain stimuli (Ringleb & Rock, 2008). Neuroscience is thus applied to executive functions such as decision-making and problem-solving, collaboration, facilitating change and emotional regulation (Ringleb, Rock, & Ancona, 2012).

2.1.1.3 Social identity theory of leadership and leader-identity transfer

Numerous leadership theories have been invoked to explain the formation and maintenance of organisational identity and organisational identification. At the forefront of these theories is the social identity theory of leadership (Hogg, 2001; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; D. van Knippenberg, et al., 2004; D. van Knippenberg, 2011), which views leadership as a group process “generated by social categorization and prototype-based depersonalisation process associated with group identity” (Hogg, 2001, p.184). Underpinning this leadership theory is Social Identity Theory, which posits that people tend to classify themselves into various groups or categories (e.g. organisational, social, sporting and religious groups; gender and age cohorts) to clarify their self-concept and answer the question, “Who am I?” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; He & Brown, 2013; Tajfel, 1974, 1982).

The central premise of the Social Identity Theory of leadership is that, as individuals begin to strengthen their identification with a group, their basis
for leadership perceptions—including evaluations of leader effectiveness and allocation of support—is increasingly determined by prototypicality rather than on stereotypical leadership qualities (Hogg, 2001, p. 191; Hogg et al., 1998; Hogg et al., 2005). Group members who are perceived as prototypical (i.e. highly representative of the group) are more likely to transcend to leadership positions and, whilst holding such positions, be considered more effective leaders—particularly by those who identify strongly with the group (Hogg, 2001, p. 191; Hogg et al., 1998; Hogg et al., 2005; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; D. van Knippenberg, 2016; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004; D. van Knippenberg, 2011). One explanation for this is that ‘group prototypical’ leaders are perceived as trustworthy and fair in the pursuit of the group’s best interests (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Such leaders yield significant influence on organisational members by shaping their self-concepts together with their perceptions of, and identification with, their organisation’s identity (He & Brown, 2013; Reicher, et al., 2005). The leader-identity-transfer model—which purports that a leader’s identification with their organisation can spill over to their followers—gives further weight to the impact of those in leadership positions (Schuh, Egold, & van Dick, 2012; van Dick, Hirst, Grojean, & Wieseke, 2007; van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016; Wieseke, Ahearne, Lam, & van Dick, 2009).

Complementary to the Social Identity Theory of leadership, research focused on the relationships between leadership and organisational identity and organisational identification has proliferated over recent years, resulting in a range of leadership models being applied to the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification. Extensively researched models, as mentioned above, such as transformational and transactional leadership (B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Burns, 1978; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Spector, 2008; Yukl, 1989), ‘engaging’ or ‘post-heroic transformational’ leadership (Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2009; Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2008), LMX (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), charismatic leadership (B.M. Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977), and authentic leadership (Avolio, 2007; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio et al., 1991; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1993; B.M. Bass et al., 2003), have espoused the influence of leadership qualities—such as charisma, follower-focus, openness, transparency, integrity
and morality—and their relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification.

Further contemporary perspectives, again as mentioned above, such as ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005; Walumbwa, Mayer, Wang, Wang, Workman, & Christensen, 2011; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009), environmental leadership (Cole, 2004; Dechant & Altman, 1994; Fernández, Junquera, & Ordiz, 2003) and complexity leadership theory (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009) have also been examined according to their relationship to these organisational constructs. Alongside contemporary perspectives, the more traditional construct of paternalistic leadership—still actively practised in Eastern cultures such as within Asia and the subcontinent (Farh & Cheng, 2000; Mustafa & Lines, 2012; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008) —has also been examined in relation to identity and identification within organisations (Cheng & Wang, 2015).

These current leadership models and perspectives are a key focus of the current systematic review, which seeks to examine contributions of various conceptualisations of leadership as they relate to organisational identity and organisational identification.

2.1.2 Organisational identity

Organisational identity focuses on the question, “Who are we as an organisation?” and delineates the ‘fundamental essence’ of an organisation whilst representing members’ shared perceptions of its central, distinctive and (often) enduring characteristics (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Clark, Gioia, Ketchen Jr, & Thomas, 2010; Corley, 2004; Pratt et al., 2016; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). It is a collective, organisational-level construct as distinct from organisational identification, which reflects perceptions of individual organisational members.

2.1.2.1 Evolution of the construct of organisational identity

The concept of organisational identity has its foundations in Social Identity Theory (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cornelissen, Haslam, & Balmer, 2007; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Pratt et al., 2000; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003; Tajfel, 1974). According to Social Identity Theory, a person’s self-concept consists of a personal identity (e.g. idiosyncratic characteristics such as physical attributes and abilities, psychological traits and interests) and
a social identity that incorporates group classifications, as described above. Organisational identity can be viewed as a specific form of social identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

People are drawn to organisations that possess prestigious, appealing and distinguishing qualities, in part because of the perception that their association with such an organisation will elevate their status and self-esteem (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Millward & Kyriakidou, 2004). Organisational identity typically incorporates members’ beliefs about what distinguishes their organisation from others and can contribute to an organisation’s image—the perception ‘insiders’ want ‘outsiders’ to have of the organisation (Alvesson, 1990; Cheney, Christensen, Conrad, & Lair, 2004; Corley, 2004; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). In their review of literature relating to organisational identity and associated constructs of organisational image and reputation, T. J. Brown, Dacin, Pratt, and Whetten (2006, p. 100) concluded that there were four central viewpoints of an organisation: "(1) Who are we as an organisation? (2) What does the organisation want others to think about the organisation? (3) What does the organisation believe others think of the organisation? and (4) What do stakeholders actually think of the organisation?" As such, the concept of organisational identity is very much in the eyes of the beholder, and susceptible to a myriad of interpretations.

Organisational identity research sheds light on how organisations choose to be similar to other organisations, as well as how they seek to differentiate themselves (Deephouse, 1999; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003). This concept, defined as optimal distinctiveness, is drawn from Social Identity Theory research that purports individuals have an innate desire to balance the opposing needs of belonging and uniqueness (Brewer, 1991; Gioia, Price, Hamilton, & Thomas, 2010; Navis & Glynn, 2010; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003; Zuckerman, 2016). The same can be said of organisations, who desire staff, clients and stakeholders to possess clarity on what they produce, represent and are affiliated to, as well as what sets them apart from their competitors.

Since Albert and Whetten’s (1985) seminal definition of organisational identity described it in terms of what is ‘central, enduring, and distinctive’, researchers (e.g. Corley, 2004; Gioia et al., 2000; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Pratt
et al., 2000) have come to view organisational identity as more flexible, multifaceted and susceptible to change. It is now commonplace for organisations to be viewed as possessing multiple or hybrid identities, depending on the nature of the organisation, its affiliates, and the perceptions of its multiple stakeholders (Cheney, 1991; Gioia et al., 2010; Pratt, 2016; Pratt et al., 2000). Such variations of organisational identity are clearly pertinent when considering organisational change processes such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures.

Hybrid identities define the coexistence of two identities that are “not expected to go together” (Albert & Whetten, 1985, p. 270), and can even be described as at odds with one another (Pratt, 2016). Pratt (2016) outlined that hybrid identities frequently diverge according to the normative-utilitarian dimension, where utilitarian identities represent “a ‘for-profit’, ‘monetary’, or ‘economic-focused’ self-definition” and normative identities are non-economic and represent “a variety of religious, cultural, aesthetic and similarly non-monetary focused identities” (p107). He proffered educational institutions, for-profit hospitals and social enterprises as examples of hybrid identities.

As the term suggests, an organisation with multiple identities possesses a number of identities, typically arranged “in some form of dynamic hierarchy, which may or may not conflict” (Pratt & Foreman, 2000, p. 110). Multiple identities are frequently layered—or nested—within one another (Meisenbach & Kramer, 2014). According to Pratt (2016), the general consensus is that multiple identities are expensive resource-wise (i.e. in terms of human, financial, physical and political resources) (p.10). Pratt and Foreman (2000) offer four options for managing multiple identities (according to the number of, and synergy between, the identities): (1) compartmentalisation—separation of identities physically, temporally or symbolically; (2) aggregation—connecting identities but still allowing them to function independently, (3) deletion—eradication of identities, most predominantly the lower status identity or one with fewer resources; and (4) integration—by merging identities to create a new one (see also Pratt, 2016).


2.1.2.2 Taxonomies of organisational identity

Now considered a “root construct” in the field of organisational psychology (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000, p.13; Pratt et al., 2016), the concept of organisational identity has been explored from multiple theoretical angles. As He & Brown’s (2013) summary of organisational identity literature attests, there are a number of competing perspectives on organisational identity, with corresponding debates about its definition, operationalisation and measurement.

Gioia and Hamilton (2016) summarised the “great debates” (p.21) in organisational identity according to the ontology and epistemology of the construct: From an ontological perspective, the essence of the organisational identity debate is whether organisational identity actually exists, with queries regarding whether organisational identity is an entity (i.e. a noun, tangible, substantive) or a process (i.e. a verb, a dynamic enterprise, or flow) (Gioia & Patvardhan, 2012; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

From an epistemological perspective—which Gioia and Hamilton (2016) assert is the perspective most examined in the organisational identity literature—organisational identity is distinguished according to: (1) social actor; (2) social construction; and (3) institutional perspectives. The social actor view considers organisational identity to be the domain of the organisation as a ‘social actor’ who has been legitimised by society to define, and make claims about, the central, enduring and distinctive features of the organisation (Gioia & Hamilton, 2016; Whetten, 2006; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). The social constructionist view places more emphasis on the role of self-reflection, whereby organisational members “collectively fashion” an identity that serves their joint interests (Gioia & Hamilton, 2016, p.24). The third perspective—institutionalist—examines how institutional forces (i.e. external influences, the need for legitimacy to ensure organisational survival) shape an organisation’s identity.

In their summary of organisational identity literature, He and Brown (2013) outlined a taxonomy of organisational identity with four domains: (1) functionalist; (2) social constructionist; (3) psychodynamic; and (4) postmodern, which are discussed subsequently.
2.1.2.2.1 Functionalist perspectives

Functionalist perspectives of organisational identity emerge as the most prevalent in organisational, marketing and strategic studies (He & Brown, 2013). Such perspectives maintain that identities are comprised of “essential, objective, and often tangible characteristics” (He & Brown, 2013, p.7) such as corporate logos and documentation, physical artefacts, and published corporate histories and speeches of senior leaders (Balmer, Greyser, & Urde, 2006; Balmer, Mukherjee, et al., 2006; T. J. Brown et al., 2006; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Cornelissen et al., 2007; He & Balmer, 2007; He & Mukherjee, 2009; Martin, Johnson, & French, 2011). The ‘social actor’ and ‘institutionalist’ definitions of organisational identity described previously fall under this functionalist category.

Studies taking a functionalist approach to organisational identity often focus on categorising identities, defining identity constructs, and examining identity responses to the environment (He & Brown, 2013). These studies also analyse the pressures organisations experience to publicise cogent and ‘acceptable’ identities (He & Brown, 2013, p.7), and the consequences of not conforming to convention (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003; E.B. Smith, 2011), such as impact on reputation and client patronage. Considered the ‘mainstream’ approach to the study of organisational identity, functionalist research is often criticised for its reification of organisations, tendency to focus on the prevailing views of senior managers regarding the identity of the organisation, reliance on “oversocialised views” of organisational members, and marginalisation of dissenting or more complex interpretations of an organisation’s identity (He & Brown, 2013, p.7).

2.1.2.2.2 Social constructionist perspectives

Social constructionist perspectives consider organisational identity to be the result of relationships between “collectively-held and socially-structured” (He & Brown, 2013, p.7) individual views regarding ‘who the organisation is’ (Corley et al., 2006; Dutton et al., 1994). Organisational discourse thus serves as the key vehicle for the formation and evolution of organisational identity from this perspective. In contrast to the seminal definition of organisational identity (Albert & Whetten, 1985), social constructionists see organisational identity as the product of a myriad of
interactions between individuals from a range of professional groups and organisational levels (Glynn, 2000; Harrison, 2000; Kjærgaard, Morsing, & Ravasi, 2011). Pratt (2003) conceptualised two versions of the social constructionist perspective: (1) an ‘aggregate’ perspective where collective identities are derived by summarising individual viewpoints regarding identity; and (2) a ‘gestalt’ perspective which attests that collective identities stem from the relational ties that strengthen people’s shared perceptions regarding organisational identity (He & Brown, 2013).

The social constructionist perspectives are seen as more fluid, adaptable and ambiguous than functionalist perspectives maintain. Social constructionist perspectives are also less reliant on the decisions and actions of senior leaders and more open to political and environmental factors such as: organisational discourse (Humphreys & Brown, 2002; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997); multiple interpretations of corporate history, including selectively remembering and forgetting events (Anteby & Molnar, 2012); nostalgia (A.D. Brown & Humphreys, 2002); media attention (Kjærgaard et al., 2011); temporality; spatiality; audio, visual and olfactory cues; rhythms; and emotional displays (Harquail & King, 2010).

2.1.2.3 Psychodynamic perspectives

Psychodynamic and psychoanalytic perspectives on organisational identity examine how collective identities are fashioned by unconscious processes (Bion, 1968). For example, organisational identity has been considered a “defensive solution” to psychological threats perceived by organisational members (He & Brown, 2013, p.8), whereby the employment of conventional administrative processes—such as those commonly associated with organisational membership—provide the perception of stability and security (Diamond, 1993). Others (e.g. Driver, 2009) consider organisational identity to be “imaginary” (p.55) in character, and the definition of organisational identity is considered an illusion or fantasy driven by a desire for self-knowledge and self-categorisation.

Analysis of the psychodynamics of organisations leveraging the work of Freud (A.D. Brown, 1997; A.D. Brown & Starkey, 2000) view organisations as a means for maintaining the self-esteem of the collective. These scholars purport that “ego-defence mechanisms”—particularly denial
and rationalisation—occur at an organisational level to counter anxieties and fears (He & Brown, 2013, p.9). Through the use of management practices such as self-reflection, discourse focused on future identities, and appropriate examination of ego-threatening issues, they suggest that such defence mechanisms can be addressed (He & Brown, 2013).

2.1.2.2.4 Postmodern perspectives

Postmodern perspectives on organisational identity provide alternative perspectives to mainstream definitions of the construct. While these perspectives vary in their degree of advocacy and support (and at times, criticism) for the construct of organisational identity, they are typically focused on “discursive (linguistic) and imagistic theorisations and analyses of identity phenomena” (He & Brown, 2013, p.10). The predominant postmodern perspectives have focused on organisational identities as texts derived through discourse and narrative (A.D. Brown & Humphreys, 2006; Chreim, 2005; Czarniawska-Jeorges, 1994; Humphreys & Brown, 2002). As Czarniawska-Jeorges (1994) asserted, organisational identities are the product of constant and evolving narration about the organisation (He & Brown, 2013). A.D. Brown (2006) defined organisational identity as the sum of narratives focused on identity, authored by organisational members in conversations, written histories, reports, websites and other corporate documents.

Gioia et al. (2000) considered organisational identity to be “a reflection of the images of the present moment” (p. 72) rather than what is central, distinctive and enduring about an organisation (He & Brown, 2013). Coupland and Brown (2004) proposed that organisational identities are the result of constant debates between organisational ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ (He & Brown, 2013). And finally, Seidl (2005) asserted that autopoietic processes (i.e. where a system is self-perpetuating) define an organisation’s identity rather than the conscious actions of organisational leaders and other key personnel (He & Brown, 2013).
2.1.2.3 Other dimensions of the organisational identity debate

2.1.2.3.1 Anthropomorphism of organisations and the reification of organisational identity

Those engaging with the construct of organisational identity are urged to be mindful of the seduction of anthropomorphism and reification in relation to the construct. Whetten (2006) discussed the tendency for organisations to be treated as if they were individuals, thus affording them human-like status (see also Balmer & Bromley, 2001; Chun, 2001; He & Brown, 2013; Sillince & Simpson, 2010). Such anthropomorphism is particularly pertinent when considering the functionalist perspective of organisational identity, which views organisations as ‘social actors’ (Gioia & Hamilton, 2016; B.G. King & Whetten, 2008). Other researchers (e.g. Alvesson & Robertson, 2016; Corley, 2004; Humphreys & Brown, 2002) have discussed the reification of organisational identity in many studies—where abstract concepts associated with an organisation’s identity have been translated (and at times, elevated) into something tangible and concrete (Oxford Dictionaries, 2018).

2.1.2.3.2 Power and politics associated with organisational identity

As Alvesson and Robertson (2016) aptly asserted, constructions of organisational identity “bear strong imprints of power” (p.167), with senior leaders viewed as having the most influence on how organisational identity is defined, constructed and articulated throughout an organisation (Kenny, Whittle, & Willmott, 2016). This brings into question how representative organisational identities are of the broader organisation (Kenny et al., 2016), and whether organisational members of lower status and seniority are expected to conform and hold the party-line (Alvesson & Robertson, 2016, p.168). Such control of organisational identity by senior leaders is considered a form of identity regulation (Alvesson & Robertson, 2016; Alvesson & Willmott, 2002).

Providing perspectives on power and organisational identity, Kenny et al. (2016) describe organisational identity as a ‘soft’ form of power (see also Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006; Nye, 2011), which can be leveraged to extract discretionary effort at no extra cost. The researchers also link three theoretical frameworks on power to the construct of organisational identity: (1) Lukes’ three dimensions of power, where the focus is on whose interests
are advanced in the promotion of power—and by extension whose interests benefit from a particular perspective on organisational identity (Lukes, 2005); (2) Foucault’s focus on power, discourse and subjectivity, where the focus is on how definitions of organisational identity facilitate organisational discourse (Foucault, 1982); and (3) Laclau and Mouffe’s perspective on power as the organisation of hegemony, where the dominant faction within the organisation is seen to have a significant influence on the organisation’s identity (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001).

2.1.2.3.3 Organisational identity and its relationship to organisational culture and image

Over the last two decades of research into the constructs of organisational identity, organisational culture and organisational image, the similarities and differences between them have distilled and they have emerged as distinct yet complimentary constructs (Ravasi, 2016). Whereas organisational culture is seen as a “broader notion” of cultural norms, and formal and informal practices that shape the behaviour within an organisation (Ravasi, 2016, p.68), organisational identity is defined more narrowly and is focused on how members define and articulate the features of the organisation they belong to (Corley et al., 2006; Hatch & Schultz, 2000, 2002; Pratt, 2003). As such, organisational culture is viewed as an “identity referent” (Ravasi, 2016, p.68; Albert & Whetten, 1985).

The distinction between organisational identity and organisational image is typically made on an internal-external dichotomy, with organisational identity referring to internal members’ perceptions of the organisation, and organisational image (or reputation) referring to external stakeholders’ perceptions (Ravasi, 2016; see also T.J. Brown, Dacin, Pratt & Whetten, 2006; Corley et al., 2006; Whetten, 2006; Gioia, Hamilton, & Patvardhan, 2014).

2.1.2.4 Third decade of organisational identity research

Research on organisational identity has now entered its third decade (Pratt et al., 2016; Wæraas, 2010). As this review of organisational identity literature attests, with its evolving maturity as a theoretical construct definitions of organisational identity have proliferated, become more nuanced, and applied to a range of organisational disciplines and work arrangements, practices and settings. Further, systematic literature searches for the term
‘organisational identity’ also extract research focusing on ‘corporate’, ‘professional’, ‘occupational’, ‘role’, ‘work-group’ and ‘team’ identity, as well as ‘social’, ‘cultural’ and ‘religious’ identities within organisations. In sum, despite the divergence of perspectives on organisational identity, most scholars agree that debates surrounding its definition and application will not be resolved any time soon (Gioia & Hamilton, 2016; He & Brown, 2013).

2.1.3 Organisational identification

Organisational identification is considered a key construct in the fields of organisational psychology and organisational behaviour, due to its demonstrated positive impact on employee satisfaction, well-being, performance, turnover intention, organisational citizenship behaviour, and other organisational outcomes (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Edwards & Peccei, 2007). Numerous definitions of organisational identification have appeared in the literature, prompting Edwards and Peccei (2007) to lament the “conceptual confusion” (p. 26) surrounding the construct. Riketta (2005) also noted heterogeneous descriptions and conceptualisations of the concept.

At its simplest, organisational identification can be described as an individual’s sense of connection with, and affinity to their employing organisation. Ashforth and Mael (1989) defined organisational identification as “the perception of oneness with or belongingness to the organisation” (p. 34). Riketta (2005) defined the concept as “the congruence of individual and organisational values” (p. 360), and described the evolution of an individual’s identification with their organisation as “the process of incorporating the perception of oneself as a member of a particular organisation into one’s general self-definition” (p. 360).

2.1.3.1 Evolution of the construct of organisational identification

The first comprehensive model of organisational identification was proposed by March and Simon (1958) who suggested that individuals evaluated their positions relative to those of others, and were open to accepting group and organisational goals, values and positions as their own. The authors proposed five basic hypotheses that strengthened an individual’s propensity to identify with a group or organisation: (1) the group’s perceived prestige; (2) joint ownership of goals; (3) frequent interaction between group
members (4) the degree to which individual needs were met; and (5) minimal competition within the group.

In the 1970s, Porter and colleagues (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulia, 1974) examined organisational identity and organisational identification in their research on attitudinal organisational commitment. However, the resurgence of interest in organisational identity and organisational identification began in earnest from the 1980s by researchers in organisational behaviour, social psychology and communication (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Balmer, 2008; Cornelissen, 2002; Fiol, 2002; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Pratt et al., 2000; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003; Riketta, 2005).

In the current world of mergers, acquisitions, service integration, globalisation and blurring geographical and organisational borders, much of the recent research into organisational identification has focused on the processes by which individuals shift their allegiances—and identification—from one organisation to another, or reduce cognitive dissonance when working across organisational boundaries where multiple identities are at play (e.g. Balogun & Johnson, 2004; Bartel, 2001; Clark et al., 2010; Giessner, 2011; Paviglionite, 2007). These processes are the focus of the current research.

Kreiner and Ashforth (2004) developed an ‘Expanded Model of Organisational Identification’ which describes three distinct forms of identification in addition to the concept of positive organisational identification already outlined: (1) **disidentification**, where the person does not define him- or herself in the same way as the organisation (Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001; Elstak & Riel, 2005); (2) **ambivalent (or schizo) identification**, when a person both identifies and disidentifies with the organisation (Elsbach, 1999; Elstak & Riel, 2005); and (3) **neutral identification**, where a person remains neutral towards the organisation, neither identifying or disidentifying (Elstak & Riel, 2005). As with earlier descriptions of organisations and individuals possessing multiple and hybrid identities (Bartel, 2001; Clark et al., 2010; Pratt, 2016; Pratt & Foreman, 2000) this expanded model of organisational identification provides useful
insight into the different forms identification can take—ranging from functional to dysfunctional—during times of change.

### 2.1.3.2 Conceptualisations of organisational identification

Some conceptualisations of organisational identification imply that it is a uni-dimensional construct (e.g. Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Dutton et al., 1994; Tajfel, 1982). Such conceptualisations align with social identity theory and view organisational identification as “self definition in terms of organisational membership” (Ashforth et al., 2008, p. 328) where the focus is on a person’s perception of their self-concept and the value they place on membership. Other conceptualisations define organisational identification more broadly, implying multiple dimensions—including value congruence, goal congruence, a variety of shared characteristics, identity-related ideologies, and identity-consistent behaviours (e.g. B. Schneider, Hall, & Nygren, 1971; van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, Christ, & Tissington, 2005).

Organisational identification has also been argued to overlap somewhat with the constructs of affective organisational commitment, organisational loyalty, person-organisation fit, psychological ownership, and job embeddedness and is most frequently confused with affective organisational commitment (Ashforth et al., 2008, p. 332). Over the past decade attention has focused on distinguishing between organisational identification and its “close conceptual neighbour”, affective organisational commitment (Riketta, 2005, p. 358): Riketta (2005) found them to be empirically distinct in his meta-analysis of the two constructs. D. van Knippenberg and Sleebos (2006), via an empirical study, concluded that “identification reflects psychological oneness” whereas “commitment reflects a relationship between separate psychological entities” (p.571). Meyer, Becker, and van Dick (2006) also maintained the view that organisational identification and affective organisational commitment were distinct across a range of dimensions (i.e. definition, orientation of attachment, nature of mindsets, and implications for behaviour).

Other researchers (e.g. Riketta, van Dick & Rousseau, 2006; Rousseau, 1989) have drawn distinctions between situated and deep identification, where situated identification is triggered more by situational cues (and is therefore more temporary and changeable) and deep structure identification, which focuses on a more “fundamental connection between individual and
collective” (Ashforth et al., 2008, p. 331). Overall, despite the heterogeneity of definitions, there remains agreement on the relevance of organisational identification as an important organisational construct.

### 2.1.3.3 Antecedents of organisational identification

Major antecedents of organisational identification are typically categorised as organisational, leadership, and social exchange factors. Organisational factors relate to perceived organisational identity attributes such as attractiveness, distinctiveness, prestige, and construed external image (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Dutton et al., 1994; He & Brown, 2013). Leadership factors focus on the impact of particular leadership styles and behaviours on followers’ organisational identification (Avolio et al., 2009; Ellemers et al., 2004; Lord & Brown, 2001; Shamir et al., 1993). Social exchange factors delineate socio-emotional and relational contributions to organisational identification, such as the organisation’s fulfilment of employees’ socio-emotional needs (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2003), procedural justice, perceived organisational support (Edwards, 2009; Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Gibney, Zagenczyk, Fuller, Hester, & Caner, 2011; Sluss, Klimchak, & Holmes, 2008), and the strength of relationships between leaders and their followers (Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007).

As mentioned, organisational identity is considered a key antecedent to organisational identification—that is, employees need to have an understanding of the organisation’s identity attributes in order to garner an organisational identification of any resonance (Dukerich et al., 2002; Dutton et al., 1994; He & Brown, 2013).

### 2.1.3.4 Outcomes of organisational identification

With respect to the outcomes associated with organisational identification, researchers have clearly established relationships between organisational identification and individual outcomes such as employee satisfaction, wellbeing and performance, low turnover intention, organisational citizenship behaviour, and employee creativity (Riketta, 2005; van Dick et al., 2006; van Dick et al., 2007; D. van Knippenberg & Schie, 2000). Organisational identification has also been linked to organisational outcomes such as organisational performance (including financial), client satisfaction (Kraus, Haumann, Ahearne, & Wieseke, 2015), and customer identification.
Bartel (2001) summarises three behavioural outcomes of organisational identification: (1) interpersonal cooperation; (2) work effort resulting from the integration of self and organisational interests; and (3) advocacy participation, where organisational standards are monitored and maintained by engaged employees (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

2.1.3.5 The ‘dark side’ of organisational identification

It should be noted that organisational identification is not considered a wholly positive construct, with some researchers (e.g. Avanzi, van Dick, Fraccaroli, & Sarchielli, 2012; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987; Costas & Kärreman, 2013; Riketta et al., 2006) viewing organisational identification as a means by which organisations can exercise control over their employees and encourage work output and organisational citizenship behaviours beyond the transacted psychological contract, potentially impacting on employee health (Burke, 2001; Schaufeli, Bakker, Van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009; van Dick, Grojean, Christ, & Wieseke, 2006). For example, in an empirical study, Avanzi et al. (2012) found a relationship between high degrees of organisational identification—over-identification—and workaholism, suggesting that the relationship between organisational identification and positive outcomes has the potential to be “curvilinear” (p.289). Other researchers (e.g. den Nieuwenboer & Kaptein, 2004; Effelsberg et al., 2014b; Umphress & Bingham, 2011) have examined the relationship between high degrees of organisational identification and unethical behaviour, purporting that strong ties with an organisation can blur an employee’s judgement about appropriate ethical (and legal) conduct.

2.1.4 Organisational change

Change management theory and practice is well established in both business and academic circles (Hartley, 2002; Jacobs et al., 2013; Todnem By, 2005). Paradoxically, organisational change is considered a constant feature of organisational life, impacting on both operational and strategic activities, and its management has become a crucial leadership capability (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Burnes, 2004; Senior, 2002; Waddell et al., 2014).
As with organisational identity, organisational identification, and leadership, there are numerous and competing definitions of organisational change. At their core, most definitions of organisational change refer to adaptions to an organisation’s way of operating—be they structure, strategy, systems, procedures, or ownership.

Organisational change is frequently defined dichotomously: Organic, ongoing and less planned change has been described as continuous (Hartley, 2002; Weick & Quinn, 1999), first-order (Argyris, 1992), and incremental (Kanter, Sten and Jick, 1992). Change that is more profound and intentional—typically arising from significant external challenges or key personnel wishing to transform the organisation, and often involving external change agents—has been described as episodic (Weick & Quinn, 1999), second-order (Argyris, 1992), and transformational (Hartley, 2002).

Waddell et al. (2014) described the pendulum as “a metaphor for change” (p.3), which swings between incremental, planned change categorised as ‘organisational development’, and dramatic, unplanned change categorised as ‘organisational transformation’. Regardless of how it is conceptualised, organisational change has been recognised as an important context and determinant of organisational identity and organisational identification.

Organisational changes associated with service integration, mergers, acquisitions, joint ventures and other strategic alliances are typically categorised as transformational, episodic, discontinuous, and second order. As Waddell et al. (2014) aptly described, such change can be dramatic, at times traumatic, and fraught with risk of failure (see also Callaly et al., 2010; Kotter, 1995; Saat & Himmelsbach, 2014; Snyder-Halpern, 2002; Steigenberger, 2017, Tannenbaum, 2006,), placing significant onus on organisational leaders, as both stewards of organisational success and entrepreneurs of organisational identity and organisational identification.

2.1.5 Leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during change

Much has been written about the impact of transformational behaviours in the midst of organisational change (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1993; B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Epitropaki &
Martin, 2005; Junni & Sarala, 2014; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; M.A. Thomas, 2006), where leaders play a key role in making sense of change imperatives, presenting a compelling case for change, and establishing structures, systems, and procedures that allow employees to transform their perspectives, behaviours, and practices.

2.1.5.1 Leadership and organisational identity during change

Strategic change processes require collective efforts to clarify shared understandings of the organisation’s environment and strategic goals to elucidate an organisation’s identity (Bhatt, van Riel, & Baumann, 2016; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Tienari & Vaara, 2016). Nag et al., (2007) described the important role organisational identity can play in strategic change, particularly when leaders facilitate progress from the definition of ‘who we are as an organisation’ to providing clarity and guidance on ‘what we do’ as part of an organisational collective. Leaders have been described as ‘entrepreneurs’ of identity by key researchers in the field (e.g. Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; Reicher et al., 2005). Alternative monikers are ‘identity custodians’ (Howard-Grenville et al., 2013; Schinoff et al., 2016) and ‘identity impresarios’ (Haslam et al., 2011; van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016).

Researchers exploring organisational identity change have observed the disorienting effects of losing part of one’s organisational identity, which is often inextricably linked to one’s self-identity (Bhatt et al., 2016; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Reissner, 2010). Mirvis (1985) aligns employee reactions to change to the stages of the grief cycle: (1) denial; (2) anger; (3) emotional bargaining—beginning in anger and concluding with (4) depression; and eventually (5) acceptance (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006, p. S86). Such comparisons serve to emphasise the impact that organisational change can have on its members.

Corley and Gioia (2004) make particular mention of the ambiguity that typically surrounds organisational identity as a result of structural change, such as with a spin-off, merger, acquisition, or integration of services where “the vagueness of self-definition emerges in contrast to the sense of clarity held before the event” (p. 200). They cite identity ambiguity as a “trigger” (p.200) for sense-making and sense-giving activities directed at providing
clarity and certainty about identity, also known as ‘identity work’ (see also Kreiner & Murphy, 2016; Reissner, 2010; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Weick, 1995; D. van Knippenberg, 2016): Sensemaking (Balogun & Johnson, 2004; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Reissner, 2010; D. van Knippenberg, 2016; Weick, 1995) refers to activities whereby individuals ascribe meaning to events and circumstances in times of change—often retrospectively; Sensegiving actions refer to the activities—typically performed by organisational leaders and managers—that provide clarity and meaning regarding changes to organisational identity and their implications for individual organisational members (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; D. van Knippenberg, 2016). Corley and Gioia (2004) described this as the “sense-giving imperative” (p.173, see also Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991).

As ‘identity custodians’ leaders are seen to communicate organisational identity (and its transition) by “saying, showing and staging ‘who we are’” (Schinoff et al., 2016, p.222). That is, by first disseminating—saying—verbal or written messages about the organisation’s identity throughout the organisation and beyond, via discourse and narrative (Czarniawska, 1997; Karreman & Alvesson, 2001; Pratt, 2003; Schultz & Hernes, 2013). The second form of organisational identity communication—showing—involves role-modelling behaviours that represent the organisation’s organisational identity (e.g. through displaying desired behaviours, formal and informal mentoring programs) (Covaleski, Dirsmith, Heian, & Samuel, 1998; Schinoff et al., 2016) as well as displaying artefacts such as the ‘look and feel’ of the organisation’s physical space (Berg & Kreiner, 1990), corporate attire (Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rafaeli & Pratt, 1993), corporate logos and products (Cappeta & Gioia, 2006; Harquail, 2006). The third form of organisational identity communication—staging—involves providing a context in which organisational members can either portray, or experience, the identity of the organisation through deeds and actions (Schinoff et al., 2016). Organisational structures (Child, 1972; Schinoff et al., 2016), rituals and routines (e.g. A. D. Brown & Starkey, 2000; Pratt, 2003), corporate training (e.g. Takeuchi, Nonaka, & Yamazaki, 2011), and managing the interface between the organisation and external stakeholders (e.g. media) (e.g. Kjærgaard et al., 2011) are examples of staging organisational identity. As ‘identity
impresarios’ (Haslam et al., 2011; van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016) leaders are seen to consolidate the processes of identity management by enabling organisational members to experience the organisation’s identity through the development of structures “which embody the new identity and make it the new social reality” (van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016, p. 376).

In their case study of an organisational identity formation, Gioia et al. (2010) identified the emergence of a transitional identity as “an interim sense being held by [organisation] members about what their organisations were becoming” (p. 397) and advocated the importance of a transitional identity in aiding the change process. In their summary of the past 20 years of research focusing on planned organisational identity change, Bhatt et al. (2016) also reinforced the importance of a transitional organisational identity. Tienari and Vaara (2016) referenced the utility of a transitional identity in their discussion of the “temporal element” in identity construction (p. 459), where transitional identities can provide a sense of continuity and provide “not only the link between the past and present, but also the road map to the future” (p. 460) (see also Schultz & Hernes, 2013).

Studies focusing on organisational identity in the wake of mergers and acquisitions emphasise the importance of managing the evolution of the post-merger organisation’s identity (Cartwright & Cooper, 1993; Corley & Gioia, 2004; Larsson & Lubatkin, 2001; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Tienari & Vaara, 2016). Millward and Kyriakidou (2004, p. 13) described the significant re-adjustment, both professionally and personally, demanded of employees during a merger, and assert that if this adjustment is not facilitated effectively, change efforts can be seriously undermined. This is particularly pertinent if employees are being asked to relinquish their affiliation with a strong and valued organisational identity or enter the arrangement as the lower status partner, and where resistance to change can occur as a result of perceived threats to a valued organisational identity (He & Brown, 2013; Tienari & Vaara, 2016; D. van Knippenberg, 2016; D. van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Monden, & Lima, 2002). Effective leadership can assist employees to traverse the personal and professional modifications required during organisational change (D. van Knippenberg, 2016).
2.1.5.2 Leadership and organisational identification during change

Organisational identification is seen as a key consideration when planning organisational change, due to its influence on employees’ willingness to embrace and support change efforts (Giessner, 2011; Paviglionite, 2007; Tienari & Vaara, 2016). Post-merger identification is considered an indication that an employee has accepted the changes associated with the merger and is psychologically engaged with the post-merger organisation (Jetten, Branscombe, & Spears, 2002; Terry & O’Brien, 2001; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2002). A widely held view is that a high degree of identification with an existing organisational identity impedes organisational identity change because individuals who have strongly invested in an organisation’s current identity will resist attempts to change this identity due to potential threats to their personal identity and status (Bhatt et al., 2016; Elstak & Riel, 2005; van Dijk & van Dick, 2009). As stated, this is particularly prevalent during organisational change such as mergers and acquisitions, when the dominant organisational partner requires the dominated parties to forsake their organisational identity (and thus organisational identification) as part of the change process (Scott, 2005; Tienari & Vaara, 2016; van Dick, Ullrich, & Tissington, 2006; van Dijk & van Dick, 2009; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2002). Hence, care needs to be taken with highly invested organisational members when assisting them to transition to a new organisational identity. Individuals with a low degree of identification are seen to be potentially more amenable to change efforts due to their ambivalence towards the current organisational identity.

Much of the recent research into organisational identification has focused on the processes by which individuals’ identification evolves in accordance with (or otherwise) changes occurring within their team, workgroup or organisation (Bartel, 2001; Benton & Austin, 2010; Clark et al., 2010; Giessner, Ullrich, & van Dick, 2011). As Ashforth et al. (2008) outlined, as societies and workplaces become more tenuous and “traditional moorings” become more unreliable, individuals instinctively seek more connection with their work (p. 326). Research has also demonstrated that followers’ organisational identification can affect what individuals focus on during times of change: B. van Knippenberg, Martin and Tyler (2006)
ascertained that employees with higher organisational identification are more likely to be occupied with the change process, whereas employees with lower organisational identification are more likely to place emphasis on change outcomes (He & Brown, 2013).

Researchers have established positive relationships between a range of leadership practices and the enhancement of organisational identification, including emphasising shared values (Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Kark et al., 2003; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004); making explicit links between followers’ personal mission and values and those of the organisation (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005); raising followers’ sense of collective self-identity (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005); fostering commitment to the work unit above individual interests; modelling self-sacrifice to the benefit of the organisation (Kark et al., 2003); exhibiting supportive behaviours; and displaying self-confidence (Yorges, Weiss, & Strickland, 1999).

The literature described above suggests that identification occurs on a continuum, thereby providing organisations and their leaders and members with a range of options for fostering a ‘collective’ that engenders positive outcomes for both organisation and individual. These processes are the focus of the current research.

2.2 The Current Study

Enabling employees to achieve organisational identity and organisational identification during times of organisational change can be critical for organisational success, and as such are key responsibilities of organisational leaders. However, the extant literature indicates there is no identified previous systematic review that has examined the measured relationship between leadership and organisational identity and organisational identification, or focused on the variation in conceptualisation and metric associated with these domains. Consequently, this study aims to systematically review and integrate the research conducted between January 2005 and May 2017 that has focused on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification, particularly during organisational change (e.g. service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and other strategic alliances). Such a synthesis
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will serve to provide organisational leaders with further insights into how to maximise the success of organisational change initiatives, as well as highlight the additional factors they must consider to focus their leadership efforts.

The systematic review conducted in Study 1 focused on the following research questions:

- **Research Question 1:** What are the summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and follower organisational identification during organisational change, such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures?

- **Research Question 2:** How do the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification converge (and diverge) in their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change?

2.3. Method

The systematic review examined articles published between January 2005 and the end of May 2017. The year 2005 was seen as an appropriate starting point for the review, as it was the year of Riketta’s (2005) meta-analytic study of organisational identification. The systematic review was limited to research conducted between January 2005 and May 2017, in order to provide a pithy summary of research over the past 12 years. The review was conducted in accordance with the three-stage systematic review process outlined by Tranfield et al. (2003): (1) planning, (2) conducting, and (3) reporting and dissemination.

2.3.1 Information sources

A series of computerised librarian-assisted systematic searches were undertaken in the EBSCO databases Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS, PsycEXTRA, Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection, PsycINFO, and PsycTESTS using a broad search strategy to find peer-reviewed articles of relevance. Scopus and Web of Science databases were also searched using the same strategy. The EBSCO searches specified articles with publication dates from January 2005 to May 2017 that were published in peer-reviewed journals, with articles
published in PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS and PsycINFO further limited to empirical studies. Searches conducted in Scopus and Web of Science specified articles with publication dates from January 2005 to present (i.e. the date of the searches, which were conducted on June 5th 2017). Key articles were mined for references, and those hand-searched papers that met the inclusion criteria were included in the systematic review.

The search terms used were: “leader*” AND (“organis?ation* identity” OR “organis?ation* identification”) AND (“organis?ation* change” OR service integration OR (merger* and acquisition*) OR “joint venture*”). The search string is presented in Appendix A.1.1.

2.3.2 Study selection

I undertook the initial eligibility assessment of titles under the direction of one of my thesis supervisors. Both my supervisor and I screened articles by abstract (and full text where further information was required) to discern inclusion. Difficult judgments on relevance were discussed and resolved by consensus.

For purposes of the current research, papers were included in the systematic literature review if they:

- identified the exploration of leadership and its relationship to organisational identity and/or organisational identification as key components of their research question(s) were published in peer-reviewed journals;
- presented empirical studies that incorporated quantitative and/or qualitative research design; or
- presented theoretical or discourse papers by peer leaders in the field of organisational identity and organisational identification.

2.4 Results

Figure 2.1 depicts the literature retrieval process. The search strategy yielded 542 articles after duplicates (n = 446) were removed. After reading the abstracts (i.e. broad screening), 357 full-text articles were sourced to be screened for eligibility. The 183 articles not sourced for narrow screening (i.e. reading the full text) were excluded because their abstracts did not reference organisational identity or organisational identification as a key focus of their
research, they described psychological tests rather than empirical research, or they were duplicate papers detected at the stage of reviewing abstracts. An additional two papers were hand-sourced whilst screening full texts for applicability, taking the total number of articles ‘narrow screened’ reviewed to 361.

Figure 2.1: Search results flow diagram.

Of the full-text articles sourced, 104 met the inclusion criteria for systematic review, as outlined in Table 2.1:

- 21 papers focused on the relationships between leadership and organisational identity (15 qualitative papers and 6 conceptual papers);
- 68 papers focused on the relationships between leadership and organisational identification (65 quantitative papers and 3 conceptual papers); and
- 15 papers focused on the relationships between leadership and both organisational identity and organisational identification (14 conceptual papers and 1 mixed method paper).
Table 2.1: Tally of Papers Focusing on Leadership and Organisational Identity versus Leadership and Organisational Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Mixed Method</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and organisational identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and organisational identification</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and both organisational identity and organisational identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are presented according to their research focus, that is a summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to: first, organisational identity; second, organisational identification; and third, both organisational identity and organisational identification. As will be outlined in the results section, some, but not all, studies examined these constructs in the context of organisational change.

2.4.1 Summary findings

A summary of each of the studies included in the review is described in the following pages, with key data reflected in Tables 2.2 -2.7.

2.4.1.1 Studies focusing on the relationships between leadership and organisational identity

The 21 studies (15 qualitative and 6 conceptual) included in the systematic review that focused on the relationships between leadership on organisational identity are outlined in Tables 2.2 and 2.3.

2.4.1.1.1 Qualitative studies focusing on leadership and organisational identity.

The role of leadership in constructing organisational identity. Thirteen of the 15 qualitative papers explored the role of leadership in constructing organisational identity, as outlined in Table 2.2.
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Table 2.2: Qualitative Studies Included in Systematic Review that Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders role in constructing organisational identity</td>
<td>Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis, and Moingeon (2015)</td>
<td>51 employees (both long-service and relative newcomers) were interviewed about their perceptions (US).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.337): Focused on changes in leadership’s discourse about the “triple bottom line” in Ben &amp; Jerry’s ice cream from its founding days through to its acquisition by and integration into Unilever. Analysed CEO claims about “who we are” from their letters in annual reports (labelled projected identity). A sample of employees was also interviewed.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.337): Findings revealed that organisation members were “whipsawed” (p.336) between their CEOs’ different logics and identity claims. Successive CEOs stressed different “logics” about the business and what would make it successful over the years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golant, Sillince, Harvey, and Maclean (2015)</td>
<td>No participants – Archival data. (US)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.608): Analysis of archival data of executive speeches at Procter &amp; Gamble.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.608): Organisational leaders were seen to actively develop and articulate potential outcomes for organisational change via ‘dissociation’, where they distinguished existing identity claims and promoted the new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jansson (2013)</td>
<td>No participants – Archival data. (Sweden)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.301): Analysis of communication materials used in Swedish trade union study circles in the 1920s and 1930s.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.301): The organisational identity constructed by leadership was closely linked to the organisation as a ‘phenomenon’ rather than class structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natifu (2016)</td>
<td>The author and her colleagues (Public Relations practitioners of a Ugandan university). Number of participants not specified.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.4): Autoethnographical—examined how the author and other Public Relations practitioners experienced the way the institution's actual and communicated identity was constructed and managed by its top management, Public Relations Officers and the media. Utilised Balmer's (2001) functionalist conception of identity with its seven new identity management mix components (i.e., strategy, structure, communication, culture, environment, stakeholders and reputation) as a theoretical analytical lens.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.4): Observed that resourcing (i.e. adequate staffing) is a key factor in identity management. Proposed the addition of 'resource' as the eighth component to Balmer's (2001) new identity management mix. Demonstrated how factors of resource, communication structure, dynamic environment, and management's leadership style, perception of public relations and control of its access to information can impact on effective organisational identity management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pant &amp; Ramachandran (2017)</td>
<td>Utilised 57 years of archival data from Hindustan Unilever, the Indian subsidiary of Anglo-Dutch multinational Unilever.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.664): Drew attention to subsidiaries' identity dualities, conceptualising identity duality as a paradox—'as the juxtaposition of the contradictory, interdependent, and persistent characteristics of the 'global' and the 'local' in the subsidiary's identity&quot; p.664. Observed changing patterns in the description of identity claims by subsidiary leaders.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.664): Found that subsidiary leaders use two approaches to organisational identity work for navigating identity duality over time — &quot;logic ordering (the articulation of identity claims that respond to contradictory institutional demands by privileging one and subordinating the other) and logic bridging (the articulation of identity claims that respond to contradictory institutional demands by effecting a Janusian integration of the said demands)&quot; p.664. Developed a process model of how subsidiaries navigate identity duality over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puusa and Kekale (2015)</td>
<td>42 university academics (Finland)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.432): Qualitative interviews carried out during the first three years of a merger process between two Finnish universities.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.432): Concluded that major organisational change can be slow and difficult. Also suggested that the “psychological realities” (p.432) at the department and organisational level tend to vary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ravasi and Phillips (2011)</td>
<td>10 managers at Bang and Olufsen (Denmark)</td>
<td>Abridged from ‘research methods’ (p.229): Interviews with managers, plus analysis of organisational documents and archival data, in the midst of strategic change</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.103): Organisational leaders avail themselves of different strategies to ensure members’ identity beliefs align with their own. Additionally, organisational leaders engage in internal identity work / identity management to preserve identity congruence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosen (2016)</td>
<td>14 members of the Philadelphia Student Union (PSU)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.224): Conducted interviews with participants, employing life histories methodology. Sought to understand both individual members’ experience with organising, and how they were influenced by and exerted influence on the PSU. Augmented the data by using participant observation and artefact analysis.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.224): Findings revealed that the organisation’s collectivist leadership model engaged young people in developing leadership capacity among membership, including positive role-modelling and representation, which helped to define and redefine organisation’s identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2: Qualitative Studies Included In Systematic Review that Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identity, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders role in constructing organisational identity, continued</td>
<td>B.R. Smith, Knapp, Barr, Stevens, and Cannatelli (2010)</td>
<td>27 executive directors of not-for-profit organisations in the US</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.108): Exploratory qualitative interview study examined how social enterprises affect organisational identity tension and how executive directors of non-profits manage multiple identities. (Focused on organisational identity).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.108): Identity tension varied according to the timing of the conception of the social enterprise. Leaders used different approaches to identity management and marketing, both at conception and after conception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracey &amp; Phillips (2016)</td>
<td>Variety of stakeholders associated with Keystone, a social enterprise in the East of England: 23 organisational members, 40 members of the local community, 6 managers from affiliated organisations, 1 representative from the Equalities and Human Rights Commission, 1 school teacher and 1 academic. No participants – case study of an IT organisation acquired, then merged (US).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.262): Researchers used the case of Digital Equipment defunct firms were compared.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract, p.262: Described how ‘legacy identities’ arise from organisational processes and events (i.e. death, decline or restructuring) that profoundly change the firms’ existence. Leaders were seen to create legacies through sensebreaking (from the past form) and sensemaking (for the present and future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh and Glynn (2008)</td>
<td>23 Chinese managers involved in the acquisition of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) by privately owned enterprises in China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.2550): Examined sociocultural integration in M&amp;A and human resource management involvement in the acquisition of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) by privately owned enterprises in China. Qualitative data from three M&amp;A case studies involving interviews with managers, selected from both acquirer and target firms, who witnessed the entire M&amp;A process.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract, p.2550: Described a range of factors that shape the sociocultural integration process in M&amp;A, emphasising “that different types of leaders’ identity work can play important roles throughout the M&amp;A process in association with various human resource management activities” (p.2570).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xing &amp; Liu (2016)</td>
<td>Staff, executive, and board members of an international faith-based nonprofit organisation in Singapore (n = 5).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract, (p.461): Focused on three identity-based leadership dilemmas in relation to (1) creating a shared vision of organisational identity (2) talent management, and (3) board governance.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract, p.461: A strong faith-based identification can both unify an organisation AND cause organisational blind spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership transition and its relationship to organisational identity</td>
<td>Balsier and Carmin (2009)</td>
<td>14 members of Friends of the Earth: Board members, administrators, office staff, and project directors (US).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.185), and ‘research methods’ (p.189): Semi-structured interviews conducted, focusing on the impact of leadership transition within the organisation (i.e. the founder leaving the organisation and a successor taking their place).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract, p185: Case revealed that the succession process exposed disagreement about an organisation’s identity, resulting in internal conflict. Recommends leaders to be attentive to varying—and often conflicting—interpretations of an organisation’s identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Browning and Boys (2014)</td>
<td>24 interim leaders of a medium-sized private university in the US</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1): Interviews conducted with interim leaders of an organisation, focusing on ways in which their identities were managed and interrelated with organisational identities.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1): The case highlighted the intimate connections between individual and collective identity, including the key questions of identity (i.e. “Who am I?” and “Who are we?”).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six of the thirteen papers were based on qualitative interviews and examined organisational members’ perceptions of the role of leadership in fostering organisational identity during strategic change (Bayle-Cordier, Mirvis, & Moingeon, 2015; Puusa & Kekäle, 2015; Ravasi & Phillips, 2011; B. R. Smith, Knapp, Barr, Stevens, & Cannatelli, 2010; Xing & Liu, 2016; Yip, Twohill, Ernst, & Munusamy, 2010). These studies emphasised that leaders were required to navigate complex challenges when creating a shared identity, such as reconciling multiple and/or competing identities and assisting organisational members to deal with identity loss, tension, and ambiguity.

Of particular note is Puusa and Kekäle’s (2015) study, which highlighted that change and integration processes associated with mergers are often time-consuming and difficult at the practical level, and that perceptions at different organisational levels tend to vary. The complexity of change and its associated leadership responsibilities was also emphasised by Xing and Liu (2016): In their examination of three case studies focused on post-merger integration of Chinese state-owned-enterprises (SOEs) acquired by private companies, they noted that identity work undertaken by leaders is crucial throughout the M&A process (p. 2570). Such identity work included exploration of the acquired firm’s identity, claiming an identity to “stabilise the emotional experience of target employees” (p. 2560) within the merged organisation, and maintaining and accommodating identity work as the merged organisation evolved. Also noteworthy is the examination of ‘projected identity’ by Bayle-Cordier et al. (2015), which provided insights into the delicate balance between maintaining valued normative traditions and affecting significant organisational change such as mergers and acquisitions.

Six of the thirteen qualitative studies drew from either qualitative interviews (Rosen, 2016; Tracey & Phillips, 2016) or archival data (Golant, Sillince, Harvey, & Maclean, 2015; Jansson, 2013; Pant & Ramachandran, 2017; Walsh & Glynn, 2008) and focused on the role of leadership in constructing, maintaining, and dismantling organisational identity. As outlined subsequently, these studies showed that institutional leadership plays a pivotal role in organisational identity deconstruction, construction, and maintenance.
Walsh and Glynn (2008) examined how organisational processes and events such as restructuring, redundancy, deterioration, and death (p.262) contribute to the development of organisational identities, viewing leadership as playing a key role through *sensebreaking* to move beyond the former identity and *sensegiving* for the current and future state. Pant & Ramachandran (2017) explored the duality of subsidiary identities, and found that subsidiary leaders typically utilise two methods of identity work to traverse identity duality: (1) *logic ordering*, “the articulation of identity claims that respond to contradictory institutional demands by privileging one and subordinating the other” (p.664); and (2) *logic bridging*, “the articulation of identity claims that respond to contradictory institutional demands by effecting … integration of said demands” (p.664).

In their study focusing on a social enterprise that had become stigmatised, Tracey and Phillips (2016) reinforced a finding from my preliminary reading associated with this thesis: that the construct of organisational identity is being considered alongside a broader range of organisational constructs. Examining the relationship between stigma research and organisational identity the researchers found that, through identity work, leaders can ameliorate the internal effects of stigma. They proposed further categorisations of identity work: (1) *advocacy* on behalf of the stigmatised group, and (2) *valorisation*, in the form of “narratively reconstructing the organisation’s purpose” (p. 753).

The thirteenth qualitative paper that explored the role of leadership in constructing organisational identity ventured from the norm with its methodology: Natifu (2016) took an autoethnographical approach, examining how she and her colleagues experienced the development and management of their organisation’s identity, as enacted by senior leadership. Whilst it could be argued that this paper has some potential limitations due to its reportage of the author’s lived experience, it proposed an addition to Balmer’s (2001) functionalist conception of identity—suggesting that organisational resources (or lack thereof) play a critical role in the management of organisational identity.

A consistent theme across these studies was the emphasis on the critical role that leaders play in constructing organisational identity, focusing
predominantly on what and how they communicate to foster a shared organisational identity and garner its support. The studies also emphasised the importance of leadership activities such as shepherding organisations and their members through the tensions and ambiguity associated with organisational identity change; communication activities including sensebreaking, sensemaking, sensegiving, logic ordering and bridging, advocacy and valorisation; and carefully managing the evolution of organisational identity following change (e.g. post-merger or acquisition, post-service integration). Additional findings were the expansion of categorisations of ‘identity work’, and the consideration of organisational identity alongside a broader range of organisational constructs.

The effect of leadership transition on organisational identity. Two qualitative papers explored the effect of leadership transition on organisational identity. The influence of ‘interim leadership’ on individual identities and organisational identity was explored by Browning and Boys (2014) who discovered that the questions “Who am I?” and “Who are we?” were pivotal to discourse on the management of individual and collective identities and needed to be explored by all leaders, regardless of their tenure with the organisation. Balser and Carmin (2009) discovered that the leadership succession process is frequently the catalyst for internal conflict as it uncovers differing opinions regarding an organisation’s identity; they urged leaders to be alert to the varying of interpretations of an organisation’s identity to provide clarity of direction and purpose to organisational members.

These two studies highlighted that ‘identity work’ within organisations is critical, continuous, and often contentious, and cannot wait until a permanent leader (or leadership team) is established before being undertaken.

2.4.1.1.2 Conceptual studies focusing on leadership and organisational identity

Leadership and organisational identity during change. Of the six conceptual papers that examined the role of leadership and organisational identity, outlined in Table 2.3, four examined these constructs within the context of organisational change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and organisational identity during organisational change</td>
<td>Almog-Baraket (2012)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.431): Explored the leadership provided by deans in business education institutions, suggesting that visionary leadership is required in order to generate a unique organisational identity and reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dillon &amp; Manz (2016)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.249): Explored the role of emotion in transformational leadership, linked to Social Identity theory. Found that transformational leaders utilise interpersonal emotion management to influence—and respond to—emotions of organisational members during times of organisational identity change. Discussed the emotional responses of organisational members who were required to undertake self-evaluation during times of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacobs, van Witteloostuijn &amp; Christe-Zeyse (2013)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.772): Focused on the barriers and enablers of organisational change from an organisational identity perspective. Presents a framework to analyse the dimensions of organisational change, incorporating leadership, environmental scans, SWOT and stakeholder analysis and knowledge sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omillon-Hodges and Baker (2014)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.435): Outlined how ‘everyday talk’ can shape an organisational identity and provides suggestions for organisational leaders on how to successful manage identity through strategic communication and managerial processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theories of leadership and their relationship to organisational identity</td>
<td>Godkin and Allcorn (2011)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.559): Explored the impact of destructive narcissistic leadership on unethical behaviour and consequential shifts in organisational identity. Proposed that a strong, positive identity can foster resistance to destructive narcissistic leadership and ensuing unethical behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of particular relevance to the current thesis were the two conceptual studies that focused on changes such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures: Jacobs, van Witteloostuijn, and Christe-Zeyse (2013) concentrated on the barriers and enablers of organisational change from an organisational identity perspective, warning that organisational change is fraught with risk, and more complex than change initiators typically assume (p. 772). Omilion-Hodges and Baker (2014) argued that organisational identity “lives somewhat enigmatically at the intersection of the attitudes of all organisational stakeholders”, and that more attention should be paid to internal stakeholders when managing organisational identity, given that they are “positioned to serve either as ambassadors of the organisation or as liabilities” (p. 435) depending on the way they describe the organisation. They also outlined how ‘everyday talk’ can influence an organisation’s identity and provided suggestions for organisational leaders on how to successfully manage identity through their communication and management practices.

The third conceptual paper to explore the relationships between leadership and organisational identity during change was authored by Almog-Bareket (2012), who explored the leadership provided by deans in business education institutions. He suggested that visionary leadership—defined as leadership that provides “the members of the organisation with an inspiring, clear, and stable future to which they can strive” (p. 432)—is required to generate a organisational identity that differentiates the institution, as well as enhancing its reputation.

Dillon and Manz (2016) delved into the leadership activities required when an organisation seeks to recover from a period of unethical conduct, where leaders are required to undertake activities that enhance the ethical norms—and consequently ‘ethical organisational identity’ (Verbos, Gerard, Forshey, Harding & Miller, 2007, p.250)—of the organisation. They proposed that, to remedy an organisation’s ethical identity, transformational leaders should link followers’ social identities to the organisation, as well as utilise interpersonal emotion management to influence—and respond to—emotions such as pride, guilt and shame arising from the self-evaluative processes of followers during times of organisational identity change.
A common theme across these four conceptual papers was that organisational leaders cannot underestimate their impact on followers’ perceptions of organisational identity during change. Organisational leaders were also urged to err on the side of ‘over-communication’, as well as to engage in honest conversations about identity loss, guilt and shame, ambiguity, and potential power and status differentials, to assist staff through complex and potentially disorientating organisational changes.

Theories of leadership and their relationship to organisational identity. Two further conceptual papers explored theories and models of leadership and their relationship to organisational identity. Godkin and Allcorn (2011) focused on the impact of destructive narcissistic leadership, suggesting that a robust and positive identity can withhold the influence of such leadership and its ensuing unethical behaviour (p.559). M. Schneider and Somers (2006) explored general systems theory and complexity theory, proposing that leadership—together with organisational identity and social movements as mediating variables—have the potential to impact the organisation as part of a complex adaptive system.

2.4.1.2 Studies focusing on the relationships between leadership and organisational identification

The 68 studies (65 quantitative and 3 conceptual) included in the systematic review that focused on the relationships between leadership on organisational identification are outlined in Tables 2.4 and 2.5.

2.4.1.2.1 Quantitative papers focusing on the relationships between leadership and organisational identification

The 65 quantitative papers outlined in Table 2.4 examined the direct relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership models and follower organisational identification, as well as follower organisational identification as a mediator or moderator between leadership and a substantive range of other individual and organisational variables.
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#### Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full range leadership model (including transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership)</td>
<td>Ayan (2015)</td>
<td>318 middle school teachers in Turkey</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Examined the relationships among leadership styles (i.e. laissez faire, ethical and authoritarian) and organisational identification, job performance, emotional exhaustion and work centrality. Employed frequency analyses, factor analyses, reliability tests, multiple regression tests, linear regression tests, and correlational analyses. Did not establish a significant relationship between laissez faire leadership and the two factors of organisational identification studied (i.e. institutional identification and employee identification), but did with ethical leadership and authoritarian leadership. Scales used: Laissez fare leadership (Ozer, ‘12); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, ‘05); Authoritarian leadership (Ertureten, ’08); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>PAL and OID: Institutional ID Employee ID (See subsequent sections for correlations between organisational identification and ethical and authoritarian leadership)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buil, Martínez, &amp; Matute (2016)</td>
<td>323 frontline employees from major hotel chains operating in Spain.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.256), method and results: Investigated the interrelationships between transformational leadership, internal brand management, organisational identification, work engagement, and OCBs. Found that transformational leadership leverages followers’ organisational identification and work engagement. Ascertained that brand training and communications do not directly elicit positive emotions in the workplace. Pertinent to the current thesis, the results suggest that work engagement is a better predictor of organisational citizenship behaviours than organisational identification. Scales used: TFL—Carless, Wearing &amp; Mann (’90); OID—Smidts (’01).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.41$ $t$-value: 5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmeli, Atwater, &amp; Levi (2011)</td>
<td>203 employees working on advanced R&amp;D projects in 12 high-tech organisations in Israel.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.257), method and results: Examined how leadership affects knowledge sharing in a knowledge-intensive work setting, testing: (1) the extent to which TFL affects employees identification with their manager (i.e. relational identification); (2) whether this relational identification, mediated by the quality of LMX, leads to greater organisational identification and its goals (and whether this results in greater knowledge sharing). Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio (’97); LMX—Liden &amp; Maslyn (’98); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID (See subsequent sections for correlations between organisational identification and LMX)</td>
<td>$r = 0.28$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effelsberg, Solga &amp; Gurt (2014a)</td>
<td>321 employees from a sample of German organisations.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.131), method and results: At three time points, participants completed questionnaires measuring transformational leadership (TFL), organisational identification, honesty/humility and selfless pro-social behaviour (SPB). SPB was also captured applying a distribution task. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effelsberg, Solga &amp; Gurt (2014b)</td>
<td>Study 1: 290 thesis-writing students recruited from different German organisations (industry not specified). Study 2: 319 employees, along with their regular job, enrolled in applied psychology studies at a large distance learning university (industry not specified).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.81), method and results: Examined, via questionnaire, the relationship between transformational leadership and unethical yet pro-organisational follower behaviour (UPB), as well as mediating and moderating processes including OID. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full range leadership model, continued</td>
<td>Epitropaki (2013)</td>
<td>864 employees from 162 work units in 10 Greek organisations.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.65), method and results: Via questionnaire, explored the dynamics of the relationship between psychological contract breach and organisational identification. Group-level TFL and TAL as well as procedural justice, were explored as key antecedents for organisational membership processes. Also explored the mediating role of psychological contract breach in the relationship between leadership, procedural justice climate, and organisational identification and proposed separateness-connectedness self-schema as an important moderator of the above mediated relationship. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Smidts et al. ('01).</td>
<td>TFL and OID, TAL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.55 ), ( r = 0.34 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epitropaki &amp; Martin (2005)</td>
<td>502 employees of 4 banks in Greece.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.569), method and results: Examined the relationship between TFL and TAL perceptions and organisational identification and further explored the moderating role of individual difference variables, such as separateness-connectedness self-schema, and positive and negative affectivity. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Smidts et al. ('01).</td>
<td>TFL and OID, TAL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.57 ), ( r = 0.50 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hansen, Byrne &amp; Kiersch (2014)</td>
<td>451 full-time employees at an international firm (USA and Canada – industry not specified).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.953), method and results: Organisational identification was examined as an underlying mechanism for how perceptions of interpersonal leadership are related to employee engagement and its relationship with commitment and job tension. Scales used: TFL—Rafferty &amp; Griffin ('04); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.34 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horstmeier, Boer, Homan, Voelpel (2017)</td>
<td>k = 27; n = 7,669 (for meta-analysis focusing on TFL and organisational identification) k = 73; n = 20,543 (for entire meta-analysis, with 3 identifications)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Conducted a meta-analysis to synthesise existing research regarding transformational leadership and employees’ identifications (i.e. organisational, team and leader). Ascertained that TFL (and each TFL sub-dimension) had stronger relationships to leader identification than with organisational identification or team identification, asserting that leader identification mediates the relationships between TFL and these identifications. Scales used: Various. However TFL most commonly measured by Bass &amp; Avolio’s ('95) MLQ and OID most commonly measured by Ashforth &amp; Mael’s ('92, '95).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( ES r = 0.37 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humphrey (2012)</td>
<td>128 employees in US organisations (industry not specified).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.247), method and results: Explored the role of organisational identification as a mediator of the relationship between TFL and organisational citizenship behaviours. Scales used: TFL, TAL &amp; LFL —Bass &amp; Avolio’s ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID, TAL and OID, PAL and OID</td>
<td>( r = -0.19 ), ( r = -0.01 ), ( r = 0.19 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kraus, Haumann, Ahearne, &amp; Wieseke (2015)</td>
<td>285 Sales Managers and 1528 Salespeople from the sales force of a US Fortune 500 company in the B2B sector.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Explored organisational identification agreement and organisational identification tension in the sales manager-salesperson dyad, analysing a triadic data set using hierarchical linear modeling. Scales used: TAL—Avolio, Bass &amp; Jung ('99); Charismatic leadership - Conger, Kanungo &amp; Menon ('00); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>TAL and OID, (See subsequent sections for correlations between OID and charismatic leadership)</td>
<td>( r = 0.44 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krishnan (2008)</td>
<td>144 teachers of a prominent high school in western India.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.11), method and results: Relationships between TFL and followers' karma yoga (duty orientation), spirituality (oneness with all beings), OID and normative organisational commitment were studied. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Shamir et al. ('98).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.41 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full range leadership model, continued</td>
<td>C-S. Lin, Huang, Chen, &amp; Huang (2015)</td>
<td>214 subordinates reporting to 66 supervisors, based in Taiwan.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.179), method and results: Drawing on distinctions between ‘authentic’ and ‘pseudo’ transformational leaders, investigated the effects of pseudo-transformational leadership on contextual performance (i.e. activities that are not directly related to task performance, but shape the organisational, political and task context), via OID. Illustrated that when subordinates perceive their supervisor to have “high manipulative intention” (p.179), the impact of group-level transformational leadership on subordinates will be reduced, as will their OID and willingness to demonstrate contextual performance activities. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x; OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. Liu, Zhu, &amp; Yang (2010)</td>
<td>191 employees in different Chinese organisations.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.189), method and results: Proposed that voice behaviour is “target-sensitive” (p.189) and that there are two types of voice behaviour: Speaking out (defined as voice toward peers) and speaking up (defined as voice toward supervisor). Stipulated that transformational leadership facilitates both types of voice behaviour, and also examined the impact of employee identifications. Found that social identification (measured via OID scales) predicts only ‘speaking out’, while personal identification predicts ‘speaking up’.</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molero, Moriano, &amp; Shaver (2013)</td>
<td>225 participants (undergraduate psychology students at a Spanish University).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Explored the extent to which employees establish attachment bonds with their leaders and the effects these bonds have on organisational outcomes. Participants reported on their supervisor’s leadership style (TFL, TAL, or PAL), their attachment bonds to this supervisor (anxious or avoidant), and four organisational variables (subordinate’s satisfaction, OID, extra effort, and perceived leadership effectiveness). Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); PAL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Doosje, Ellemers &amp; Spears (’95).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moriano, Molero, Topa &amp; Levy Mangin (2014)</td>
<td>186 employees belonging to several Spanish public and private organisations.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.103), method and results: Examined the influence of manager leadership styles on employee intrapreneurial behaviour and the mediating role of OID. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); PAL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rahn, Jawahar, Stone, &amp; Scrimshire (2016)</td>
<td>210 newly-hired employees of a healthcare organisation in the U.S. MidWest.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.43), method and results: Focusing the importance of followers in the leadership equation, proposed and tested a model that explored the relationships between transformational leadership (TFL), the quality of the leader-member exchange, and followers implicit leadership theory (ILT) and congruence (ILT congruence). Employed structural equation modelling. Overall model was strongly supported: Transformational leadership influenced the quality of LMX; LMX fully mediated the quality of ILT congruence and perceptions of TL on the dependent variables of turnover intentions, OID and POS. Scales used: TFL—Avolio et al.’s MLQ 5x (’99); LMX—Liden and Maslyn (’98); OID—Cook &amp; Wall (’80).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.K. Schneider, George, Carroll, &amp; Middleton (2011)</td>
<td>Study 1: Presidents and members of 8 service clubs (i.e. Lions, Rotary) in a southeastern (US).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.259), method and results: Outlined two small field studies, incorporating questionnaires, which suggested that the effects of TFL are mediated, at least partially, by OID. Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio’s (’97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full range leadership model, continued</td>
<td>S.K. Schneider, George, Carroll, &amp; Middleton (2011), continued</td>
<td>Study 2: 66 employees, 35 from 7 different branches from Australian supermarket chain and 31 from 5 different branches of a fast food chain.</td>
<td>Scales used: TFL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); TAL—Bass &amp; Avolio's ('97) MLQ 5x (Short); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( \beta = 0.46 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schuh, Zhang, Egold, Graf, Pandey &amp; van Dick (2012)</td>
<td>Study 1 was conducted in Germany (n = 18 leaders and 216 employees).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.421), method and results: Extended the organisational identity transfer model by examining the mediating role of TFL behaviour in the leader organisational identity-follower organisational identity link. Using a multi-level, multi-source approach the model was tested in two studies using questionnaires.</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( t \text{-value: 3.58} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.J. Wang, Demerouti, &amp; Le Blanc (2017)</td>
<td>Study 2 was conducted in China (N= 44 leaders and 109 followers).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.185), method and results: Explored the link between transformational leadership and job crafting (i.e. “seeking resources, seeking challenges, and reducing demands”, p.185), and the moderating role of organisational identification. Supervisors rated their own transformational leadership and subordinates’ adaptability, and subordinates rated their job crafting activities and their OID. Applied structural equation modelling techniques. Found that transformational leadership was linked to “more expansion” (p.185) job crafting (i.e. seeking resources and challenges) via adaptability, and that this was more prevalent for employees with lower OID. Transformational leadership was seen as an antecedent of employee adaptability and productivity.</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.23 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu &amp; Yuan (2015)</td>
<td>330 employees from 20 companies in China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.435), method and results: Investigated the links between transformational leadership and feedback-seeking behaviour, in addition to OID as a potential mediator. Found that transformational leadership can enhance employee OID, thus increase frequency of feedback-seeking behaviour.</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.48 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2012)</td>
<td>672 participants (375 men and 297 women) in an American sample obtained through internet-based survey company Zoomerang.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.186), method and results: Using a sample of managers across different industries, examined via survey the underlying processes through which TFL and active TAL affects followers’ organisational identification.</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.62 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

| Carmeli, Arwater, & Levi (2011)                                                 | See full description of paper above.                                          | See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table. | Scales used: TFL—Bass & Avolio ('97); LMX—Liden & Maslyn ('98); OID—Mael & Ashforth ('92). | LMX and OID          | \( r = 0.30 \) |
| DeConinck (2011)                                                               | 356 Salespeople from a variety of manufacturing and sales industries.        | Abridged from abstract (p.21), method and results: Tested a model examining the effects of LMX and OID on the performance and turnover among a sample of salespeople. | Scales used: LMX—Scandura, Gaen & Novak ('86); OID—Mael & Ashforth ('92). | LMX and OID          | \( r = 0.51 \) |
| Farrell & Oczkowski (2012)                                                       | 170 customer service employees from a national fast food chain in 6 locations. | Abridged from abstract (p.365), method and results: Investigated the potential antecedents of organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs)—including the supervisor-employee relationship and employer-employee identification—in a service setting. | Scales used: LMX—Liden & Maslyn ('98); OID—Mael & Ashforth ('92). | LMX and OID          | \( r = 0.74 \) |

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### CHAPTER 2. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

#### Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange, continued</td>
<td>Katrinri, Atbay, Gunay, &amp; Guneri (2008)</td>
<td>148 nurses working in a private general hospital. In Turkey.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.354), method and results: Explored the relationship between LMX quality and OID and the mediating role of job involvement in this relationship. Utilised questionnaires, which included measures for OID, level of LMX quality, job involvement and questions about the demographic characteristics of the sample. Scales used: LMX—Graen &amp; Uhl-Bien (‘95); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidbari, Fadaei &amp; Ebrahim (2016)</td>
<td>349 employees of the Medical Sciences faculty at Rashtra University, Iran.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.463), method and results: Investigated the role of ethical leadership on employees’ performance, with LMX, followers’ self-efficacy and OID as mediating variables. Found positive relationships between ethical leadership and the three mediating variables (including OID), and that these mediating variables facilitated a positive effect of ethical leadership on job performance. Scales used: LMX (Scandura &amp; Graen, ‘84); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, ‘05); OID—Ashforth &amp; Mael (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar &amp; Singh (2012)</td>
<td>169 participants (convenience sample from a web-based survey).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.5), method and results: Explored whether perceived quality of the LMX and the general environment of exchange could predict turnover intention. It further examined the role of OID as an explanatory variable mediating between exchange relationships and turnover intention. Used three-step hierarchical linear regressions on a data set collected in two time waves. Scales used: LMX—Liden &amp; Maslyn (‘98); OID—Ashmore, Deaux &amp; McLaughline-Volpe (‘04).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar, Singh, Rai, &amp; Bhattacharya, (2012)</td>
<td>192 participants</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.2), method and results: Explored the relationship of ‘humane orientation’ of organisations with members’ reactions to the way they were treated by the organisation. Examined subordinates’ perceptions of the quality of LMX, and measured ‘humane orientation’ via POS and OID (as well as burnout and turnover intentions). Conducted three step hierarchical linear regressions at two time waves. All hypotheses were supported. Scales used: LMX—Liden &amp; Maslyn (‘98); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Hall, Baker, Andrews, Hunt, &amp; Rapp (2016)</td>
<td>265 employees of a US-based business-to-business service industry firm.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.23), method and results: Drew from the social identity perspective of OID theory, proposing a model in which product and service quality serve as antecedents to frontline OID (which lead to positive realtionships with job satisfaction, commitment, and customer satisfaction). Model also proposed that LMX serves as a ‘boundary condition’ for the associated outcomes. Tested the model, and found that all hypotheses were supported, with the exception of the moderating effects of LMX on the relationship between OID and job satisfaction. Scales used: LMX—Scandura &amp; Graen (‘84); OID—Mael &amp; Ashworth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Liu, Cai, Li, Shi, &amp; Fang (2013)</td>
<td>190 leader/member dyads (111 (58%) were from mainland China (i.e. Shenzhen), and 79 (42 percent) were from Hong Kong).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.305), method and results: Examined how an approach of culturally specific human resource management (HRM) moderated the relationship between leadership style and employee turnover. Questionnaire were data collected. Scales used: LMX—Graen &amp; Uhl-Bien (‘95); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loi, Chan, &amp; Lam (2014)</td>
<td>306 employees of two companies (garment manufacturing) in southern China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.42), method and results: Examined the influence of LMX on employee OID and job satisfaction. Hypotheses were tested using a two-phase survey data collected. Scales used: LMX—Hui, Lee &amp; Rousseau (‘04); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu, Shen, &amp; Zhao (2015)</td>
<td>312 employees of a Chinese organisation and 119 of their colleagues (industry not specified)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.297), method and results: Examined the moderating role of a LMX in the relationship between psychological contract breach and employee outcomes. Scales used: LMX—Liden, Wayne &amp; Stilwell (‘93); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>r = 0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).


Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange, continued</td>
<td>Rahn, Jawahar, Stone, Scriphshire (2016)</td>
<td>See full paper above.</td>
<td>See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table. Scales used: TFL—Avolio et al.’s MLQ 5x (‘99); LMX—Liden and Maslyn (‘98); OID—Cook &amp; Wall (‘80).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.49$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sluss, Klimchak, &amp; Holmes (2008)</td>
<td>364 supervisor-subordinate dyads (from a large multi-national organisation headquartered in South Eastern US — industry not specified). 210 undergraduate students from a large mid-Atlantic university.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.457), method and results: Using cross-level data from supervisor-subordinate dyads, examined how relational exchange quality, perceived organisational support (POS), and OID interrelated. Scales used: LMX—Liden &amp; Maslyn (‘98); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.44$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sollitto, Martin, Dusic, Gibbons, Wagenhouser (2016)</td>
<td>Time 1: 1723 employees from a Belgian Federal Public Service; Time 2: 695 employees.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.74), method and results: Utilised LMX theory to explore communication between student part-time employees and their supervisors. Found that LMX was significantly and positively related to organisational assimilation, OID, work motivation and career relevance. Scales used: LMX—Graen et al. (‘82); OID—Cheney (‘83a).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.53$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stinglehamber et al. (2015)</td>
<td>581 frontline nurses and 29 supervisors in a Midwestern hospital in the United States.</td>
<td>Time 1: 1723 employees from a Belgian Federal Public Service; Time 2: 695 employees.</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.19$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangirala, Green, &amp; Ramanujam (2007)</td>
<td>196 Nurses and nurse assistants working in five Belgian nursing homes.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.373), method and results: This study examined the relations between perceived organisational support, the quality of LMX, in-role and extra-role behaviour, professional identification and OID among registered nurses and nurse assistants. Scales used: LMX—Scandura &amp; Graen (‘84) with adaptations; OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>LMX and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.21$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Akbari, Kashani, Nikookar, Ghaemi (2014)</td>
<td>122 employees in the Tax office of Guilan in Iran.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.41), method and results: Examined the relationship between servant leadership, OID and job involvement, using questionnaires that measured the aforementioned constructs. Found that servant leadership had a positive and significant effect on OID and job involvement. Job involvement was also found to have a positive effect on OID. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—Gholipour &amp; Ezzati (‘09); OID—Ashforth &amp; Mael (‘89).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$t$-value: 13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chughtai (2016)</td>
<td>174 employees of a large food company, based in Pakistan.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.866), method and results: Investigated the mediating role of OID and psychological safety in the relationship between servant leadership, employee voice and negative feedback-seeking behaviour. Established that OID and psychological safety partially mediated the effects of servant leadership on voice and negative feedback seeking behaviour. Servant leadership was positively related to OID. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—Liden et al (‘09); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correia de Sousa &amp; van Dierendonck (2014)</td>
<td>1,107 respondents from two merging Portuguese companies (industry not specified).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.877), method and results: Via a survey, explored how servant leadership can affect engagement during a merger with high levels of uncertainty through the mediating role of OID and psychological empowerment. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale (van Dierendonck &amp; Nuijen, ‘11); OID taken from Kelly &amp; Kelly (‘92), Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992), and R.Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, &amp; Williams (1986).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$N/A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jiang (2015)</td>
<td>101 supervisor-subordinate diads, in 3 Chinese companies involved in construction and water conservancy.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.42), method and results: Drew on social exchange theory and focused predominantly on the impact of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs), whilst also exploring the role of OID. Proved that servant leadership has a positive effect on OCB and OID, and that OID plays an intermediary role between the two constructs. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—Barbuto &amp; Wheeler (‘06); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.29$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
**CHAPTER 2. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership,</td>
<td>Liden, Wayne, Liao, Meuser (2014)</td>
<td>961 employees working in 71 restaurants within one restaurant chain, located in 6 states of the United States.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.4344), method and results: Developed and tested a model purporting that servant leaders imbue servant leadership behaviours in others, thereby creating a service culture. Such a culture influences unit (i.e. restaurant) performance and employee attitudes and behaviours. Proved their hypotheses; importantly ‘serving culture’ was seen to mediate the relationship between servant leadership and OID. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—Liden et al. (2008); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID (indirect path, via serving culture)</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.37$, (Indirect path coefficient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otero-Neira, Varela-Neira, Bande (2016)</td>
<td>181 sales people and 83 sales managers working in a range of industries (location not specified).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.860), method and results: Explored how perceived organisational support and OID play a mediating role in the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance. Utilised dyadic data and multi-level structural equation modelling. Established a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership and OID. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—Liden et al. (2008); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.57$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vondey (2010)</td>
<td>114 respondents who worked in various industries across the US.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.3), method and results: Utilising a cross-sectional self-report survey, explored the relationship between servant leadership and organisational citizenship behaviours, as well as the moderating effects of person-organisation fit and organisational identification. Scales used: Servant leadership assessment (Dennis &amp; Bocarnea, '05); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (92).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang, Kwan, Everett, &amp; Juan (2012)</td>
<td>230 managers in China (various industries).</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.747), method and results: Via a field survey, investigated the impact of servant leadership as perceived by followers on their work-to-family enrichment by focusing on the mediating role of OID and the moderating role of work climate for sharing family concerns. Scales used: Servant leadership—Barbuto &amp; Wheeler ('06); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth (92).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.36$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhao, Liu, Gao (2016)</td>
<td>293 subordinate-supervisor dyads from within the hospitality industry in China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.898), method and results: Investigated identification-based mechanisms (i.e. subordinates’ identification with their leader and organisation) and their impact on the relationship between servant leadership and organisational outcomes (i.e. organisational citizenship behaviours towards coworkers and turnover intention). Demonstrated that identification with supervisor and organisational identification are important when translating the effect of servant leadership to organisational citizenship behaviours and turnover intention. Importantly, found the “occurrence of the two identifications” (p.903) to be sequential (i.e. identification with the supervisor preceded organisational identification). Also found that OID can be established via servant leadership’s ability to reduce subordinate’s fear of being close to their immediate supervisor. Scales used: Servant Leadership Scale—version of Liden et al. (2008); OID—Smidts et al. ('01).</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.31$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authentic leadership

| Edu Valsania, Moriano, & Molero (2014) | 212 employees of Spanish companies (various sectors in Madrid). | Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Explored the relationship of authentic leadership with employees' intrapreneurial behaviour and the intervening processes. (including OID). A correlational study was carried out, in which two cross-level mediation hypotheses were tested. Scales used: ALQ (Spanish version, Moriano et al. '11); OID—Mael & Ashforth (92) Spanish version. | Authentic leadership and OID | $r = 0.52$ |
| Fallatah, Laschinger & Read (2017) | 998 new graduate nurses in Canada. | Abridged from abstract (p.172), method and results: Examined the influence of authentic leadership on turnover intentions, via personal identification with their leader, organisational identification, and occupational coping self-efficacy. Employed secondary data analysis of a cross-sectional national study, using structural equation modelling. Found that authentic leadership had a significant positive effect on nurses’ personal identification with their leader, and organisational identification. Further, OID was found to have a significant positive effect on occupational coping self-efficacy, which had a flow-on effect of ameliorating turnover intentions. Scales used: ALQ (Walumbwa et al. '08); OID—Sluss et al. ('12). | Authentic leadership and OID | $r = 0.37$ |

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Authentic Leadership, continued

**Fox, Gong, & Attoh (2015)**

398 teachers from 19 public and private schools in the state of Maryland, U.S.

Abridged from abstract (p.6), method and results: Via survey, empirically tested a framework purporting that authentic leadership leads to trust, mediated via personal and organisational identification.

Scales used: ALQ (Spanish version, Moriano et al ’11), OID—Kark et al (’03), adapted from Mael & Ashforth.

**García-Guiu, Molero, & Moriano (2015)**

210 employees at several Spanish companies.

Abridged from abstract (p.60), method and results: Analysed the relationship between authentic leadership, organisational identification and group cohesion, whilst also examining the potential effect of organisational justice as a mediating variable. Positive relationships were found amongst the variables studied, and organisational justice was indeed found to be a mediator.

Scales used: ALQ (Spanish version, Moriano et al ’11, originally developed by Walumbwa, ’08); OID—Mael & Ashforth (’92) Spanish version validated by Topa, Moriano & Morales (’08).

**Kurt (2016)**

122 white collar employees from a variety of organisations (location not specified).

Abridged from abstract (p.391), method and results: Examined the mediating role of cynicism on the relationship between authentic leadership and organisational identification, utilising a convenience sample. Results supported the hypotheses that there is a positive and significant relationship between authentic leadership and organisational identification, and that cynicism mediates the relationship between the two variables (i.e. has a negative effect on the relationship between the two variables).

Scales used: ALQ (Gardner et al. ’05); OID—Mael & Ashforth (’92).

**S-M. Lee, Lim, Swanson, Park, & Lee (2016)**

204 hotel employees in Seoul, Korea.

Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Examined the effect of authentic leadership on leader trust, OID, job performance and employee loyalty. The study was undertaken in a food-and-beverage department in a hotel. Structural equation modelling was utilised to analyse data. Found that authentic leadership had significant effects on leader trust and job performance, but (surprisingly) did not affect OID. Leader trust was found to have positive and significant influences on OID and employee loyalty, and fully mediated the relationship between OID and employee loyalty. (Other findings not directly related to this thesis have been omitted in the interests of parsimony).

Scales used: ALQ (Neider & Schreisheim, ’11); OID—Smidts et al. (’01).

**Monzani, Braun, & van Dick (2016)**

458 employees from German-speaking countries from diverse work sectors.

Abridged from abstract (p.246), method and results: Explored the relationship between authentic leadership and employees’ loyalty to their organisation, their likelihood to leave the organisation (i.e. exit) their willingness to voice concerns, and the mediating effect of organisational identification. Predicted that authentic leadership would be positively related to employees’ loyalty, but that in dilemmatic situations this effect would be “buffered” (p.246) by high organisational identification, as a result of conflicting loyalties. Also predicted that the influence of authentic leadership may be counter-productive if not matched with a high organisational identification. Achieved partial support for hypotheses (but for the purposes of this thesis, established a positive and significant relationship between authentic leadership and organisational identification).

Scales used: ALQ (Walumbwa, ’08—German version); OID—Kreiner & Ashforth (’04).

### Charismatic Leadership

**Kraus, Haumann, & Wieseke (2015)**

See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table.

Scales used: TAL—Avolio, Bass & Jung (’99); TFL—Conger, Kanungo & Menon (’00); Faire Leadership; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Charismatic leadership, continued | Lian, Brown, Tanzer & Che (2011) | Two independent samples: 1) 397 employees from multiple organisations in Beijing, Shanghai and Taiwan (who were also part-time students); 2) 197 employees from 2 companies in Beijing. | Abridged from abstract (p.251), method and results: Evaluated whether Conger and Kanungo’s conceptualisation of charismatic leadership is generalisable to senior leaders in Chinese society. Found that, although the factor structure of charismatic leadership is replicated, some behaviours (i.e. “being an exciting public speaker” p. 266) are not considered charismatic and therefore less effective in the Chinese context. Also discovered that charismatic leadership is positively related to followers’ job satisfaction and performance, partially mediated by identification with the leader and organisational identification. Scales used: ChL Conger & Kanungo (‘98) & Conger, Kanungo & Menon (‘00); OID—Mael & Ashforth (‘95). | Charismatic leadership and OID | Sample 1: $r = 0.59$
|                   |                |                                          |              |          | Sample 2: $r = 0.39$
|                  | Lindblom, Kajalo & Mitronen (2016) | 208 frontline employees from the Finnish retail industry. | Abridged from abstract (p.266), method and results: Explored the relationship between retailers’ charismatic leadership and frontline employee outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, self-efficacy, organisational identification and turnover intentions). Found positive relationships between charismatic leadership and job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and organisational identification, with an expected strong negative impact on employee turnover intentions. Scales used: ChL Vlachos et al (‘03, originally developed by Conger & Kanungo (‘88b); OID—Smidts et al. (‘01). | Charismatic leadership and OID | $r = 0.62$
|                  | Rast, Hogg & Giessner (2016) | 367 participants in Study 2, employees from a variety of British organisations. | Abridged from abstract (p.259), method and results: Questioned the supposition that charismatic leaders tasked with initiating change are particularly effective during uncertainty, arguing instead that both change- and stability-focused leadership styles can be effective in these situations. In 3 studies (2 experiments and 1 time-lagged field study), investigated how uncertainty and group membership importance affect followers’ trust in change- or stability-focused leadership. Found that, where a group is psychologically meaningful to a person’s self-concept, people express great trust in change-focused leadership (deemed charismatic) when they feel uncertain. However, followers who place less psychological importance on the group, tend to trust stability-focused (non-charismatic) leadership more when their uncertainty is low. Focused on the relationship between change focused leadership and organisational identification in their second study, establishing a positive and significant relationship. Scales used: ChL / change-focused leadership (Yukl et al, ‘02); OID—adapted from Hogg et al. (‘07), Mael & Ashforth (‘92). | Change-focused (charismatic) leadership and OID | $r = 0.47$
|                  | Wieseke, Ahearn, Lam, & Dick (2009) | Study 1: 39 sales managers; 285 sales representatives of a large US pharmaceutical company. Study 2: German travel agencies – 22 directors; 394 sales managers and 1005 sales representatives. | Abridged from abstract (p.123), method and results: Tested the organisational identity-transfer research model in two multinational studies using multilevel and multisource data. Scales used: ChL Bass & Avolio (‘90) & Conger, Kanungo & Menon (‘00); OID—Mael & Ashforth (‘92). | N/A | N/A

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Paire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership continued</td>
<td>Xenikou (2016)</td>
<td>200 employees from a public organisation in Greece.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.567), method and results: Investigated the relationship between organisational identification, perceived organisational support values and charismatic leadership. Found that perceived organisational support values predicted both cognitive and affective organisational identification, whereas charismatic leadership predicted affective identification. A significant interaction effect was also found of perceived organisational support values and charismatic leadership on affective organisational identification, with charismatic leadership also shown to be positively associated with affective organisational identification in conditions of low support. <em>Scales used:</em> Charismatic/inspirational subscale of MLQ—Avolio et al. (99); Cognitive and affective OID—Ellemers, Kortekaas and Ouwerkerk ('99).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and Cognitive OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.16 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership and Affective OID</td>
<td>Ebrahimi (2016)</td>
<td>See full paper above.</td>
<td>See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table. <em>Scales used:</em> Laissez faire leadership (Ozer, '12); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); Authoritarian leadership (Ertuteten, '08); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>Ethical Leadership and OID: Institutional ID Employee ID</td>
<td>( r = 0.29 ), ( r = 0.15 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>Ayan (2015)</td>
<td>See full paper above</td>
<td>See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table. <em>Scales used:</em> Laissez faire leadership (Ozer, '12); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); Authoritarian leadership (Ertuteten, '08); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.44 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demitras, Hannah, Gok, Arslan, &amp; Capar (2015)</td>
<td>440 employees from three aviation maintenance centres in Turkey.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Examined a proposed model whereby ethical leadership positively influences the level of meaning followers experience in their work, and the positive impacts that cascade to work engagement and organisational identification, as well as reducing workplace envy. <em>Scales used:</em> Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.44 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Allen &amp; Clayton (2016)</td>
<td>Study 1: n = 223 graduate students in a southeastern US university. Study 2: n = 244 working adults in the southeastern US.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.215), method and results: Examined the ideological resources (i.e. value-oriented principles) that are inherent in a leader-subordinate relationship, in addition to the typically explored transactional and relational resources. Predicted that the impact of ethical leadership on organisational commitment, job satisfaction, organisational identification would be greater for individuals within a more benevolent organisation. In Study 1, equity sensitivity moderated the influence of ethical leadership on organisational commitment and OID, with a positive relationship between ethical leadership and organisational identification established. In Study 2, where participants were randomly assigned to one of three leadership conditions (ethical leadership high, ethical leadership low and ethical leadership neutral), as predicted those who experienced favourable ethical conditions reported stronger organisational identification than those who experienced less favourable. <em>Scales used:</em> Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); OID—Mael &amp; Ashforth ('92).</td>
<td>Study 1: Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.44 ), ( r = 0.39 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership (high condition) and OID</td>
<td>Study 2: Ethical leadership (low condition) and OID</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical leadership (low condition) and OID</td>
<td>( r = -0.26 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalshoven, van Dijk &amp; Boon (2016)</td>
<td>156 employees in several Dutch organisations.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.500), method and results: Examined whether social exchange or social identity mechanisms drive the relationship between ethical leadership and unethical pro-organisational behaviour (UPB). Found a direct relationship between ethical leadership and UPB when followers have little autonomy. Also ascertained that ethical leadership relates to UPB via OID when followers have high autonomy. <em>Scales used:</em> Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); OID—Edwards &amp; Peccci ('07).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.40 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidbari, Fadaei &amp; Ebrahim (2016)</td>
<td>See full paper above.</td>
<td>See full description of paper in LMX section of this table. <em>Scales used:</em> LMX (Scandura &amp; Graen, '84); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, '05); OID—Ashforth &amp; Mael ('92).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>( r = 0.35 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OID = Organisational Identification. The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
Table 2.4: Quantitative Studies Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership and Organisational Identification, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population (including Country of Origin)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership, continued</td>
<td>Shu (2015)</td>
<td>341 employees from 4 enterprises in China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.229), method and results: Examined how psychological security and OID play a role in the relationship between ethical leadership and prohibitive voice. Multiple hierarchical regression analysis and structural equation modelling were applied. Scales used: Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino, &amp; Harrison, ‘05); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.58$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic (including authoritarian) leadership</td>
<td>Ayan (2015)</td>
<td>See full paper above.</td>
<td>See full description of paper in Full Range Leadership Model section of this table. Scales used: Laissez-faire leadership (Ozer, ‘12); Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, ‘05); Authoritarian leadership (Ertureten, ‘08); organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>Authoritarian leadership and OID; Institutional ID Employee ID</td>
<td>$r = 0.10$ $r = 0.14$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y. Wang, Tang, Naumann &amp; Wang (2017)</td>
<td>378 employees from a large bank in China.</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Examined the relationship between paternalistic leadership and employee creativity, identifying followers' organisational identification as a mediator and employee-perceived job security as a moderator. Categorised paternalistic leadership into three components: 1) moral leadership, 2) benevolent leadership, and 3) authoritarian leadership. Also found that followers' organisational identification mediated the relationship between the 'morality' component of paternalistic leadership and employee creativity. Scales used: Paternalistic leadership (Cheng, Huang, &amp; Chou, ’02; Cheng, Shieh &amp; Chou, ’02; Cheng et al., ’04; Cheng, Chou, Huang, Farth, &amp; Peng, ’04); organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (’92).</td>
<td>Moral leadership and OID; Benevolent leadership and OID; Authentic leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.10$ $r = -0.09$ $r = 0.11$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial leadership</td>
<td>Li, Zhang &amp; Tian (2015)</td>
<td>Study 1: Students (who also worked) of 3 universities in Southern China. 253 supervisors &amp; 407 subordinates (214 complete dyads). Study 2: 189 dyads from a Chinese telecommunications company. Abridged from abstract (p.13), method and results: Across two studies, tested a theoretical model explaining why and when self-sacrificial leadership might promote taking charge. Explored the differences in the boundary conditions for self-sacrificial leaders to influence taking charge and affiliation. Scales used: Self-sacrificial leadership (de Cremer &amp; van Knippenberg '04); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92).</td>
<td>Study 1: Self-sacrificial leadership and OID</td>
<td>$r = 0.39$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership orientation</td>
<td>Anand, Prasad, Sinha, &amp; Prahkya (2013)</td>
<td>244 participants in a strategic business unit, in an Indian IT business. Abridged from abstract (p.1), method and results: Explored the relationship between the peripheral vision need of top management and the organisation's capacity, their leadership orientations, and the organisational identification of employees as perceived by the knowledge workforce. No measure.</td>
<td>Leadership orientation and OID</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OID = Organisational Identification. The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
The individual variables examined in the quantitative studies included:

1. **cognitive and affective variables** (i.e. affectivity, creativity, employee engagement, employee loyalty (and neglect), followers’ implicit leadership theory [and congruence], intention to leave [or stay], perceptions of job autonomy, job tension, perceived leadership effectiveness, perceived organisational support, perceived psychological contract breach, perception of supervisor’s manipulative intention, psychological empowerment, organisational commitment, satisfaction [i.e. with job; leader’s performance], self-efficacy, spirituality and trust);

2. **behavioural variables** (i.e. customer service, employee voice, discretionary effort, feedback-seeking behaviour, knowledge-sharing, intrapreneurial behaviour, job crafting, pro-social organisational behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour, supervisor-specific avoidance, taking charge, unethical yet pro-social organisational behaviour, and other work-related behaviour);

3. **relational variables** (i.e. affiliation with peers and supervisors, attachment to leader, LMX, relational identification [i.e. with leader, team or profession], separateness-connectedness, work-to-family enrichment);

4. **health-related variables** (i.e. burnout, occupational coping) and

5. **outcome variables** (i.e. contextual performance [i.e. activities that are not directly related to, but set the scene for, task performance], and work performance).

The **organisational variables** explored included customer satisfaction and internal brand management. Another variable relating to leadership included leaders’ manipulative intention. It should be noted that the majority of quantitative studies will be given much attention in Chapter 3 of this thesis (i.e. Study 2), which will present the findings of the meta-analytic review.

As will be outlined subsequently, all quantitative studies employed survey methodologies and the majority yielded direct, positive, and significant relationships between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership models and follower organisational identification. Negative relationships between the two constructs were reported on only three models of leadership, in three separate studies (i.e. Humphrey, 2012; Molero, Moriano, & Shaver, 2013; Moriano, Moleri, Topa, & Lévy Mangin, 2014). It is noteworthy that the quantitative studies focused on the relationships between followers’ perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification (as
opposed to organisational identity, which was focused on in the qualitative and conceptual papers).

**Full-Range Leadership Model (including transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership) and organisational identification.**

**Transformational leadership.** In 18 of the 20 papers examining the relationship between transformational leadership and follower organisational identification, the relationship was reported as positive and significant (i.e. Buil, Martínez, & Matute, 2016; Carmeli, Atwater, & Levi, 2011; Effelsberg et al. 2014a & 2014b; Epitropaki, 2013; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Hansen, Byrne, & Kiersch, 2014; Horstmeier, Boer, Homan, & Voelpel, 2017; Krishnan, 2008; C-S. Lin, Huang, Chen, & Huang, 2015; Molero et al., 2013; Moriano et al., 2014; Rahn, Jawahar, Stone, & Scrimpshire, 2016; S.K. Schneider, George, Carroll, & Middleton, 2011; Schuh, Zhang, Egold, Graf, Pandey, & van Dick, 2012; Xu & Yuan, 2015; Zhu et al., 2012). The four components of transformational leadership, namely charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration (see B.M. Bass et al., 2008) were seen as positively related to fostering followers’ organisational identification. In behavioural terms, the actions undertaken by transforming leaders to raise consciousness about common organisational goals, encourage followers to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of the organisation, and aim to achieve goals broader than their own sphere of influence (B.M. Bass et al., 2008), were seen as positively related to organisational identification across these studies.

A number of these 18 studies explored additional variables in relationship to transformational leadership and followers’ organisational identification. Of significant interest to the current thesis is Horstmeier et al.’s (2017) meta-analytic review, synthesising quantitative research exploring the relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ identifications (i.e. organisational, team and leader). Yielding 73 suitable studies published between 1992 and 2013, the authors found positive relationships between transformational leadership and all three identifications. The link between transformational leadership and leader identification emerged as the strongest, enabling the authors to conclude that leader identification mediates the relationships between transformational leadership
and the other two identifications. Three individual papers also focused on other forms of identification: Carmeli et al. (2011) examined the relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ identification with their manager (i.e. relational identification) and their organisational identification. In two separate studies, Schuh, Zhang, et al. (2012) reported that transformational leadership enhanced leader organisational identification, which then cascaded to a positive relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ organisational identification. Finally, C.M. Liu, Zhu, and Yang (2010) examined the relationship between transformational leadership and social identification (measured using Mael and Ashforth’s 1992 scale of organisational identification) and personal identification, as well as the interrelationships between these constructs and employee voice and extra-role behaviour.

Six studies examined the interplay between transformational leadership, followers’ organisational identification, and employee behaviour—both desirable and undesirable—and corresponding performance (Effelsberg et al., 2014a & b; Hansen et al., 2014; C-S. Lin et al., 2015; H.J. Wang, Demerouti, & Le Blanc, 2017; Xu & Yuan, 2015): Organisational identification was seen to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and selfless pro-social organisational behaviour in a study conducted by Effelsberg et al. (2014a). These researchers extended their study (2014b) by exploring the relationship between transformational leadership and follower’s unethical yet pro-social organisational behaviour, demonstrating that followers’ organisational identification again served as a mediating mechanism. And Xu and Yuan (2015) investigated the links between transformational leadership and feedback-seeking behaviour, in addition to followers’ organisational identification as a potential mediator. They found that transformational leadership can enhance followers’ organisational identification, thereby increase frequency of feedback-seeking behaviour.

Differentiating between ‘authentic’ and ‘pseudo’ transformational leaders, C-S. Lin et al. (2015) explored the impact of pseudo-transformational leadership on contextual performance, with organisational identification as a mediating variable. The authors illustrated that when followers perceive their supervisor to have ‘high manipulative intention’ (p.179), this diminishes the
impact of group-level transformational leadership, as well as followers’ organisational identification and willingness to demonstrate contextual performance activities (i.e. activities that are not critical to performance, but nevertheless “shape the organisational, political and task context that serves as the critical catalyst for task activities and process” p. 181).

H.J. Wang et al. (2017) examined the relationship between transformational leadership and job crafting (i.e. pursuing resources and challenges, and minimising demands, p.185), and the moderating role of organisational identification. Their study yielded a positive but not significant result between transformational leadership and organisational identification. Interestingly, transformational leadership was linked to expansion-related job crafting (i.e. pursuing resources and challenges) mediated by adaptability, and this was more prevalent for employees with lower organisational identification.

Two studies investigated the connections between transformational leadership, follower organisational identification and engagement (in addition to other variables). Hansen et al. (2014) explored organisational identification as an “underlying mechanism” (p.953) for the relationship between perceptions of transformational leadership, engagement, and its association with commitment and job tension. Buil et al. (2016) explored the interrelationships between transformational leadership, internal brand management, followers’ organisational identification, engagement, and organisational citizenship behaviours, establishing that transformational leadership positively influenced organisational identification and engagement.

Focusing the importance of followers in the leadership equation, Rahn et al. (2015) found that transformational leadership influenced the quality of LMX. The researchers also established that LMX fully mediated the quality of followers’ implicit leadership theory congruence (i.e. the degree to which followers perceive their leader to fit with their pre-existing leadership schemas)—and perceptions of transformational leadership—on the dependent variables of turnover intentions, organisational identification and perceived organisational support. Finally, Krishnan (2008) extended research into the leadership-organisational identification relationship beyond the traditional corporate realm by exploring the role of spirituality in relation to the
constructs of transformational leadership and followers’ organisational identification, establishing that transformational leadership enhances spirituality, which in turn enhances organisational identification.

Only one of the 19 studies (Humphrey, 2012) found a negative relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ organisational identification—the “exact opposite” (p.260) of what was predicted. Humphrey offered the Social Identity Theory of leadership as a possible explanation: That is, because leadership is often inextricably linked to group membership, a leader’s prototypicality (Hogg, 2001; Rousseau, 1989; D. van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004) can afford them more power and influence—and, potentially, leeway—than their subscription to more proactive and positive leadership styles.

**Transactional leadership.** Eight quantitative studies examined the relationship between transactional leadership and followers’ organisational identification (the majority in addition to their focus on transformational leadership and organisational identification), with seven of these reporting positive and significant relationships between the two constructs (Epitropaki, 2013; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Kraus et al., 2015; Molero et al., 2013; Moriano et al., 2014; S.K. Schneider et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2012). The findings indicate that the transactions undertaken between a leader and follower—namely establishing an agreement about the work that needs to be undertaken and providing rewards (either psychological or material) upon satisfactory completion (B.M. Bass et al., 2008)—are related positively to organisational identification.

Humphrey reported a small negative relationship between transactional leadership and followers’ organisational identification in her 2012 study, however this result was not statistically significant therefore substantive conclusions cannot be drawn from this finding.

**Laissez-faire leadership.** Four quantitative studies examined the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and followers’ organisational identification, in addition to other aspects of the Full-Range Leadership Model. Both Molero et al. (2013) and Moriano et al. (2014) reported a negative relationship between laissez faire leadership and organisational identification, consistent with broader research which suggests that laissez-
faire leadership—described by Humphrey (2012) as “essentially the practice of non-leadership” (p.262)—has an inverse relationship to positive individual and organisational outcomes as compared with other leadership styles.

Contrary to expectations, two of the four studies that examined laissez-faire leadership reported a positive relationship with followers’ organisational identification. Ayan (2015) obtained a positive (but not significant) relationship in his investigation of the relationship between organisational identification and several leadership constructs (i.e. ethical, authoritarian and laissez-faire leadership). Humphrey (2015) attained a positive and significant relationship and, as with the negative relationship between transformational leadership and organisational identification obtained in the same study, refers to Social Identity Theory as a possible explanation. That is, if leaders are perceived as prototypical, they may not feel compelled to put as much effort into their leadership practice and may be able to leverage their similarity to others and the associated benefits of status and trust this affords. Humphrey also reported that, whist employees with laissez-faire leaders experienced greater organisational identification, they engaged in fewer organisational citizenship behaviours.

Leader-member exchange and organisational identification. In the 17 quantitative studies which explored the relationship between LMX and followers’ organisational identification, positive relationships were established (i.e. Carmeli et al., 2011; DeConinck, 2011; Farrell & Oczkowski, 2012; Katrinli, Atabay, Gunay, & Guneri, 2008; Kelidbari, Fadaei, & Ebrahim, 2016; Kumar & Singh, 2012; Kumar, Singh, Rai, & Bhattacharya, 2012; Lindsey Hall, Baker, Andrews, Hunt, & Rapp, 2016; Z. Liu, Cai, Li, Shi, & Fang, 2013; Loi et al., 2014; Lu, Shen, & Zhao, 2015; Rahn et al., 2016; Sluss et al., 2008; Sollitto, Martin, Dusic, Gibbons, & Wagenhouser, 2016; Stinglhamber et al., 2015; Tangirala et al., 2007; Trybou, Gemmel, Pauwels, Henninck, & Clays, 2014). These studies indicated that the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower—which can be a motivating exchange with both psychological and material benefits—relates positively to followers’ organisational identification.

A number of these studies explored other variables in addition to LMX and followers’ organisational identification. Five studies explored the
dynamics between LMX, organisational identification and perceived organisational support. Sluss et al. (2008) concluded that subordinates’ perceived organisational support mediated the relationship between LMX and organisational identification, in addition to reporting a positive and significant relationship between LMX quality and organisational identification. Trybou et al. (2014) found that organisational identification and professional identification moderated the relationship between perceived organisational support and extra-role behaviour, as well as reporting a significant direct relationship between LMX and organisational identification. Stinglhamber et al. (2015) investigated the mediating role of organisational identification on the relationship between perceived organisational support, LMX, job autonomy and affective commitment. Focusing on Chinese firms, Lu et al. (2015) discovered that LMX can mediate the relationship between psychological contract breach and organisational identification, and also organisational citizenship behaviours. And lastly, Kumar et al. (2012) focused on the relationship between the ‘humane orientation’ of organisations – as measured through perceived organisational support and organisational identification—and LMX, together with burnout and turnover intention, discovering that organisational identification mediated the relationship between the quality of LMX and burnout (as did perceived organisational support). The direct relationship between LMX and organisational identification was also reported as positive.

Five studies explored the relationship between LMX, followers’ organisational identification, and other leadership constructs. Tangirala et al. (2007) established that LMX had a greater impact on employees’ attitudes towards the organisation (including organisational identification) and its customers when leader-leader exchange was higher. As mentioned previously, Carmeli et al. (2011) established both direct and indirect (through LMX) relationships between transformational leadership and relational identification: relational identification was seen to promote organisational identification, resulting in a positive and significant relationship between LMX and organisational identification. Farrell and Oczkowski (2012) confirmed that the supervisor-employee relationship and employer-employee identification contributed to enhancing customer orientation and organisational citizenship
behaviours, as well as reporting a positive and significant relationship between LMX and organisational identification. And Rahn et al. (2016) established a positive and significant relationship between LMX and followers’ organisational identification, in addition to their research exploring transformational leadership (as mentioned above). Kelidbari et al.’s (2016) investigation of LMX, followers’ self-efficacy and organisational identification as mediators between ethical leadership and employee performance established positive relationships between the constructs.

Three studies examined the relationship between LMX, followers’ organisational identification and turnover, in addition to other individual variables. DeConinck (2011) discovered that LMX, organisational identification and performance were related indirectly to turnover through organisational commitment, reporting the relationship between LMX and organisational identification as positive. Whilst studying the effect of LMX on employee turnover, Z. Liu et al. (2013) also examined the direct and indirect effect of LMX on followers’ organisational identification (and the cascading effect on turnover), reporting a positive and significant relationship between LMX and organisational identification. And Kumar & Singh (2012) explored whether the perceived quality of the general environment of relationship exchange (in addition to the perceived quality of LMX) could predict turnover intention. Organisational identification was examined as a mediating variable and was found to mediate the LMX and turnover intention relationship, as well as the general environment of exchange and turnover intention relationship.

Lindsey Hall et al. (2016) drew on the social identity perspective of leadership, proposing and testing a model in which product and service quality served as antecedents to frontline organisational identification. LMX was considered a “boundary condition” (p.23) that would moderate the relationships between organisational identification and commitment, job satisfaction, and customer orientation “such that these relationships [would] be stronger under conditions of high LMX” (p. 30). The moderating effect of LMX on the relationships between organisational identification and commitment, and organisational identification and customer orientation were supported, but not regarding job satisfaction. Finally, Solitto et al. (2016) drew
on LMX theory to explore communication between student part-time employees and their supervisors. They found that LMX was significantly (and positively) related to organisational assimilation, followers’ organisational identification, work motivation, and career relevancy.

**Servant leadership and organisational identification.** Nine quantitative studies explored the relationship between servant leadership and followers’ organisational identification, reporting positive findings. Each of these studies also explored the interplay between these two constructs and other organisational variables.

Two studies examined the interrelationships between servant leadership, followers’ organisational identification and organisational citizenship behaviours (in addition to other organisational variables). Through the lens of social exchange theory, Jiang (2015) determined that servant leadership had positive effect on organisational citizenship behaviours and organisational identification, and that organisational identification played an intermediary role between the two constructs (p.42). Zhao, Liu, and Gao (2016) explored subordinates’ identification with their leader and organisation, and the corresponding impact of these “identification-based mechanisms” (p.898) on the relationships between servant leadership, organisational citizenship behaviours towards coworkers and turnover intention. The authors demonstrated that identification with one’s supervisor—and organisational identification—play a pivotal role in translating the impact of servant leadership to organisational citizenship behaviours and turnover intention (p.898). Importantly, they found the incidence of the two identifications to be sequential (i.e. identification with the supervisor was a prelude to organisational identification) (p.903).

Zhang et al. (2012) established a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership and followers’ organisational identification, and additionally determined that organisational identification mediated the positive relationship between servant leadership and work-to-family enrichment. Vondey (2010) revealed that servant leadership partially predicted organisational citizenship behaviours, and also found that the relationship between servant leadership and organisational citizenship behaviours was partially moderated by person-fit and organisational identification. And
Correia de Sousa and van Dierendonck (2014) found servant leadership related positively to work engagement during uncertain and ambiguous times, with organisational identification and psychological empowerment acting as mediating variables.

Akbari, Kashani, Nikookar, and Ghaemi (2014) explored the relationships between servant leadership, followers’ organisational identification and job involvement, establishing that servant leadership had a positive and significant effect on organisational identification and job involvement. Chughtai (2016) also established a positive relationship between servant leadership and organisational identification, whilst discovering that organisational identification and psychological safety partially mediated the effects of servant leadership on employee voice and negative feedback seeking behaviour.

Liden, Wayne, Liao, and Meuser (2014) designed, tested and established support for their model purporting that servant leaders influence others to display similar behaviours (p.1434), contributing to a service culture that influences organisational performance and employee attitudes and behaviours (i.e. job performance, creativity, customer service orientation and turnover intention). This ‘serving culture’ was seen to mediate the relationship between servant leadership and followers’ organisational identification.

And finally, Otero-Neira, Varela-Neira, and Bande (2016) examined how perceived organisational support and followers’ organisational identification mediated the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance. In addition to obtaining a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership and organisational identification, they determined that sales managers’ servant leadership is directly and positively related to salespeople’s organisation member performance.

**Authentic leadership and organisational identification.** In the seven papers exploring the relationship between authentic leadership and followers’ organisational identification, positive relationships were reported (with six of the seven relationships determined to be significant). Working with employees of Spanish companies, Edú Valsania, Moriano, and Molero (2014) found that employees’ organisational identification and organisational empowerment both mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and employees’
intrapreneurial behaviours, in addition to obtaining a significant direct relationship between authentic and organisational identification. Exploring the relationships between authentic leadership and follower attitudes, Fox, Gong, and Attoh (2015) establishing that authentic leadership leads to trust, mediated via personal identification and organisational identification.

Fallatah, Laschinger, and Read (2017) found that authentic leadership had a significant positive effect on new nurses’ personal identification with their leader, as well as their identification with the organisation. Further, they found organisational identification to have a significant positive effect on occupational coping self-efficacy, which subsequently reduced turnover intentions. García-Guiu, Molero, and Moriano (2015) established positive relationships between authentic leadership, organisational identification and group cohesion, whilst also confirming the effect of organisational justice as a mediating variable.

Two papers explored the interrelationships between authentic leadership, followers’ organisational identification, and less constructive aspects of organisational life: Kurt (2016) found a positive and significant relationship between authentic leadership and organisational identification, whilst also establishing that cynicism mediated the relationship between the two variables, with a negative effect. Monzani, Braun, and van Dick (2016) examined the relationship between authentic leadership and employees’ loyalty to their organisation, their likelihood to leave the organisation (i.e. exit), their willingness to voice (versus a tendency to remain silent and neglect) concerns, and the mediating effect of organisational identification. They established a positive and significant relationship between authentic leadership and followers’ organisational identification. Furthermore, they established positive relationships between authentic leadership and employees’ loyalty and exit, but found that in dilemmatic situations these effects would be cushioned by high organisational identification, as a result of conflicting loyalties (e.g. where an employee may feel disloyal to their leader by voicing concerns, but also be concerned about the longer-term interests of the organisation). The authors also determined that the influence of authentic leadership may be counter-productive if not complemented by a high organisational identification (p.246).
S.M. Lee, Lim, Swanson, Park, and Lee (2016) unexpectedly ascertained a non-significant relationship between authentic leadership and followers’ organisational identification when they examined these constructs in addition to leader trust, job performance and employee loyalty. They found that authentic leadership had significant effects on leader trust and job performance, but contrary to expectations did not impact organisational identification. Nevertheless, another dimension of leadership (i.e. leader trust) was found to have a positive and significant influence on organisational identification.

Charismatic leadership and organisational identification. Positive relationships were established in the six papers focusing on charismatic leadership and followers’ organisational identification: Wieseke et al. (2009) investigated the organisational identity-transfer model and found that the organisational identity-transfer process took place between senior managers and middle managers, with the effect cascading to the middle managers and their staff. The direct relationship between managers’ charismatic leadership and followers’ organisational identification was positive at the two leadership levels measured.

Two studies explored the impact of charismatic leadership on followers’ organisational identification in sales environments: Focusing on organisational identification agreement and organisational identification tension in sales manager-salesperson dyads, Kraus et al. (2015) determined that the direct relationship between sales managers’ charismatic leadership and followers’ organisational identification was positive. The authors also established that transactional leadership related positively to followers’ organisational identification. And Lindblom, Kajalo, and Mitronen (2016) studied the relationship between retailers’ charismatic leadership and frontline employee outcomes—including job satisfaction, self-efficacy, organisational identification and turnover intentions—establishing positive relationships between charismatic leadership and job satisfaction, self-efficacy and followers’ organisational identification. As anticipated, charismatic leadership had a inverse impact on employee turnover intentions.

Further contributing to cross-cultural leadership research, Lian, Brown, Tanzer, and Che (2011) investigated the applicability of Conger and
Kanungo’s (1998) definition of charismatic leadership in a Chinese context, examining its impact on followers’ job satisfaction, performance and organisational identification. They found that, although the factor structure of charismatic leadership was reproduced, some behaviours (i.e. animated public speaking) were not considered charismatic and therefore less effective in the Chinese context (p. 251). They also discovered that charismatic leadership was positively related to followers’ job satisfaction and performance, partially mediated by identification with the leader and followers’ organisational identification. A positive and significant direct relationship between charismatic leadership and organisational identification was established.

Xenikou (2016) explored the relationship between organisational identification, perceived organisational support values and charismatic leadership within the Greek public service, and found that charismatic leadership predicted affective (but not cognitive) organisational identification, whilst perceived organisational support was positively related to both forms of organisational identification. She also discovered the “significant interaction effect” (p. 567) of charismatic leadership and perceived organisational support values on affective organisational identification, as well as establishing positive associations between charismatic leadership and affective organisational identification in conditions of low support.

Lastly, and of particular interest to the current thesis, is the study undertaken by Rast, Hogg, and Giessner (2016) who examined the impact of charismatic leadership during times of organisational uncertainty. The authors argued that both change- and stability-focused leadership can be effective in times of flux (rather than just change-focused leadership), depending on the importance followers place on group membership and their levels of uncertainty. They found that followers who have a strong connection to the group tend to trust change-focused leadership (generalisable to charismatic leadership) when feeling uncertain, yet prefer stability-focused leadership when their uncertainty is low. Conversely, followers who place less psychological importance on the group tend to be less trusting of change-focused leadership when feeling uncertain. The authors focused specifically on the relationship between change-focused leadership and followers’
organisational identification in two of three studies, establishing a positive and significant relationship in one of the studies.

*Ethical leadership and organisational identification.* Six quantitative papers examined the relationship between ethical leadership and followers’ organisational identification: Demirtas, Hannah, Gok, Arslan, and Capar (2015) tested a model proposing that ethical leadership positively influences organisational identification (as well as work engagement) by enhancing the level of meaning followers experience in their work, ascertaining a positive effect between the two constructs. Shu (2015) found that psychological security and followers’ organisational identification mediated the relationship between ethical leadership and prohibitive voice (whereby organisational members feel inhibited to voice opinions and concerns). A positive and significant direct relationship between ethical leadership and followers’ organisational identification was also established in their study.

In two studies, Evans, Allen, and Clayton (2016) examined the ideological resources and value-oriented principles embedded within a leader-subordinate relationship (p. 215). In their first study, they established a positive relationship between ethical leadership and followers’ organisational identification, as well as ascertaining that ‘equity sensitivity’—“a predisposition to react in consistent but individually different ways to both perceived equity and inequity” (p. 217)—moderated the influence of ethical leadership on organisational commitment and followers’ organisational identification. In their second study, as anticipated, those who experienced favourable ethical leadership conditions reported stronger organisational identification than those who experienced less favourable.

Two studies explored the relationship between ethical leadership and organisational identification, alongside other leadership constructs: Kelidbari et al. (2016) explored the relationship between ethical leadership and employees’ performance, with LMX, followers’ self-efficacy and followers’ organisational identification as mediating variables. Positive relationships were found between ethical leadership and the three mediating variables (including organisational identification), with these mediating variables facilitating a positive effect of ethical leadership on job performance. Ayan (2015) examined the relationships among three styles of leadership (i.e.
ethical, laissez faire and authoritarian) and followers’ organisational identification, job performance, emotional exhaustion and work centrality. The researcher established that an ethical leadership style was positively and significantly related to organisational identification, job performance and work centrality. Both authoritarian and laissez faire leadership styles were also positively related to organisational identification, but only authoritarian yielded a statistically significant effect.

And finally, Kalshoven, van Dijk, and Boon (2016) explored the ‘dark side’ of ethical leadership, specifically whether social exchange or social identity mechanisms influence the relationship between ethical leadership and unethical pro-organisational behaviour. Whilst the researchers established a positive relationship between ethical leadership and followers’ organisational identification, they found that ethical leadership relates to unethical pro-organisational behaviour via organisational identification—by “evoking reciprocal and identification behaviour aimed at benefitting the organisation” (p.503)—when followers are able to operate autonomously.

Other models of leadership and organisational identification. For the separate studies that focused on leadership orientation, paternalistic leadership, authoritarian leadership, self-sacrificial leadership and organisational identification, the relationship between leadership and followers’ organisational identification was found to be predominantly positive:

Anand, Prasad, Sinha, and Prakhya (2013) investigated the organisational identification of employees and its relationship with the peripheral vision need and capability of top management (i.e. their predisposition and ability to see and anticipate future circumstances and their impact on the organisation, p.3), the organisation’s capability, and the leadership orientations of top management. The organisational identification of knowledge workers was enhanced if they perceived senior leadership to demonstrate strong knowledge management systems and strategic orientation.

Two studies examined the relationship between leadership and organisational identification from a cross-cultural perspective, investigating two types of leadership commonly employed in China. Y. Wang, Tang, Naumann, and Wang (2017) investigated the relationship between paternalistic leadership (comprising of moral leadership, benevolent
leadership, and authoritarian leadership) and employee creativity, examining. Followers’ organisational identification as a mediator between the two constructs. Positive and significant relationships were demonstrated between organisational identification and moral leadership, and organisational identification and authoritarian leadership. The negative relationship reported between benevolent leadership and organisational identification was not significant. Organisational identification mediated the relationship between moral leadership (i.e. where leaders serve as role models for others by operating with the utmost integrity, fulfilling obligations, and acting with a strong moral compass) and employee creativity.

In two studies based in Chinese organisations, R. Li, Zhang, and Tian (2015) tested a model examining how self-sacrificial leadership might encourage followers to take charge of activities within their organisation, with followers’ organisational identification explored as a mediating factor (along with risk aversion). Both studies yielded positive and significant relationships between self-sacrificial leadership and followers’ organisational identification. Finally, in his study exploring the relationship between organisational identification and several leadership styles, Ayan (2015) established a positive and significant relationship between authoritarian leadership and organisational identification.

2.4.1.2.2 Conceptual papers focusing on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

Three conceptual papers, as outlined in Table 2.5, focused on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification. Two of the three examined the relationship between transformational leadership and organisational identification: Dik, Byrne, and Steger (2013) explored the link between transformational leadership and relational identification and, by extension, organisational identification. Their research concluded with a model asserting that relational identification (and organisational identification) mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and meaningful work. Particularly pertinent to the focus of this thesis is the paper written by Vasilaki, Tarba, Ahammad, and Glaister (2016), exploring the ‘human element’ of M&A integration and the role of leadership. In this paper a conceptual framework is presented, focused on the moderating role of
transformational leadership on the attainment of human integration during M&A activity, as well as followers’ organisational identification (p. 2488). The authors asserted that transformational leadership behaviours moderate the implementation of human resource management activities during M&As, contributing to constructive employee behaviour and enhanced identification with the merged organisation.

One paper (van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016) explored the social identity approach to leadership, with a specific focus on the Chinese context. In addition to discussing the key underpinnings of leadership with a social identity lens—such as leader prototypicality and leader-identity transfer—the authors provided an insightful summary of the relationships between organisational identification and other work-related variables. They synthesised meta-analytic studies conducted on organisational identification to date (i.e. Riketta, 2005; Riketta & van Dick, 2005; E-S. Lee, Park & Koo, 2015), presenting average correlations for the relationships between organisational identification and AOC (~0.53), job satisfaction (~0.37), job involvement (~0.41), turnover intentions (~0.48) and in-role performance (~0.22) (p. 365).

Table 2.5: Characteristics of Conceptual Studies Focused on the Relationships between Leadership and Organisational Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership and its relationship to organisational identification</td>
<td>Dik, Byrne and Steger (2013)</td>
<td>Included a chapter by Walumbwa, Christensen and Muchiri (2013) that focused on the relationship between transformational leadership and relational identification, and by extension organisational identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity approach to leadership, including leader-identity transfer</td>
<td>van Dick &amp; Kerschreiter (2016)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.2488). Developed a conceptual framework focusing on the moderating role of transformational leadership on the attainment of human integration and organisational identification in M&amp;A integration. Maintained that communication, employee involvement, teamwork, and training and development positively impact on employee behaviour and organisational identification with the new organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.1.2.3 Studies focusing on the relationships between leadership and organisational identification – Summary

To summarise the findings from the studies focusing on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification, the breadth...
of constructs examined in relation to leadership and organisational identification—as antecedents, intervening variables, and outcomes—highlights that organisational identification is continuing to evolve as an important organisational construct, both in research and applied circumstances. Furthermore, the examination of more ‘established’ models of leadership (i.e. the Full-Range Leadership Model including transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership, authentic, charismatic, paternalistic and servant leadership, as well as LMX) alongside more contemporary models (i.e. leadership orientation, ethical and self-sacrificial leadership) reinforces that organisational identification has retained its relevance as an organisational construct since its inception three decades ago.

Additionally, rather than highlighting the efficacy of one leadership style over others, the studies illustrated that a range of leadership styles related positively to followers’ organisational identification, and corresponding organisational outcomes. Leadership behaviours that are common across the leadership models examined—such as inspiring a common vision and mission, effective and targeted communication, forging authentic and positive relationships with followers, the provision of support, and sustained efforts to transform both organisations and individuals—indicate that it is what leaders do and how they do it, rather than the particular model they ascribe to, that fosters organisational identification in followers.

2.4.1.3 Studies focusing on leadership and both organisational identity and organisational identification

Fifteen studies (14 conceptual and 1 mixed method) included in the systematic review focused on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification. These are outlined in Tables 2.6 and 2.7.

2.4.1.3.1 Conceptual papers focused on the relationships between both organisational identity and organisational identification

Overview of organisational identity and organisational identification literature. Two of the 14 conceptual papers (all of which are outlined in Table 2.6) provided an overview of organisational identity and organisational identification literature. Haslam and Ellemers (2011) provided a comprehensive overview of theory and research related to issues of identity
and identity processes, together with a discussion of their application to a range of organisational constructs, with a significant focus on leadership.

He and Brown (2013) outlined a taxonomy of four major approaches to organisational identity: functionalist, social constructionist, psychodynamic, and post-modern. In addition to providing recent summaries on the topics of organisational identity and organisational identification, with a lens of leadership, the authors consolidated the importance of these constructs in academic research and organisational practice. He and Brown (2013) also highlighted priorities for future research into organisational identity (i.e. how organisational identity can be utilised and managed in organisations, and its measurement as a research construct) and organisational identification (i.e. organisational identification in virtual contexts, its moderating impact on employee performance, the impact of corporate social responsibility on organisational identification, the relationship between other personal factors and organisational identification, the impact of other identities on organisational identification, and connections between organisational identification and self-related motives). Pertinent to the current systematic review is He and Brown’s comment that the body of literature focused on the relationships between leadership and organisational identification is “thin and has many unaddressed issues” (p. 18).

**LMX, organisational identity and organisational identification.** Four conceptual papers focused on LMX and its relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification. These papers explored relational identity and, by extension, organisational identity and organisational identification (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007, 2008); leader group prototypicality and the roles of uncertainty, leader fairness, leader-follower relationship, leader self-perceived prototypicality, and leadership of creativity and innovation (D. van Knippenberg, 2011); and a cross-level model describing how individual identities contribute to the development of organisational identities (B. Smith, Meyskens, & Wilson, 2014).

These papers focused more on the perceived quality of the exchange between leaders and followers, as distinct from other leadership models that concentrated on the characteristics and behaviours of leaders. As such, these papers support the Social Identity Theory of leadership that purports that
leadership is a construct that is ascribed by the group (D. van Knippenberg, 2011). Nevertheless, the papers also reinforced the importance of individual leadership behaviours such as effective and targeted communication, forging authentic and positive relationships with followers, and the provision of practical and emotional support, when establishing and fostering organisational identity and organisational identification.

*Leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification during change.* Two conceptual papers focused on the relationship between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification during changes such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures: Benton and Austin (2010) concluded that mergers can be viewed positively (i.e. as an opportunity to evolve and progress), or negatively with the loss of an organisation’s identity. Giessner et al., (2011) put the spotlight on corporate mergers, advocating that stronger post-merger identification results in reduced conflict and increased motivation (p. 333). Further, they described leadership activities that contribute to successful merger integration, including “influencing levels of identification, and addressing status and dominance differences of the involved organisations, as well as motivational threats and uncertainties” (p.333).

A common theme across these conceptual papers was the vital role organisational leaders play in shaping followers’ perceptions of organisational identity and organisational identification during change. As with the conceptual papers focusing on leadership and organisational identity, and leadership and organisational identification, organisational leaders were urged to prioritise discussions with staff regarding organisational change and the corresponding implications for the organisation’s identity. Additionally, leaders were encouraged to engage in substantive and sincere conversations with staff about what the organisational changes—including those associated with identity—meant for them at a personal level (i.e. in terms of impact on their personal, professional and team identities, potential threats to and loss of identity, the ambiguity associated with organisational and identity change, and potential power and status differentials associated with changes such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures) to guide them through the change process and continue to foster organisational identification.
Table 2.6: Conceptual Studies Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership, Organisational Identity and Organisational Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of organisational identity and organisational identification literature</td>
<td>Haslam and Eilemers (2011), He and Brown (2013)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.715). Reviewed theory and research related to issues of identity, and its application to leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, negotiation, productivity, stress and well-being. Defined identity at different levels, including individual, organisational and cultural. Abridged from abstract (p.3). Provided an overview of the literatures on organisational identity and organisational identification. Provided a taxonomy of four major approaches to organisational identity: (1) functionalist, (2) social constructionist, (3) psychodynamic and (4) post-modern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX and its relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification</td>
<td>Sluss and Ashforth (2007), Sluss and Ashforth (2008), B. Smith, Meyskens, &amp; Wilson (2014), D. van Knippenberg (2011)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.9). Explored relational identity and relational identification and, by extension, organisational identification. Abridged from abstract (p.807). Extended on their 2007 research and explored how the subordinate’s identification with the subordinate-manager role relationship (i.e. relational identification, RI) potentially converges with their organisational identification. Proposed that convergence occurs through cognitive, affective and behavioural mechanisms “including social influence, anthropomorphisation, personalisation, affect transfer, and behavioural sensemaking” (p. 807). Abridged from abstract (p.295). Presented a cross-level model describing how individual identities facilitate the creation of organisational identities. Also introduced the constructs of ‘organisational’ relational identity and identification by extending the individual-level construct of relational identity to the organisational level. Abridged from abstract (p.1708). Reviewed empirical research into leader group prototypicality, concluding that there is a sound basis for the key components of the social identity theory of leadership. Discussed the roles of uncertainty, leader fairness, leader-follower relationship, leader self-perceived prototypicality, and leadership of creativity and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification during organisational change</td>
<td>Benton and Austin (2010), Giessner, Ulrich, &amp; van Dick (2011)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.458). Examined the key components of successful mergers between non-profit organisations, responding to increasing competition and decreasing resources. Outlined that mergers can be viewed positively (i.e. as an opportunity to survive and improve services), or negatively with the loss of an organisational identity. Abridged from abstract (p.333). Focused on corporate mergers, advocating that stronger post-merger identification results in “less conflict and higher levels of motivation” (p.333). Outlined that employees often identify more strongly with their pre-merger organisations than with the merged organisation, and understanding the antecedents of employees’ identification with the merged organisation is crucial. Also described the roles played by leaders and managers of corporate mergers, who provide a path for successful merger integration by influencing levels of identification, and addressing status and dominance differences of the involved organisations, as well as motivational threats and uncertainties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theories of leadership and their relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification</td>
<td>Verbos, Gerard, Forshey, Harding, and Miller (2007)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.17). Focused on authentic leadership and its impact on ethical organisational identity and organisational culture, describing a “living code” as being “the cognitive, affective, and behavioural manifestation of an ethical organisational identity” (p.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders’ Emotional Intelligence influencing organisational identity and organisational identification</td>
<td>Prati, McMillan-Capehart, and Karriker (2009)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p.404). Explored how managers can leverage their emotional intelligence to foster relational identification and influence the culture of the organisation, in turn creating a strong organisational identity in followers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other theories of leadership and its relationship with organisational identity and organisational identification. Two other conceptual papers explored other theories and models of leadership and their relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification: Verbos et al., (2007) focused on authentic leadership and its relationship to ethical organisational identity and organisational culture. Prati, McMillan-Capehart, and Karriker (2009) discussed how leaders’ emotional intelligence can nurture relational identification, influence the culture of the organisation, and create a strong organisational identity in followers. These two papers also reinforced the important role that leaders play in fostering organisational identity and organisational identification—regardless of the leadership model they ascribe to.

Other perspectives on leadership and its relationship with organisational identity and organisational identification. Reinforcing the anecdotal evidence that the concepts of leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification are being applied to a wider range of organisational phenomena and variables, four papers proffered broader perspectives: Building on research focusing on the importance of narrative and discourse in constructing organisational identities, Remke (2013) focused on the relationships between leadership, organisational communication, the management of corporate reputation, organisational identity and organisational identification. Jaros (2012) took a post-modern approach to organisational identity by analysing ‘contextualist’ (defined as “anti-capitalist” and rooted in “Marxian intellectual tradition” p.47) and ‘discursive’ approaches to the study of identity. He provided a detailed critique and comparison of identity approaches, suggesting that “common ground [lies in] the importance of the workplace in shaping individual and collective identities” (p.51).

Peters, Haslam, Ryan, and Steffens (2015) proposed a conceptual model describing four phases of structured activities that leaders can undertake to develop an ‘organic’ organisational identity (p.94) that reflects its organisational constituents—including subgroup identities and the superordinate organisational identity. Their ASPIRe model (i.e. Actualising Social and Personal Identity Resources) was expounded, together with a measurement of corresponding organisational identification. Lastly,
Blackwood (2010) explored organisational identity and organisational identification in the context of collective action, and the union movement in New Zealand. Also focusing on leadership, this paper explored these concepts through an employee relations lens and considered how identities are politicised.

2.4.1.3.2 Mixed method paper focused on the relationship between both organisational identity and organisational identification

Table 2.7 outlines the key characteristics of the mixed method study that focused on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification: Ruediger Kaufmann, Vrontis, Czinkota, and Hadiono (2012) utilised mixed methods to explore organisational identification and leadership behaviours. Their research culminated in a theoretical model of corporate branding and brand-building behaviour, focused on ensuring alignment between organisational, brand and stakeholders’ identities, in which leadership “serves as the key integrating concept that incorporates and aligns” (p. 194).

Table 2.7: Characteristics of Mixed Method Study Focused on the Relationships Between Leadership, Organisational Identity and Organisational Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Paper</th>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders’ impact on developing organisational identity</td>
<td>Ruediger Kaufmann, Vrontis, Czinkota, and Hadiono (2012)</td>
<td>80 employees of a food company in Asia</td>
<td>Utilised a “triangulation approach” (p. 192), applying a case study, survey, telephone interviews and questionnaires.</td>
<td>Antecedent factors of behavioural branding were elicited, including leadership, marketing control and followers’ organisational identification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.1.3.3 Studies focusing on leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification – Summary

The conceptual papers included in the review highlighted how research into the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification has proliferated over the past three decades, and has been applied and/or considered alongside a broader range of societal, political, and organisational constructs. Either implicitly or explicitly, the conceptual papers describe organisational identity as the antecedent to organisational identification (i.e. that employees require an understanding of an organisation’s identity in order to foster a cogent organisational identification). This was also reinforced in the mixed method paper by Ruediger et al. (2012).
As with He and Brown’s (2013) summary of extant literature, these papers also signal opportunities for future research and application of the constructs.

2.5 Discussion

Leadership has been stated to play a positive role in establishing and fostering organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification. As ‘entrepreneurs’ (Haslam & Ellemers, 2011; Reicher et al., 2005), ‘custodians’ (Howard-Grenville et al., 2013; Schinoff et al., 2016) and ‘impresarios’ (Haslam et al., 2011; van Dick & Kerschreiter, 2016) of identity, leaders play a particularly critical role during times of change. However, variation in both leadership conceptualisation and metric is evident across existing studies, and the implications of this variation on the measured relationship between leadership and organisational identity and organisational identification had not been integrated prior to this thesis. Consequently, this study systematically reviewed and integrated the research conducted between January 2005 and May 2017 that focused on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change.

This systematic review focused on the following research questions:

1. What are the summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during organisational change?

2. How do the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification converge (and diverge) in their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change?

2.5.1 Summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during organisational change

The first key objective of this systematic review was to summarise the findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during change, focusing on research over the past decade (or so). Leadership was found to be strongly related to both organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification across studies: Regardless of whether research was conducted using quantitative,
qualitative, or conceptual methodologies, the relationships between the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification were considered meaningful and enduring. In particular, the relationship between leadership and followers’ organisational identification was substantiated through significant and positive relationships reported in the majority of quantitative studies. Notably, the Social Identity Theory of leadership provided theoretical underpinnings for many of the papers, rather than being a primary focus of the research.

Organisational change was seen as an important lens through which to examine the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification. However, none of the 65 quantitative studies specifically focused on, or quantitatively measured, dimensions of organisational change, suggesting opportunities for future research and development of metrics.

Of the 15 qualitative papers included in the review, seven examined leadership and organisational identity within the context of organisational change (Balser & Carmin, 2009; Bayle-Cordier et al., 2015; Golant et al., 2015; Puusa & Kekäle, 2015; Ravasi & Phillips, 2011; Walsh & Glynn, 2008, Xing & Lin, 2016). Another (Pant & Ramachandran, 2017) examined these constructs more organically in their longitudinal study of the identity dualities of a multinational organisation and its subsidiaries over a 50-year period. The one mixed method article (Ruediger Kaufmann et al., 2012) examined leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification in the context of broader environmental changes (rather than organisational change per se).

Of the 23 conceptual papers, six discussed the key research constructs with a focus on organisational change (Almog-Bareket, 2012; Benton & Austin, 2010; Dillon & Manz, 2016; Giessner et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2013; B. Smith, et al., 2014). Mergers, acquisitions, and strategic alliances provided the context for these conceptual papers (rather than service integration and joint ventures).
2.5.2 The constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification and their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change

The second key objective of this systematic review was to ascertain how the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification converge (and diverge) in their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change.

One of the key findings of this systematic review was the confirmation that the empirical studies focused on the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification diverge according to the construct measured and the research methodology used: All of the research studies included in the systematic review that focused on organisational identity (n = 15) employed qualitative research methods, whereas all of the research studies examining organisational identification (n = 65) employed quantitative methods. The one mixed method study that focused on both organisational identity and organisational identification (Ruediger Kaufmann et al., 2012) mirrored this divergence in research methods, as it also employed qualitative methods to examine organisational identity and quantitative methods to examine organisational identification.

The current findings related to organisational identity (i.e. that all included organisational identity studies employed qualitative methodologies) do not reflect a recent systematic review conducted by Foreman and Whetten (2016). In their review of the body of empirical research in organisational identity—with a specific focus on how organisational identity is measured or operationalised—five clusters of organisational identity methodology emerged: (1) narrative and discourse analysis; (2) grounded theory; (3) case study method; (4) survey data analysis; and (5) secondary data analysis. While Foreman and Whetten concluded that “Organisational identity research as a whole has been more qualitative than quantitative over time” (p. 51), two of the five clusters (i.e. survey data analysis and secondary data analysis) in their systematic review were quantitative. The fact that the organisational identity studies included in the current systematic review utilised the three qualitative methodologies cited by Foreman and Whetten, rather than the two quantitative, may potentially be because the current systematic review
examined a broader set of constructs and their relationship to organisational identity (i.e. leadership, organisational identification and organisational change).

Another possible explanation for the divergence between the methodologies used to examine organisational identity and organisational identification in the current systematic review, is that organisational identification has been examined predominantly by researchers in the field of organisational psychology—a conclusion drawn by noting the research journals the studies included in the systematic review were published in. Organisational psychologists’ orientation towards measurement and metric may have contributed to the focus on studying—and quantifying—organisational identification. Again, deduced from the origins of the research journals featuring the studies focused on organisational identity, organisational identity was examined by researchers from a broader range of disciplines such as management, marketing, communication, in addition to organisational psychology, who may have differing schemas associated with organisational identity (thus impacting on a consistent approach to measurement).

These findings also support the claims made by leading researchers in the fields of organisational identity and organisational identification who claim that organisational identification is a more tightly-defined—and therefore measurable—construct, whereas organisational identity is privy to multiple interpretations (Foreman & Whetten, 2016; He & Brown, 2013; Pratt, 2003; Whetten, 2006). This is reinforced by the research methodologies associated with the studies focused on organisational identification in the systematic review, which employed a small range of extensively used measures of organisational identification. Organisational identity was examined predominantly via case study research where qualitative themes about the organisation’s identity—from the perspectives of internal and external stakeholders—emerged. This divergence in measurement presents opportunities for future research into the quantitative assessment of organisational identity, potentially borrowing from measures of organisational culture and climate which are often seen as comparable constructs to organisational identity (Ravasi, 2016).
The current review also sought to determine whether a particular leadership model or style would prove more effective at fostering organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification than others. From a quantitative perspective, all but one of the eleven leadership styles explored in the systematic review (i.e. transformational, transactional, LMX, servant, authentic, authoritarian, charismatic, ethical, paternalistic, self-sacrificing) yielded positive and (and predominantly) significant effects on followers’ organisational identification. Laissez-faire leadership was the exception, in keeping with the established perspective that it is the practice of ‘non-leadership’ (B.M. Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Humphrey, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). What emerged was that transformational leadership and transactional leadership, and their relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification, were explored more frequently in the 65 quantitative studies, with LMX the next most frequent leadership style examined. Servant leadership was the fourth most frequent leadership style explored. The relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification will be explored further in the meta-analytic review in Study 2, in Chapter 3.

One possible explanation for the current focus on transformational and transactional leadership and LMX, is that the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and LMX scales are widely accessible and used in research circles; therefore, making transformational and transactional leadership and LMX obvious choices for research focused on leadership and organisational identification compared with other emerging styles (and corresponding measures) of leadership. As this area of research gains further momentum, it will be interesting to observe whether other leadership styles and their relationship to organisational identity and organisational identification in times of change are explored more thoroughly, including the development of metrics.

A convergent theme across studies focusing on organisational identity was the emphasis on the pivotal role that leaders play in the construction and evolution of organisational identity, focusing predominantly on what and how they communicate to foster and garner support for a shared organisational
identity. ‘Identity work’ within organisations was viewed as a key priority and an ongoing responsibility of leadership, often contentious, and not to be deferred until a permanent leader (or leadership team) was established. As mentioned in the body of this chapter, of note is the marked increase in categorisations of identity work, indicating that it is a topic of ongoing interest for researchers.

Researchers included in this systematic review urged organisational leaders to err on the side of ‘over-communication’, as well as to engage in substantive and sincere conversations about identity loss, ambiguity, and potential power and status differentials, to assist staff through complex and potentially disorientating organisational changes. The importance of forging authentic and positive relationships with staff, and the provision of practical and emotional support, were also viewed as critical leadership behaviours in the establishment and reinforcement of organisational identity and organisational identification.

The conceptual papers included in the review acknowledged the contribution of the Social Identity Theory of leadership to this field of research, highlighting how research into the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and organisational identification has proliferated over the past three decades, and has been applied and/or considered alongside a broader range of societal, political, and organisational constructs. Most notably in Haslam and Ellemers’ (2011) and He and Brown’s (2013) summaries of existing literature, these papers signalled opportunities for future research and application of the constructs: There is potential to further explore how organisational identity can be utilised and managed in organisations, and its measurement as a research construct. Additionally, there are opportunities to examine organisational identification in virtual contexts; its moderating effect on employee performance; its relationship with other organisational variables such as corporate social responsibility; and its relationship between other personal factors, other identities, and self-related motives. In the context of organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures, the constructs of multiple and hybrid identities merit further research, particularly in terms of how organisational members forge
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identification with more than one (and at times potentially competing) organisational identity.

2.5.3 Limitations of this research

One of the key limitations of this research is the timeframe set for the systematic review (i.e. January 2005-May 2017). Whilst set to provide a contemporary summary of extant research, it could have been expanded to take into account earlier research on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification.

Further, for quantitative studies included in the systematic review, it should be noted that (1) none included randomised control trials; and (2) whilst several studies were conducted over two or three time periods, none were longitudinal. Last, only studies published in English were included in the research, which meant that a number of studies uncovered in the initial screening could not be factored into the systematic review.

2.5.4 Theoretical and practical contributions of research

The current systematic review (i.e. Study 1) makes a theoretical contribution to research by collating, discussing and summarising studies focusing on leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during change. To summarise the key findings of this review:

1. Leadership was found to be strongly related to both organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification across studies. Of particular note, the relationship between leadership and organisational identification was substantiated through significant and positive statistical relationships reported in the majority of quantitative studies.

2. The empirical studies included in the systematic review diverged according to the constructs measured and the research methodology used: the impact of leadership on organisational identity was explored using qualitative methodologies, and the impact of leadership on followers’ organisational identification examined using quantitative methodologies.

3. The constructs of leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification were examined or considered alongside a broader range of societal, political, and organisational constructs, suggesting an
increasing appreciation of the value of such constructs, together with their capacity to facilitate a variety of positive outcomes.

4. Organisational change was seen as an important lens through which to examine the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification, but was not specifically focused on or quantitatively measured.

5. Additional categorisations of ‘identity work’ were proposed, indicating that it is a topic of ongoing interest for researchers, with the potential to provide organisations and their leaders with a broader range of strategies to foster organisational identity and organisational identification.

Furthermore, at the time of writing this thesis, this systematic review was the most encompassing in existence in its examination of a range of leadership styles and their impact on organisational identity and organisational identification. In addition to providing an integrated review of recent studies, this research highlights opportunities for further exploration to expand the body of knowledge on these constructs, as mentioned previously.

From a practical perspective, the current review highlights that the relationships between the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, and followers’ organisational identification were considered strong; most notably that leaders indeed influence followers’ perceptions of their organisation’s identity through their words and deeds, as well as having considerable bearing on followers’ sense of affinity to, and connection with, the organisation. Consequently, this study serves to reinforce the critical role that leaders play in fostering these organisational constructs, particularly during times of change.

Rather than highlighting the efficacy of one leadership style over others, the studies included in the systematic review clearly highlight the impact leadership behaviours can have on organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification, and corresponding organisational outcomes. Taken at face value, the research supports the premise that effective leadership during times of change is the conscientious, consistent (and at times courageous) practice of engaging genuinely with followers to influence them to achieve organisational outcomes, including encouraging them to adapt their personal, professional, and organisational schemas and practice.
Chapter 3: Study 2—The Relationship between Leadership Models and Follower Organisational Identification—Meta-Analytic Review

3.1 Introduction

The current chapter presents the results of a meta-analytic review conducted as an extension to the systematic literature review undertaken in Study 1. As Study 2, the meta-analytic review makes an important contribution to the literature by being one of the first to examine the strength of associations between a range of leadership models and follower organisational identification.

The systematic literature review supported the positive, meaningful and enduring relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification. As outlined in Chapter 2, one of the key findings of the systematic review was that all of the research studies that focused on organisational identity employed qualitative methods, whereas all of the research studies examining organisational identification employed quantitative methods. Consequently, Study 2 focuses on studies that examined correlations between followers’ ratings of their leaders’ demonstration of effective leadership models and followers’ identification with their employing organisation, and addresses the second aim of this thesis:

**Aim 2:** To estimate the correlation between leadership effectiveness and followers’ organisational identification using a range of different leadership models.

To date, no published meta-analyses have examined the relationship between follower perceptions of a range of leadership models and follower organisational identification. One meta-analytic study (i.e. Horstmeier et al., 2016) has explored the relationship between these two constructs, but has focused on only one model of leadership—transformational—and follower organisational identification. Therefore, this gap in the research provided an opportunity to make a unique contribution to the body of knowledge relating to these important constructs, by broadening the focus to examine the
relationship between a range of leadership models and follower organisational identification.

The research questions that are the focus of this chapter are:

- **Research Question 3:** What is the size of the correlation between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?

- **Research Question 4:** What are the effects of key moderators on the relationship between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?

### 3.1.1 Leadership

Previous chapters of this thesis have focused on defining leadership, as well as describing its evolution as a theoretical construct and its application in organisational contexts. The reader is invited to revisit Chapters 2 for an exposition of leadership theory and application. The development of quantitative measures of leadership has evolved in tandem with the evolution of leadership theory, and there is an abundance of psychometric tools available to measure leadership traits and behaviours (B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Cascio, 1991; Robertson, Bartam, Ditton, & Callinan, 2002; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Spector, 2008). These measures are applied in research environments, and increasingly employed within organisations as they seek to maximise the effectiveness of their leaders.

The current systematic review and meta-analysis provide an overview of the leadership measures employed over the past decade which have focused specifically on obtaining followers’ ratings of their leaders’ demonstration of effective leadership models (as distinct from ratings of a leader’s effectiveness undertaken by other internal and external stakeholders). The specific measures will be described in subsequent sections of this chapter. In this Study 2, these measures have been employed to quantify the strength of the relationship between followers’ perceptions of their leaders’ effectiveness and their identification with their employing organisation, and to understand how this relationship is moderated by the leadership model employed.
3.1.2 Organisational identification

As established in previous chapters of this thesis, organisational identification is considered a key construct in the fields of organisational psychology, organisational behaviour, communication and marketing, due to its impact on employee, team and organisational performance (including financial), satisfaction, well-being, low turnover intention, organisational citizenship behaviour, and other organisational outcomes (Ashforth et al., 2008; Edwards & Peccei, 2007). In essence, organisational identification is defined as an individual employee’s sense of connection to their organisation’s identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Patchen, 1970). Organisational identification can be measured using a range of scales including Edwards and Peccei (2007), Kreiner and Ashforth’s (2004), and Mael and Ashforth’s (1989, 1992, 1995) scales of organisational identification. For the purposes of Studies 1 and 2 undertaken as part of this thesis, the ratings of organisational identification pertain to the leaders’ followers’ identification with their employing organisation (in order to determine the impact of effective leadership models on follower organisational identification).

3.2 Method

The methodology associated with the systematic review has been described in detail in Chapter 2, including the information sources drawn from, the search terms, and the inclusion criteria for the systematic review. However, for completeness of this chapter, the key facets of the systematic review methodology are outlined below.

3.2.1 Information sources and search terms

A series of computerised librarian-assisted systematic searches were undertaken in the EBSCO databases Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS, PsycEXTRA, Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection, PsycINFO, and PsycTESTS using a broad search strategy to find peer-reviewed articles of relevance. Scopus and Web of Science databases were also searched using the same strategy. The EBSCO searches specified articles with publication dates from January 2005
to May 2017\textsuperscript{4}, that were published in peer-reviewed journals, with articles published in PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS and PsycINFO further limited to empirical studies. Searches conducted in Scopus and Web of Science specified articles with publication dates from January 2005 to present (i.e. the date of the searches—June 5\textsuperscript{th} 2017). Key articles were mined for references, and those hand-searched papers that met the inclusion criteria were included in the systematic review.

The search terms used were: “leader*” AND (“organis?ation* identity” OR “organis?ation* identification”) AND (“organis?ation* change” OR service integration OR (merger* and acquisition*) OR “joint venture*”). As mentioned, the systematic review search string is outlined Appendix A.1.1.

\subsection*{3.2.2 Study selection}

\subsubsection*{3.2.2.1 Inclusion criteria for systematic review}

For purposes of the current research, papers were included in the systematic literature review if they:

- identified the exploration of leadership and its relationship to organisational identity and/or organisational identification as key components of their research question(s)\textsuperscript{5};
- were published in peer-reviewed journals;
- presented empirical studies that incorporated quantitative and/or qualitative research design; or
- presented theoretical or discourse papers by peer leaders in the field of organisational identity and organisational identification.

\subsubsection*{3.2.2.2 Inclusion criteria for meta-analysis}

For the purposes of the meta-analysis, quantitative papers were the primary focus. Thus, the meta-analysis focused on the relationship between follower perceptions of leadership models and follower organisational identification, \textit{not} organisational identity. Papers were included if they provided an estimate of the correlation between followers’ ratings of their leader’s demonstration of an effective leadership model and follower

\textsuperscript{4} As outlined in Chapter 2 describing the systematic review, the year 2005 was seen as an appropriate starting point, as it was the year of Riketta’s (2005) meta-analytic study of organisational identification. The systematic review was limited to research conducted between 2005 and May 2017 in order to provide a concise summary of research over the past 12 years.

\textsuperscript{5} To ensure all suitable quantitative studies were included, all studies examining the relationship between leadership and organisational identification were included in the initial screening of studies.
organisational identification, or statistics from which a correlation could be derived. Specifically, for a study to be included required:

- a single measure of a leadership model (as opposed to aspects of a leadership model) focused on leadership behaviours directed towards influencing followers to achieve outcomes; and

- a single measure of follower organisational identification (again, as opposed to sub-components of organisational identification).

It should be noted that the relationship between follower perceptions of LMX and organisational identification was explored in 15 of the 65 quantitative studies in the systematic review. However, for the purposes of the meta-analysis LMX was not considered a measure of leadership per se, rather a measure of the quality of relationship between leader and follower (notwithstanding that LMX will be determined in part by the style and efficacy of the leader). While these studies were included in the systematic review, they were excluded from the meta-analysis.

3.2.2.3 Additional studies sourced for meta-analytic review

To mitigate against publication bias, suitable theses and dissertations were sourced via the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global database. Using the search terms “lead*” and “organis?ation* identification” for the time period January 2005-May 2017 (inclusive), five theses were obtained that met the meta-analytic inclusion criteria (i.e. quantitatively measured the relationship between leadership and organisational identification).

3.2.3 Studies included in the meta-analysis

Of the articles sourced, 104 met the inclusion criteria for the systematic review. Sixty-five of those papers were quantitative and reported a correlation between leadership models and organisational identification (i.e. followers’ ratings of their leaders’ demonstration of an effective leadership model and follower organisational identification). Of those 65 quantitative papers, 41 met the inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis, to which five dissertations were added that had not been published in peer-reviewed journals, but reported studies that met the inclusion criteria (i.e. Carter, 2016; Einstein, 2013; Galvin, 2010; G. Wang, 2011; Wolfe, 2007). To this end, the number of papers included in the meta-analytic review totalled 46. Of these studies 23 focused on facets of the Full-Range Leadership Model (i.e. transformational,
transactional and / or laissez faire leadership), seven examined authentic leadership, six focused on ethical leadership, five papers explored servant leadership, four papers focused on charismatic leadership (one of which, Kraus et al., 2015, also explored transactional leadership); and one paper examined self-sacrificial leadership. Several papers contained more than one study, thus reporting more than one correlation between followers’ perception of leadership and follower organisational identification.

Overall, 50 studies yielded 63 correlations contributing to the meta-analysis (N = 22,893). As mentioned previously, these correlations were between (1) followers’ ratings of their leaders’ demonstration of effective leadership models and (2) followers’ identification with their employing organisation.

### 3.2.4 Variables ascertained from each study

The following general characteristics were ascertained from each paper: (1) year of publication, (2) source of publication (journal article, book, or thesis), (3) authors, and (4) title. For each study within each paper, the following characteristics were recorded: (i) sample size; (ii) characteristics of population sample (i.e. age, gender and occupation of participants, the industries they worked in); (iii) country in which the study was conducted; (iv) study design, including leadership models examined, the scales used for measuring follower perceptions of leadership models, follower organisational identification and their reliabilities; and (v) key results (i.e. correlation between measures of perceptions of leadership models and follower organisational identification).

### 3.2.5 Computation and analysis of correlations

In the majority of studies, correlations between followers’ perceptions of their leaders’ demonstration of leadership models and follower organisational identification are reported. However, one study (S.K. Schneider et al., 2011) reported t-scores, which were transformed into correlations using a standard formula.

The statistical software R (R Core Team, 2016) and the meta-analytic package metafor (Viechtbauer, 2010) were used to conduct random-effects analysis and meta-regression. In accordance with Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) meta-analytic methodology, individual correlations were corrected for
attenuation due to measurement error. The reliabilities reported for each sample (i.e. for both leadership and organisational identification measures) were used for this procedure. All reliability scores met or exceeded 0.7.

For the three studies measuring passive-avoidant (laissez-faire) leadership (Humphrey, 2012; Molero, et al., 2013; Moriano et al., 2014), the direction of the correlation was reversed when the data was entered into R, so that it was consistent with the other data. The rationale for the reversal was that passive-avoidant leadership—described by Humphrey (2012) as “essentially the practice of non-leadership” (p.262)—thus higher scores indicated less ‘leadership’, meaning that an inverse relationship to positive individual and organisational outcomes would be expected.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 Characteristics of studies

Table 3.1 contains a listing of the 46 studies included in the meta-analysis, their characteristics and the raw correlations between leadership models and organisational identification. A more comprehensive description of these studies is reported in Study 1 (Systematic Review, see Chapter 2).

3.3.1.1 Country of origin

The 46 studies included in the meta-analytic review originated from 16 countries: 14 were from North America (i.e. USA and / or Canada), eight were from China, with one of the papers also including participants from Taiwan in the same population sample; five were from Germany; five were from Spain; and two were from Greece. Individual studies originated from Australia, Finland, India, Iran, Israel, Korea, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Turkey. Two papers did not specify the origin of their research.

3.3.1.2 Industry

A range of sectors and industries were represented in the included studies, encapsulating education, health, hospitality, finance, information, communications and technology (ICT), manufacturing, research and development (R&D), and retail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Range Leadership Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buil, Martínez, &amp; Matute (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Hospitality Country = Spain</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Transformational leadership—Carless, Wearing &amp; Mann (2000); Organisational identification (OID)—Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmeli, Atwater, &amp; Levi (2011)</td>
<td>Industry = R&amp;D Country = Israel</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Transformational leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effelsberg, Solga &amp; Gurt (2014a)</td>
<td>Industry = Range Country = Germany Study 1:</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Transformational leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effelsberg, Solga &amp; Gurt (2014b)</td>
<td>Study 2: Industry = Range Country = Germany</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Transformational leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitropaki (2013)</td>
<td>Industry = Range Country = Greece</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Transformational leadership and transformational leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitropaki &amp; Martin (2005)</td>
<td>Industry = Finance Country = Greece</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Transformational leadership and transactional leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Byrne &amp; Kiersch (2014)</td>
<td>Industry = Not stated Countries – USA and Canada</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>Transformational leadership—Rafferty &amp; Griffin (2004); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey (2012)</td>
<td>Industry = Not stated Country = USA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Transformational leadership, transactional leadership and passive-avoidant leadership—B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also see correlations for charismatic leadership and OID below*

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Table 3.1: Characteristics of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krishnan (2008)</td>
<td>Industry = Education Country = India</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Transformational leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, &amp; Popper (*98)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molero, Moriano, &amp; Shaver (2013)</td>
<td>Industry = Education Country = Spain</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Transformational leadership, transactional leadership and passive-avoidant leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Doosje, Ellemers &amp; Spears (1995)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriano, Molero, Topa, &amp; Lévy Mangin (2014)</td>
<td>Industry = Range Country = Spain</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Transformational leadership, transactional leadership and passive-avoidant leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TAL and OID</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuh, Zhang, Egold, Graf, Pandey, &amp; van Dick (2010)</td>
<td>Industry = Retail Country = Australia Study 1:</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Transformational leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry = Germany Country = China Study 2:</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Transformational leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.K. Schneider, George, Carroll, &amp; Middleton (2011)</td>
<td>Industry = Retail Country = USA Study 2:</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Transformational leadership and transformational leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu &amp; Yuan (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Range Country = China</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Transformational leadership — C. Li &amp; Shi (2005); Organisational identification — Mael &amp; Ashforth (*92)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Hu, Sosick, Riggion, &amp; Yang (2012)</td>
<td>Industry = ICT Country = USA</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>Transformational leadership and transformational leadership — B.M. Bass &amp; Avolio’s (1997) MLQ 5x (Short); Organisational identification — Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>TFL and OID</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFL = Transformational Leadership; TAL = Transactional Leadership; OID = Organisational Identification; PAL = Passive Avoidant Leadership (also known as Laissez-Faire Leadership). The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Table 3.1: Characteristics of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authentic Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstein (2013)</td>
<td>Industry = Finance, Country = USA</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, 2005); Organisational identification—Smidts, Pryun, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Allen &amp; Clayton (2016)</td>
<td>Study 1: Industry = Range, Country = USA</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, 2005); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (‘92)</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: Industry = Range, Country = USA</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Ethical leadership measured via a series of vignettes, where participants read a scenario regarding a hypothetical leader and were asked to rate the leader as possessing ‘high’, ‘low’ or ‘neutral’ ethical leadership; Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>Ethical leadership (high) and OID</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical leadership (low) and OID</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidbari, Fadaei &amp; Ebrahimi (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Education, Country = Iran</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Ethical leadership (M.E. Brown, Trevino &amp; Harrison, 2005); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>Ethical leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OID = Organisational Identification. The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
### Table 3.1: Characteristics of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Leadership, continued:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charismatic Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindblom, Kajalo &amp; Mitronen (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Retail Country = Finland</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Charismatic leadership—Vlachos, Panagopoulos, &amp; Rapp (2013); Organisational identification—Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>Charismatic leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Servant Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otero-Neira, Varela-Neira, Bande (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Range Country = Not stated</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Servant Leadership Scale—Ehrhart (2004); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao, Liu, Gao (2016)</td>
<td>Industry = Hospitality Country = China</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Servant Leadership Scale—truncated version of Liden et al (‘08); Organisational identification—Smidts, Pruyn, &amp; van Riel (2001)</td>
<td>Servant leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OID = Organisational Identification. The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
Table 3.1: Characteristics of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: Industry = ICT Country = China</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Self-sacrificial leadership (de Cremer &amp; van Knippenberg 2004); Organisational identification—Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>Self-sacrificial leadership and OID</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OID = Organisational Identification. The correlations presented are those provided by the researchers (and are not corrected for reliability).
3.3.1.3 Study design

All studies employed questionnaires—completed by the followers of leaders—to assess the constructs of leadership effectiveness (as per leadership models) and follower organisational identification. The majority of studies employed confirmatory factor analyses, and all studies provided support for the validity (i.e. construct, convergent, and / or divergent) and reliability (i.e. composite, individual, and / or internal consistency) of the measures used.

Eight models of effective leadership were measured: transformational; transactional laissez-faire / passive-avoidant; servant; authentic; charismatic; ethical and self-sacrificial. Follower organisational identification was measured using a range of scales (i.e. Mael & Ashforth, 1992, 1995; Shamir & Kark, 2004; Smidts, Pruyn, & van Riel, 2001), as were a range of other individual and organisational variables (as described subsequently). The ‘Mael scale’ (Mael & Ashforth, 1992, 1995) continued to be the predominant measure of follower organisational identification, with 28 of the 46 studies employing this scale in their research.

3.3.1.4 Participants

Across the 46 papers (totalling 50 separate studies), there was a total of 17,178 participants. Female respondents represented 52.89% of participants. The mean age across the studies (for those that provided such data) was 34.90 years. Both of these calculations were weighted according to study sample size. Participants held a range of occupations, including senior, middle and line management roles, professional roles across industries and sectors, and front line roles across industries and sectors.

3.3.2 Overall correlation of the relationship between models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification

Two random effects meta-analyses were conducted to examine the overall correlation between models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification, encompassing all of the eight leadership models examined by studies included in the meta-analytic review. To provide a “sensitivity analysis” (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009), the first meta-analysis was conducted without correcting for error of measurement, and the second meta-analysis utilised the reliability coefficients provided to correct for error of measurement. These meta-analyses were
conducted utilising the 63 correlations provided for the relationship between followers’ ratings of their leaders demonstration of models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification.

### 3.3.2.1 Random-effects model not corrected for error of measurement

First, a random effects meta-analysis was conducted without correcting for error of measurement. The random-effects model obtained is outlined in Appendix B.1.1, and the forest plot for the analysis is presented below in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1: Forest plot for random effects model (not corrected for error of measurement)](image)

The analysis resulted in an average pooled correlation of $r = 0.36$, 95% CI $[0.32, 0.41]$, $p < .0001$, $\tau^2 = 0.03$, SE = 0.01, which indicates that followers’ perceptions of effective leadership are moderately associated with
followers’ organisational identification (Cohen, 1992). The Cochran's Q test of heterogeneity indicated significant variation in the strength of this association between studies ($Q(df = 62) = 1047.12, p < .0001$). Examination of this variation indicates that a substantial proportion of the variability in the observed effects is likely due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error ($I^2 = 93.80\%$).

The funnel plot for the random effects meta-analysis is presented in Figure 3.2. The regression test for funnel plot asymmetry found a significant correlation between the sample size and mean raw correlation: $z = -4.09, p < .0001$, which indicates the potential presence of publication bias (Rothstein, Sutton, & Borenstein, 2006).

![Figure 3.2: Funnel plot for random effects model (not corrected for error of measurement)](image)

### 3.3.2.2 Random-effects model corrected for error of measurement

A second random effects meta-analysis was conducted on the correlations provided for the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, correcting for
error of measurement. One of the studies did not provide reliability coefficients for the measure of leadership used (i.e. Evans et al., 2016) therefore 62 (rather than 63) correlations were included in this model. The random-effects model obtained is outlined in Appendix B.1.2 and the forest plot is presented below in Figure 3.3.

![Forest plot for random effects model (corrected for error of measurement)](image)

Figure 3.3: Forest plot for random effects model (corrected for error of measurement)

The average pooled correlation when corrected for attenuation was $r = 0.47$, 95% CI $[0.41, 0.54]$, $p < .0001$, $\tau^2 = 0.04$, $SE = 0.01$, which again indicates that followers’ perceptions of effective leadership are moderately associated with followers’ organisational identification (Cohen, 1992). As

---

6 In Study 2, Evans et al. (2016) measured ethical leadership via a series of vignettes, where participants read a scenario regarding a hypothetical leader and were asked to rate the leader as possessing ‘high’, ‘low’ or ‘neutral’ ethical leadership (see p.21 & p.22).
with the uncorrected meta-analysis, the Cochran’s Q test of heterogeneity indicated significant variation in the strength of this association between studies (\(Q(df = 61) = 1033.41, \ p < .0001\)). Examination of this variation indicates that substantial proportion of the variability in the observed effects is likely to be due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (\(I^2 = 93.92\%\)).

The funnel plot for the corrected random effects meta-analysis is presented in Figure 3.4. The regression test for funnel plot asymmetry found a significant correlation between the sample size and mean corrected correlation: \(z = -3.67, \ p = 0.0002\), which indicates the potential presence of publication bias (Rothstein et al., 2006).

Figure 3.4: Funnel plot for random effects model (corrected for error of measurement)

### 3.3.3 Effect of moderators on the relationship between leadership on organisational identification

Three meta-regression analyses were undertaken on the corrected correlations, using Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) methodology, on key categorical moderator variables (i.e. leadership type, industry, and region the research was conducted in). These analyses were undertaken to examine the
influence of the moderator variables on the mean correlation, using regression-based techniques (Thompson & Higgins, 2002; van Houwelingen, Arends, & Stijnen, 2002).

### 3.3.3.1 Analyses with the categorical moderator ‘leadership type’

The model describing the results of the mixed-effects meta-analysis with ‘leadership type’ as a categorical moderator is outlined in Appendix B.1.3. As outlined previously, the eight leadership types examined by studies in the meta-analysis were: authentic, charismatic, ethical, passive-avoidant (laissez-faire), self-sacrificial, servant, transactional, and transformational.

The omnibus test of the moderator found that there was a significant effect of leadership type on organisational identification ($QM (df = 7) = 18.58, p = .0096$), indicating significant between-group differences for leadership type. The $R^2$ indicated that 32.92% of the total amount of heterogeneity could be accounted for by including the eight levels of the leadership moderator in the model. The test for residual heterogeneity indicated significant variation in the strength of this association between studies ($QE (df = 54) = 723.35, p < .0001$), possibly indicating that other moderators not considered in the model are influencing the relationship between leadership and organisational identification.

Subgroup meta-analyses were undertaken for each leadership type separately, using the corrected data. Table 3.2 outlines the correlations – and corresponding statistics – for each leadership type examined. Large mean correlations were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between follower organisational identification and ethical, transactional, and transformational leadership. Moderate mean correlations (corrected for attenuation) were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between follower organisational identification and the four of the eight leadership types: **authentic** leadership, **charismatic** leadership, **self-sacrificial** leadership, and **servant** leadership. The relationship between **passive avoidant** (or laissez-faire) leadership and follower organisational identification was not statistically significant.
Table 3.2: Mean Correlation between Leadership and Organisational Identification by Leadership Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI Lower Bound</th>
<th>CI Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sacrificial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: k = number of studies; N = group sample size; r = mean correlation (corrected); se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%).

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

3.3.3.1 Pairwise comparisons with the categorical moderator leadership type

Post-hoc pairwise comparisons were undertaken with leadership type to examine the basis for the moderator effect, which are presented in Appendix B.1.4. The Shaffer method was used to adjust p values for multiple comparisons. There was a significant difference in the mean correlation between charismatic leadership and both transactional leadership (z = 3.01, p = .02) and transformational leadership (z = 2.69, p = .04). There were also significant differences in the average effect between passive avoidant leadership and ethical leadership (z = 2.64, p = .04), transactional leadership (z = 3.07, p = .01), and transformational leadership (z = 2.72, p = .04).

3.3.3.2 Analyses with the categorical moderator ‘industry’

Appendix B.1.5 presents the model outlining the results of the mixed effects meta-analysis with ‘industry’ as a categorical moderator. As outlined previously, the ten industry types examined by studies in the meta-analysis were: education, finance, health, hospitality, information and communication technology (ICT), manufacturing, retail, R&D, a range of industries, and ‘not stated’. The omnibus test of the moderator found that there was a significant effect of industry type on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification ($QM \ (df = 9) = 22.78, p = .0067$), indicating significant between-group differences for industry type.

Overall, 43.71% of the observed heterogeneity was accounted for by including the ten industry moderators in the model. However, the test for residual heterogeneity indicated that there was still significant variability in
the correlations not accounted for by industry \( (QE\ (df = 52) = 608.82,\ p < .0001) \), possibly indicating that other moderators not considered in the model are influencing the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification.

Sub-group meta-analyses were also undertaken for each industry type separately, utilising the data corrected for attenuation. Table 3.3 outlines the correlations and corresponding statistics for each industry type examined. Large and statistically significant correlations were obtained via the random effects meta-analyses conducted for two of the ten industry groups: the three studies which focused on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification in organisations in the \textit{ICT} industry and the two studies that examined the relationship in the \textit{manufacturing industry}.

Moderate correlations were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification in six of the ten industry groups: education, finance, health, hospitality, research and development (R&D), and a range of industries. Two industries yielded small correlations: retail and industry not stated.

Table 3.3: Summary of Correlations for Studies Conducted Within Particular Industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( se )</th>
<th>( z )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>CI Lower Bound</th>
<th>CI Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.51 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.64 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.67 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.95 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.70 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.45 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.55 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.49 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \( k \) = number of studies; \( N \) = group sample size; \( r \) = mean correlation (corrected); \( se \) = standard error; \( z \) = \( z \)-value; \( p \) = \( p \)-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** \( p < .001 \); ** \( p < .01 \); * \( p < .05 \).
3.3.3.2.1 Pairwise comparisons with the categorical moderator industry type

Post-hoc pairwise comparisons were undertaken with industry type. The results of these comparisons are shown in Appendix B.1.6. There was a significant difference in the mean correlation between the ICT industry and both the retail industry \((z = -3.97, p = .0007)\) and ‘industry not stated’ \((z = -3.65, p = .002)\). There were also significant differences in the average effect between ‘retail’ and ‘a range of industries’ \((z = 2.77, p = .04)\).

3.3.3.3 Analyses with the categorical moderator ‘region’

Appendix B.1.7 outlines the model presenting the results of the subgroup meta-analysis with ‘region’ as a categorical moderator. The 16 countries that contributed to studies in the meta-analysis were clustered into six regions: Asia, Europe, the Middle East, North America, the Pacific and Not Stated. The omnibus test of the region moderator was not significant \((QM (df = 5) = 3.58, p = .62)\). Overall, 5.62% of the observed heterogeneity was accounted for by including the six levels of the region moderator in the model.

3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Overall correlation of the relationship between models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification

As expected, the meta-analyses indicated that followers’ ratings of their leaders’ demonstration of effective leadership models were moderately associated with their organisational identification. This expectation was established through early literature reviews during the formulation of this thesis topic, and supported via the systematic literature review described in Chapter 2, which revealed that the relationship between followers’ perceptions of their leader and their organisational identification was meaningful and enduring regardless of whether research was conducted using quantitative, qualitative or conceptual methodologies.

3.4.2 Effect of categorical moderators on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

Analyses were conducted with three categorical moderators: leadership type, industry and region, to determine whether any had a significant influence on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and
followers’ organisational identification. These analyses all used the corrected data.

3.4.2.1 The effect of leadership type on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

There was a significant effect of leadership type on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership models and follower organisational identification, indicating significant between-group differences for leadership type and prompting subsequent analyses. The largest correlations with follower organisational identification were observed for ethical leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Moderate correlations with follower organisational identification were observed for authentic leadership, charismatic leadership, self-sacrificial leadership, and servant leadership. These results were consistent with the expectations that a range of leadership styles would be positively associated with followers’ organisational identification. As expected, the leadership styles that focused on a leader’s ability to inspire, clearly articulate expectations (regarding both performance and conduct), foster meaningful relationships, and support followers’ professional and moral development, were positively related to follower organisational identification. However, as will be outlined when the limitations of this research are discussed subsequently, these correlations imply a relationship rather than causality, and should be interpreted as such.

The relationship between passive-avoidant (or laissez-faire) leadership and follower organisational identification was not significant. This finding is consistent with broader research which suggests that passive-avoidant leadership does not contribute to positive individual and organisational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and productivity (B.M. Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yammarino et al., 1993), as compared with other leadership styles.

Interestingly, when the leadership models with the largest correlations (i.e. ethical, transformational and transformational leadership) were compared and contrasted, some commonalities between dimensions of ethical and transformational leadership were apparent—specifically, the ‘idealised influence’ component of transformational leadership, which examines a
leader’s consideration of the moral and ethical consequences of decisions (B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004), which is akin to ethical leadership. However, the measures of transactional leadership—which focus on the leader providing clarity on performance expectations and corresponding rewards (B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004)—were quite different, again indicating that a range of approaches to leadership are positively related to followers’ organisational identification.

When the leadership models with moderate correlations (i.e. authentic, charismatic, self-sacrificial and servant) were compared and contrasted, there were common themes regarding leaders drawing on their interpersonal and communication skills to connect with their followers in a meaningful way. There were also similarities between the dimensions measured in several of the leadership models (i.e. authentic and servant leadership both examine ethical principles and encouraging self-determination in followers, and self-sacrificial and servant leadership both examine putting the interests of followers ahead of a leader’s own). However, there was also considerable variability in what the models emphasised and measured, again suggesting that a range of approaches to leadership can positively influence followers’ organisational identification.

When all seven leadership models that yielded positive correlations with follower organisational identification (i.e. both large and moderate correlations) were compared and contrasted, it appears that—as its name suggests—the Full Range Leadership Model (B.M. Bass, 1985; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1997; B.M. Bass et al., 2008), and its measures of transactional and transformational leadership share commonalities with the other leadership models included in the meta-analytic review. Specifically, the following dimensions of transformational leadership corresponded to other models (1) ‘idealised influence—attributes’, which measured, amongst other behaviours, whether a leader transcends his or her own self interest, and corresponds to measures of self-sacrificial and servant leadership, (2) ‘idealised influence—behaviours’, which examined whether a leader considers the moral and ethical consequences of actions, and corresponds to measures of authentic, ethical and servant leadership (3) ‘inspirational motivation’, which references a leader talking optimistically about the future, and corresponds to measures of
charismatic leadership, (4) ‘intellectual stimulation’ which explores a leader transcending his or her own self interest, corresponding to measures of self-sacrificial and servant leadership, and (5) ‘individualised consideration’, exploring a leader’s demonstration of concern for others, and willingness to tailor their approach to accommodate the needs of others, which are akin to aspects of authentic and servant leadership.

Dimensions of transactional leadership—which measure a leader’s ability to clearly communicate expectations and the commensurate rewards—relate to aspects of ethical leadership (i.e. where an ethical leader is clear about the ethical standards he/she expects of followers). Note that these comparisons have been made at the thematic level, as an empirical examination is outside the parameters of this thesis.

Pairwise comparisons identified significant differences in the mean correlation between follower perceptions of charismatic leadership and follower organisational identification, and both transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Given the conceptual difference between charismatic leadership (i.e. the ability to inspire and motivate others to perform) and transactional leadership (i.e. the facilitation of performance via the provision of rewards and sanctions), the statistical difference between the two mean correlations is unsurprising. However, the mean correlation with follower organisational identification was larger for transactional leadership ($r = .60, p < .001$) than for charismatic leadership ($r = 0.29, p = 0.01$) and this is contrary to expectations. This result merits further investigation.

The significant difference in mean correlation with follower organisational identification between follower perceptions of transformational and charismatic leadership is noteworthy, as historically charismatic leadership has been viewed as a subset of transformational leadership in the form of ‘inspirational motivation’. In the current study, transformational leadership yielded a large mean correlation with follower organisational identification ($r = 0.51, p < .0001$), whereas charismatic leadership yielded a small-to-moderate one ($r = 0.29, p = 0.0049$). This may be due to the more encompassing nature of transformational leadership, which consequently may have broader appeal to a range of followers.
Significant differences (via pairwise comparisons) were also found in the average correlation between followers’ perceptions of passive avoidant leadership and follower organisational identification, as well as followers’ perceptions of ethical leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership. These findings are unsurprising, given the ‘non-leadership’ status ascribed to passive-avoidant leadership mentioned previously (Humphrey, 2012).

The meta-analytic review published by Horstmeier et al. (2016) provides the only opportunity to compare findings from the current meta-analytic review, specifically those pertaining to transformational leadership and its relationship to organisational identification: The current study estimated a very similar correlation between the two constructs ($k = 24, r = 0.51$) to Horstmeier et al. (2016) ($k = 27, r = 0.43, p < .001$). Three papers included in the Horstmeier et al. (2016) study were either outside the timeframes for the current meta-analytic review, or did not include complete measures of transformational leadership, therefore were not included in the current review. Both studies concurred that followers’ perceptions of transformational leadership are positively associated with their organisational identification.

3.4.2.2 The effect of the industry moderators on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

The test of moderators undertaken during the mixed effects meta-analysis for industry type found that there was a significant effect of industry type on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of models of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, indicating significant between-group differences for industry type. One interpretation of this finding is that the strength of the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effectively leadership and followers’ organisational identification may vary depending on the industry.

The mixed-effects meta-analysis with industry type yielded large mean correlations for two of the ten industry groups (i.e. the ICT and manufacturing industries) and moderate correlations were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification in six of the ten industry groups (i.e.
education, finance, health, hospitality, R&D, and a range of industries). All of these results were significant.

When post-hoc pairwise comparisons were undertaken with the industry type moderators, significant differences were obtained between the mean correlations between ICT as the comparator and the retail industry, as well as the ‘industry not stated’ category. Significant differences were also found when comparisons were undertaken when the retail industry category was compared against ‘a range of industries’. Given the small number of studies involved with some industry groups, it would be tenuous to draw firm conclusions about the influence of the industry group on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification. However, these results do indicate an opportunity for future research into the impact of different industries—including their values, organisational identities and cultures, professional orientations, leaders’ backgrounds preferences and skills—and the impact these have on followers’ organisational identification. This may require some form of standardised comparison of industry qualities in order to undertake statistical comparisons.

3.4.2.3 The effect of the region moderators on the relationship between follower's perceptions of leadership models and follower organisational identification

Region did not moderate the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and follower organisational identification. This finding was unexpected, given the perceived differences in cultures, leadership and work practices, and relationships to power and status that exist across regions of the globe. In particular, I had been curious to understand whether there would be a difference in the relationship between leadership and organisational identification in individualist societies (i.e. Europe, North America and parts of the Pacific such as Australia) versus collectivist (e.g. Asia and the Middle East, and other parts of the Pacific such as island nations). This proposition did not eventuate in the current study, and provides opportunities for future researchers to explore.
3.4.3 Further considerations

3.4.3.1 Theoretical implications of findings

This meta-analytic review was the first to explore the relationship between followers’ perceptions of a range of leadership models and followers’ organisational identification, adding to the body of knowledge on these two important constructs in a range of ways, as outlined below.

First, the current study addresses He & Brown’s (2013) call to further investigate the relationship between leadership and organisational identification, whereby the current body of literature is considered “still thin on the ground and [with] many unaddressed issues” (p.18). This meta-analytic review contributes quantitative data to the body of knowledge on these constructs, together with a methodology that can be replicated—and expanded upon—by future researchers. Specifically, the current study identified a moderate and statistically significant relationship between followers’ perceptions of effectively leadership and followers’ organisational identification.

Second, the current study provides insights into the leadership models—and their associated constructs and styles—that are considered worthy of examination in relation to follower organisational identification by contemporary researchers. As He & Brown (2013) outlined, to date only a limited number of leadership models have been examined in relation to organisational identification—predominantly transformational. In the current study, eight leadership models were examined in quantitative studies deemed suitable for inclusion in the meta-analysis: the three dimensions of the Full-Range Leadership Model (i.e. transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant leadership), together with authentic, charismatic, ethical, self-sacrificial and servant leadership. While transformational and transactional leadership—dimensions of the Full Range Leadership Model—were the leadership styles explored most frequently in relation to their impact on follower organisational identification, with 23 of the 46 papers focused on these constructs, the current study reinforces the findings of the systematic review: that is, that a broader range of leadership styles are being considered by researchers. Further, the quantitative measurement of these leadership
styles reinforces their theoretical and empirical value, as well as consolidating them as observable and assessable research constructs.

Third, the current study also reflects the substantive body of research available that links the relationship between effective leadership behaviours to a range of individual and organisational outcomes, with followers’ organisational identification seen as either a mediating or moderating variable (as reported in the ‘results’ section of this chapter). The cognitive, affective and behavioural processes that occur when an employee strengthens their identification with their organisation indeed facilitate a range of individual and organisational outcomes, with leaders seen has having the potential to play a critical role in fostering that identification. As described in Chapter 2 outlining the systematic review, and reinforced by the results of the meta-analysis outlined in the current chapter, the relationships between follower perceptions of effective leadership, follower organisational identification and a range of individual and organisational outcomes were confirmed through the positive and significant correlations obtained.

The fourth theoretical contribution of this study is the examination of categorical moderators and their relationship to models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification, which found that different leadership styles and industry contexts significantly influence the strength of the relationship between follower perceptions of leadership models and followers’ organisational identification, but that regional contexts do not. The current study was the first extensive examination of the impact of these moderators on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification. The findings significantly extend previous research, which has been limited to comparing the three components of the Full Range Leadership Model, or an individual component of the aforementioned model and one other leadership style, and their relationship with followers’ organisational identification.

An additional finding was that the currently study reflected previous research by illustrating the predominance of Mael and Ashforth’s (1992, 1995) scale of organisational identification. Sometimes known as ‘The Mael Scale’, it was the most frequently used scale of organisational identification in papers included in the meta-analysis, utilised in 28 of the 46 papers. This is consistent
with Riketta’s findings in his 2005 meta-analysis focused on organisational identification and organisational commitment, where he determined it was one of the main measurements of organisational identification used by researchers. Riketta concluded that the Mael Scale was “the most representative measure” of organisational identification in relation to empirical outcomes, adding that correlations involving the Mael scale “showed much less variation” than correlations involving all measures of organisational identification (p. 368). Horstmeier et al. (2016) also confirmed the pre-eminence of the scale in their meta-analytic review of the relationship between transformational leadership and organisational identification.

3.4.3.2 Practical implications of findings

The findings of the current meta-analytic study substantiate claims that the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification is worthy of focus in organisational contexts, by showing that a positive and significant relationship exists between the two constructs. Organisations seeking to maximise their employees’ sense of identification, connection to and ‘oneness’ (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Patchen, 1970) with the organisation would do well to support their leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification in their day-to-day work, particularly to capitalise on the positive outcomes that can occur as a result.

By summarising the key leadership styles deemed effective in fostering organisational identification in followers, the study provides leadership practitioners with endorsement of a range of styles they could employ in their own leadership practice. Yielding large and significant mean correlations, ethical, transformational and transactional leadership emerged as the three styles that had the most impact on followers’ organisational identification. Authentic, charismatic, self-sacrificial, and servant leadership styles were also found moderately effective in fostering followers’ organisational identification. This should be heartening for leadership practitioners, as this range of endorsed styles means that, if they are employing effective leadership strategies and techniques currently, they need not make wholesale changes to their approach, nor subscribe to one particular leadership model (i.e. there is not one leadership style that predominates in the attainment of followers’ organisational identification).
The ICT and manufacturing industries emerged as environments most conducive to leaders in their efforts to foster organisational identification in followers. Nevertheless, this is a preliminary finding, and further examination is required within these industries to understand why such environments facilitate stronger relationships between leadership and organisational identification.

3.4.4 Limitations of this research

A key limitation of this research stems from the fact that the measures of leadership and organisational identification utilised in the meta-analytic review were solely obtained from the ratings of followers, thereby only providing the perspectives of one organisational cohort. This is particularly pertinent for the leadership measure, which represented followers’ ratings of their leader’s demonstration of models of effective leadership, and can often be influenced by a follower’s degree of affinity to, and positive regard for, their leader. That is, those followers who have a strong rapport with their leaders may be inclined to rate them more favourably on measures of effectiveness—a phenomenon known as ‘rater affect’ (Antonioni, 2001; Tsui, 1986; T.L. Robbins & DeNisi, 1994). In order to strengthen these findings—and remove the potential bias associated with one cohort’s perspective—the evaluation of leadership effectiveness could be triangulated with additional data (i.e. 360-degree feedback ratings by the leader’s leader, peers, internal and external stakeholders, and performance metrics). The same could be said for followers’ ratings of their organisational identification (i.e. that employees who have a positive relationship with their leader have the potential to identify more strongly with their organisation), which has been established by studies exploring the relationship between relational identification and organisational identification (e.g. Carmeli et al., 2011).

The potential presence of publication bias, as indicated by the regression test for funnel plot asymmetry ($z = -3.67$, $p = 0.0002$)—utilising the corrected data—is another limitation of this research, as it can be surmised that the research published in the literature may not representative of the population of completed studies (Ioannidis & Trikalinos, 2007; Rothstein et al., 2006). That is, the majority of studies included in the meta-analytic review yielded positive correlations for the relationship between follower perceptions
of leadership models and organisational identification, and for that reason may have been more likely to be published than those that did not yield positive results that supported the predominant hypotheses—a phenomenon known as the ‘file drawer problem’ (Rosenthal, 1979). As such, it is possible that the findings of the current study may not be representative of the range of studies examining the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, and have presented skewed results.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, for the quantitative studies included in the meta-analysis it should be noted that none included randomised control trials and whilst several studies were conducted over two or three time periods, none were longitudinal. The correlations included imply a relationship rather than causality, and should be interpreted as such. Furthermore, only studies published in English were included in the research, which meant that a number of studies uncovered in the initial screening could not be factored into the meta-analytic review. Lastly, while the time period of the review (i.e. January 2005-May 2017) was intended to focus the review, it may have led to the exclusion of suitable earlier studies.

3.4.5 Future research

The dearth of published meta-analytic reviews examining the relationships between models of effective leadership and follower organisational identification indicates ample opportunity for researchers to contribute to this field of research. It is hoped that the current study may serve as a catalyst for an expanded range of inquiry regarding these two constructs.

Future studies could augment research into the relationship between organisational identification and a range of leadership models – particularly extending beyond the more frequently studied leadership styles of transformational and transactional leadership. As the current study established, the significant between-group differences for leadership type indicate that different leadership styles do in fact yield different correlations for the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, and further investigation of these differences would be beneficial to both researchers and practitioners alike. As mentioned, the measures of leadership effectiveness could also be augmented
with additional data—particularly triangulation with 360-degree ratings by the leader’s leader, peers, internal and external stakeholders, and performance metrics—to minimise rater bias.

There is also opportunity to more closely examine whether there is a difference in the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification in different industries and geographical locations, including an examination of whether other mediating and moderating variables are at play in these circumstances. As discussed, the current study established a preliminary finding that industry type impacts the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, but more research is required to substantiate this finding. Furthermore, the impact of geographical region on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification is under-researched, and while the current study did not identify a significant impact, future—and more focused—research may uncover valuable insights into regional variation for this relationship. Cross-cultural leadership research mentioned in Chapter 2, such as that undertaken by Lian et al. (2011) who examined whether charismatic leadership was generalisable to senior leaders in Chinese society, may provide a useful starting point.

3.5 Conclusion

The meta-analytic study presented in this chapter reinforced both research and anecdotal evidence regarding the positive relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership models and followers’ organisational identification. The moderate correlation in the corrected studies \( r = 0.47, p < .0001 \) after correcting for reliability supports the premise that leaders have the potential to play an important role in fostering employees’ sense of connection to their organisation. Further, as expected, seven of the eight leadership styles were positively correlated with organisational identification, with the eighth—passive-avoidant leadership—yielding an anticipated non-significant relationship. Leadership type and industry type were seen to have a significant impact on the relationship between the two
constructs, although future research is required to augment these preliminary findings.

Given the established association between followers’ organisational identification and a range of individual and organisational outcomes, this study summarises the key leadership styles deemed effective in fostering organisational identification in followers, which leaders could use as a blueprint for their own leadership practice in order to make a positive contribution to their organisation and its members. Together with the systematic review (Study 2, presented in Chapter 2), this study also provides empirical underpinnings for the two organisationally-based studies undertaken as part of this thesis, which will be described in Chapters 4 and 5.
Chapter 4: Study 3—Leadership Competencies Required for Successful Service Integration

4.1 Introduction

Health reform is on the agenda in Australia, and attempts at service integration have become increasingly prevalent as a means to facilitate collaboration and address improvements within the health sector (McGorry et al., 2008). When facilitating service integration, a critical task for health service managers is to balance the task of improving the provision of quality services at the same time as improving efficiency (Allen & Stevens, 2007; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990).

Management of service integration can be challenging and requires capable organisations and leaders to facilitate success. However, the competencies required in consortia service integration in this new and emerging area have been inadequately researched. The focus of this chapter is on Study 3, which was designed to identify the key leadership competencies required to ensure successful service integration within a coalition framework. The opportunity to work with an Australian-based health consortia arose serendipitously, through the professional network of one of my PhD supervisors. The consortia sought assistance with the development of a practical list of leadership competencies to assist the consortia to progress organisational development initiatives.

With its focus on the role of leadership in guiding organisations through change, this third study was considered adequately aligned to the overall aims of the current thesis, and provided an opportunity to corroborate the findings of the systematic and meta-analytic reviews in a real-world context. Furthermore, it provided an opportunity to make a tangible contribution to the health sector in Australia. Via Study 3, third aim of this thesis is addressed:

---

7 This chapter is an adapted version of the following published journal article: Aitken, K., & von Treuer, K. (2014). Organisational and leadership competencies for successful service integration. Leadership in Health Services, 27(2), 150-180. See Appendix C.1.11 for Authorship Statement.
**Aim 3:** To identify the key elements of leadership that contribute to successful service integration.

### 4.1.1 Service integration

Service integration is one common method that organisations have used to create better organisational efficiencies while improving or maintaining service quality for consumers (Allen & Stevens, 2007; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). Service integration reflects the degree to which organisations that were previously distinct amalgamate their functions and activities, with the aim of optimising the utility of their resources (G. King & Meyer, 2006). As defined by Park and Turnbull (2003) service integration in health involves “a systematic effort to provide appropriate and harmonised services, [including] collaborative partnerships between families and professionals, among professionals, and among agencies” (p. 50).

Approaches to service integration are as varied as the organisations that undertake it. Lewis et al. (2010) describe the “varying degrees of formality” with which organisations integrate services, “ranging from loose organisational ties, or ‘linkages’, to those that have become ‘fully integrated’ organisations” (p. 11). Fulop et al. (2005) distinguish service integration from organisational integration in healthcare environments, with the latter seen as a more formal arrangement resulting in mergers, collectives, coordinated provider networks (either ‘virtual’ or ‘actual’), or service delivery contracts between distinct organisations (Callaly et al. 2011). Service integration, as defined by Fulop et al. (2005), focuses more on the amalgamation of clinical services at an organisational level, typically delivered through multi-disciplinary teams.

Service integration has also been conceptualised as one pole of an underlying continuum (Glendinning, 2003; G. King & Meyer, 2006; Konrad, 1996). When agencies achieve service integration, they share numerous key operations and strategies, such as vision, communication processes, and management systems (Callaly et al., 2011). Full service integration occurs when the degree of collaboration among parties is so seamless that the different agencies no longer see their separate identities as being distinct, and
individuals primarily identify with the overarching entity instead of their original organisation (Glendinning, 2003).

Service integration aims to reduce the fragmentation of service provision by addressing service gaps and facilitating the movement of clients between services. Effective service integration reduces the costs of services by decreasing repetition (i.e., multiple assessments), reducing the amount of inappropriate service usage by clients and increasing overall service efficiency (G. King & Meyer, 2006; Weiner, Amick, & Lee, 2008). It is therefore unsurprising that service integration is on the national health reform agenda of Australia and other Western countries (National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission (Australia), 2009). Subsequently, attempts at service integration within health sectors across Australia have become more prevalent (McGorry et al., 2008; Staiger, Young, Magilton, Parkes, & Liddy, 2003).

As introduced in Chapter 1, the ethos and change management methodologies associated with service integration have their origins in those employed during joint ventures, mergers and acquisitions (Appelbaum et al., 2007a, 2007b; Bert et al., 2003; Bijlsma-Frankema, 2001; Callaly et al., 2010). However, integration of services between agencies is often more fluid and susceptible to multiple interpretations, as agencies with different cultures, professional affiliations, client bases, organisational structures and service delivery models integrate some—or all—of their services (Lewis et al., 2010). The scope and possibilities associated with service integration are often not as clear-cut as in a typical commercial arrangement.

Given the complexity of the service integration task, many organisations achieve only partial implementation (Alexander et al., 2006; Callaly et al., 2011), or are unsuccessful with their endeavours (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Nag et al., 2007; Sastry, 1997). Further, implementation failure is probably more common than publicly reported (Snyder-Halpern, 2002; Tannenbaum, 2006). The reasons for service integration failures appear to centre upon the degree of effectiveness of organisational change management strategies, including people engagement and leadership (Glendinning, 2003).
4.1.2 Determinants of service integration success

Research examining the determinants of service integration success has identified four requisite clusters of conditions and practices, which are consistent with collaborative practices associated with other forms of organisational merger and partnership:

1. **Joint goals and shared vision**: A commitment to a shared vision and philosophy for integrated services is identified as a critical component of successful service integration (Callaly et al., 2011; Graetz et al., 2006; Hill, Ginsburg, Citko, & Cadogan, 2005), together with leaders and managers who champion and support the vision. This commitment greatly aids the implementation of strategies that ensure all employees of the various providers are aligned with, and inspired by, the same vision and values (Carrolton, DiPasquale, Folden, Hall, & Hopkins, 1994; Doll, et al., 2000).

2. **Clarity regarding the roles and capabilities of all individuals and teams**, together with avenues of communication that reinforce this understanding and collaboration (Callaly et al., 2011): While a common vision is critical, it is important that each contributing party—be they an agency, team or professional—clearly understands their specific responsibilities, accountabilities and deliverables associated with the service integration (Doll et al., 2000; Glendinning, 2003; Hodges & Hardiman, 2006; Park & Turnbull, 2003).

3. **Formal change management processes to facilitate the service integration** (Amaro et al., 2004; Bijlsma-Frankema, 2001; Summers et al., 2001): Such processes need to be tightly scripted, and include logistics and resources, funding models, and how staff are to be physically accommodated (e.g. Freeman & Peck, 2006; Glendinning, 2003).

4. **Informal practices that foster cooperation**: Informal practices must complement the formal processes of service integration (Narine & Persaud, 2003). For example, no one agency or profession should be granted supreme authority (Callaly et al., 2010), and all agencies should participate in the planning of the integration (Amiot, Terry, &
Callan, 2007; Fischer, Greitemeyer, Omay, & Frey, 2007; Terry & O’Brien, 2001). In some examples of successful service integration, mergers, acquisitions and joint ventures, the integration has evolved from agencies’ prior history of cooperation and collaboration (Callalay et al., 2011; Glendinning, 2003); see also Epstein (2005) and Lodorfos and Boateng (2006).

### 4.1.3 Health consortia involved in research

Set within a health services consortia, this study combined the research focus of this thesis with the information requirements of the consortia, which sought further understanding of the leadership determinants of successful service integration. The opportunity to work with the consortia arose serendipitously through the professional network of one of my PhD supervisors.

The consortia involved in this research project is focused on developing and delivering health services for a specific client group in Australia. The consortia focuses its efforts on: service delivery; enhancing community awareness of the needs of its client group; education and training of service providers; and knowledge generation, collation, dissemination and implementation.

At the time this study was undertaken, the consortia included over 25 service centres across Australia, located in each State and Territory, covering metropolitan, regional and rural locations. The number of centres was expected to increase in subsequent years.

The model of service delivery developed by the consortia was considered an innovative and important development that would improve the delivery of services to its client base. Other health providers—nationally and abroad—have sought to replicate this model. The success of the model relied largely upon successful service integration, which is underpinned by the management of the service integration process itself. In order to understand and therefore manage service integration, it was important to understand the desired competencies at a leadership level that would enable the next generation of healthcare managers to meet these challenges adroitly.
The aim of the study was to identify the key leadership competencies required to ensure successful service integration within a coalition framework. At the time this study was undertaken, key consortia members were developing frameworks to assist with the selection of organisations (and their leaders) responding to service integration tenders; the competency list was to serve as a reference point for those selection frameworks.

Rather than focusing specifically on the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification, this study examined whether these constructs emerged as a natural priority amongst leaders when focusing on organisational change such as service integration.

### 4.1.4 Competencies and Service Integration

#### 4.1.4.1 The importance of organisational competency in service integration

Identifying core competencies is crucial to the success of organisations (Bryson, Ackermann, & Eden, 2007) and competencies are gaining prominence in health as a means to increase both the quality and efficiency of health care services (Lin et al., 2009). Garman and Johnson (2006, p. 14) define core competencies as “competencies thought to be associated with the success of an organisation”. Referencing the work of Hamel and Prahalad (1994), Lindgren, Henfridsson, and Schultze (2004) describe core competencies as “… the collective knowledge and capabilities that are embedded in the organisation, they are central determinants of the organisation’s competitiveness due to their centrality to customer value, their resistance to imitation and their ability to extend to new business applications” (p.436).

At the organisational level, core competency frameworks allow for the identification of skills and knowledge necessary to achieve an organisation’s strategic agenda (Lin et al., 2009). Competency frameworks can help articulate the behavioural implications of a strategic vision to integrate services (Garman & Johnson, 2006). Consequently, competencies can also be identified and used to assist in the on-going processes of service integration.
4.1.4.2 The importance of leadership competency in service integration

When used to define the requirements of leadership roles within an organisation, competency models (also known as frameworks) provide clarity about the behaviours and characteristics leaders must demonstrate to help their organisation achieve its vision and goals (MacKay, 1997). As with other types of competencies, leadership competencies are frequently described as the building blocks upon which best-practice leadership selection, development and performance management are constructed (Calhoun et al., 2008; New, 1996; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). The development of leadership competencies has also been strongly linked to better performance and more successful healthcare organisations (Cunningham & MacKenzie, 2005; Edmonstone, 2011a, 2011b; Guo, 2009; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001).

Definitions of leadership and related competencies are abundant. As Middlehurst (1993, cited in Beinecke, 2009b) commented, “the idea of leadership is complex, difficult to capture and open to numerous definitions and interpretations” (p. 6). MacKay (1997, cited in Beinecke, 2009b) defines leadership competencies as “individual characteristics that must be demonstrated to provide evidence of superior or effective performance in a job … the complete competency set or model for an individual role identifies all the knowledge, skills, experiences and attributes a person should display in their behaviour when they are doing the job well” (p. 15).

Alimo-Metcalfe et al. (2007) describe leadership competencies as “necessary in order that staff can undertake both strategic and day-to-day planning, and in this way help to turn the vision of an organisation, department or team into a reality” (p.iii). Because a leader’s performance is inextricably linked to the success of his or her organisation (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2008; New, 1996), leadership competencies are typically closely aligned to—and often a subset of—the core organisational competencies (Lahti, 1999).

Much of the recent literature focused on leadership in health emphasises the complexities and challenges associated with the healthcare environment and systems and the need for exceptional leaders (Frączkiewicz-
Beinecke (2009a, p. 2) asserts that developing the next generation of healthcare leaders is “a critical challenge”. Competencies are viewed by many as the cornerstone of leadership development (Boyatzis, 1982, 2008; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; McClelland, 1973; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003).

### 4.1.5 Focus of the current study

In a real-world context, the leadership competencies required for successful service integration were examined. The research question that is the focus of this chapter is:

- **Research Question 5:** What are the leadership competencies required for successful service integration?

### 4.2 Methodology

#### 4.2.1 Literature review

**4.2.1.1 Literature review, Phase One: Organisational competencies for service integration**

The first phase of the literature review involved a search for organisational competency literature related specifically to service integration. While the focus of the study was to identify the key leadership competencies required to ensure successful service integration within a coalition framework, the organisational competency literature was seen as critical background. As such, Phase One of the literature search was conducted using the key terms competency, organisational competency, core competency, and service integration in the search engines Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, Emerald Full Text, ERIC, Google Scholar, Health Business Fulltext Elite, Health Reference Centre Academic, Health Source Nursing/Academic Ed., JSTOR, PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS, Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection, PsycINFO, Web of Science. Following the databases search, a purposive search for books and book chapters was completed. The reference lists of key articles were also mined for additional papers.

The literature review was limited by the few such studies conducted in this new and emerging area—in fact, no articles were found that made specific reference to both organisational competency and service integration. However,
the available literature regarding service integration yielded some key themes regarding the critical factors that underpin its success, which are summarised in Table 4.1. The 27 papers referred to are included in Appendix C.1.1.

The literature highlighted the importance of organisational leaders who demonstrate full and visible support for service integration, skilled and influential ‘change agents’, organisational leaders possessing a thorough understanding of and commitment to the service integration model and the changes it requires, effective organisational systems and processes, organisational readiness (including a willingness to adapt organisational systems and processes to accommodate the service integration) and staff engagement.

Subsequently, the literature search and review of research was broadened to encompass organisational competencies as they related to change management, mergers, acquisitions and the health sectors, using the key terms competency, organisational competency, core competency, mergers and acquisitions, and organisational change.

Table 4.1: Key Themes from Literature Focused on Organisational Competency in Service Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Organisation Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full, visible and sustained support for service integration from organisation’s leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisation possesses enthusiastic local ‘change agent’ leaders and/or champions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Shared Vision</td>
<td>• Understanding of the service integration model, and commitment to the underlying purpose for the service integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Systems and Processes</td>
<td>• Effective organisational systems and processes associated with governance, strategic planning, finance, human resource management, communication and information technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the dearth of literature obtained in the first data search, it was decided to set reasonably broad parameters for the inclusion criteria for material found: literature was considered and reviewed if it referenced organisational competency in the context of organisational change, with
particular emphasis given to literature set within healthcare environments. Background material regarding health care in Australia—including organisational documentation from the consortia—was also obtained. Finally, literature regarding the management of organisational change, such as mergers and acquisitions, was obtained for broader reference purposes.

Seventy full-text documents were reviewed: 32 related to organisational competencies, as well as 32 documents relating to organisational change more broadly. These documents are presented in Appendix C.1.2 and C.1.3 respectively. In addition, six documents were reviewed that outlined policies, strategies and plans relating to the specific aspect of the health sector the consortia was involved in. However, because the consortia desired anonymity, these have not been included (as they would have identified the participating consortia).

A number of organisational competency models were considered to have relevance for the consortia and provided reference points, including: (1) Competencies for public health in New Zealand, developed by The Public Health Association of New Zealand (2007a, 2007b); (2) Core competencies for public health in Canada, developed by The Public Health Agency of Canada (2007); (3) The United Kingdom’s National Health Service’s Competency Framework for (General) Practice Management (retrieved online October 2010); and (4) The competency model for remote and rural senior allied health professionals in Western Australia, developed by I. Lin et al. (2009). These are summarised in Appendix C.1.4.

4.2.1.2 Literature review, Phase Two: Leadership competencies for service integration

The second phase of the literature review involved a search for leadership competency literature related specifically to service integration. A literature search was conducted, with the same search engines used in Phase One, applying the key terms leadership competency, service integration, mergers and acquisitions, organisational change, and leadership. As with Phase One, a purposive search for books and book chapters was completed and the reference lists of key articles were mined for additional papers. Fifty-

---

8 Given the parameters (i.e. time and resources) of the study, a comprehensive systematic literature review was not conducted.
two documents were reviewed, with focus given to those that comprehensively described leadership competency frameworks (27 documents). Particular attention was given to competency frameworks set within healthcare environments (13 documents). These documents are presented in Appendix C.1.5.

While much has been written about the field of leadership (B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Stogdill, 1974; M.A. Thomas, 2006), the literature search on leadership competency in service integration was limited. However, studies examining the factors associated with effective change management and successful mergers and acquisitions—organisational practices considered relevant to service integration—reinforced the significance of skilled leaders (Appelbaum et al., 2007a, 2007b; Covin, Kolenko, Sightler, & Tudor, 1997; Kotter, 1996; Parry, 1999). Additionally, much of the literature focused on leadership in the health sector highlighted the importance of effective leadership in guiding organisations and sectors through complex health reforms and constant change (Battilana, Gilmartin, Sengul, Pache, & Alexander, 2010; Cikaliuk, 2011; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Stefl, 2008).

The literature afforded several comprehensive leadership competency frameworks—outlined in Appendix C.1.6—that were used as reference points in this study. Beinecke’s (2009b) ‘Leadership and Management Skillset’ was drawn on as a comparative framework for the preliminary leadership competency framework. In collaboration with the International Initiative for Mental Health Leadership, Beinecke (2009a, 2009b) reviewed the leadership competencies and leadership development and training practices of mental health organisations in seven developed countries and conducted a comprehensive literature review of leadership in mental health. He concluded that many core competencies are universal. His ‘Leadership and Management Skillset’ cites five leadership competency areas that the majority of the health, mental health and public administration models and programmes included: (1) personal skills and knowledge, (2) interpersonal skills, (3) transactional (execution, management) skills, (4) transformational (leadership) skills, and (5) policy and programme knowledge (including knowledge of and experience
in mental health, clinical knowledge, understanding of policies and political knowledge).

Also referred to was the Healthcare Leadership Alliance Model (Stefl, 2008) developed for a consortium of six major healthcare professional membership organisations, and to be used as the basis for both individual and organisational assessment. Like the ‘Leadership and Management Skillset’, it also includes five broad leadership competency domains: (1) communication and relationship management, (2) leadership, (3) professionalism, (4) knowledge of the healthcare environment, and (5) business skills and knowledge.

Additionally, the competency framework developed by Gebelein et al. (2001) on behalf of Personnel Decisions International (PDI) was referenced, with its four broad leadership and management competency domains: (1) thought leadership, (2) results leadership, (3) people leadership, and (4) self leadership. The Full-Range Leadership Model (Avolio & Bass, 1991; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1997) also served as a reference for the preliminary leadership competency framework.

The available literature yielded the following themes regarding the key leadership factors underpinning successful service integration: organisational leaders who demonstrate full and visible support for service integration; ability to champion and manage change; a thorough understanding of, and commitment to, the service integration model and the changes it requires; ability to foster organisational readiness (including a willingness to adapt organisational systems and processes to accommodate the service integration); leadership skills and characteristics; relationship management and communication skills (including teamwork and professional liaison); ability to manage people and organisational systems and processes; policy and programme knowledge (as it relates to relevant field or specialty); and the personal skills and characteristics the leader brings to the role. These themes are summarised in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Key Themes from Literature Focused on Leadership Competency in Service Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Organisational Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and governance</td>
<td>• Full, visible and sustained support for service integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enthusiastic local ‘change agent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of Shared Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understands the service integration model and is committed to the underlying purpose of service integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering Organisational Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Willing to adapt organisational, structural and team processes to facilitate successful service integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Skills and Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively communicates a shared vision, mission and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possesses a range of effective leadership behaviours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Professional Liaison and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship management and communication</td>
<td>Possesses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td>• Relationship management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highly developed communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experienced at leading effective teams, including promoting group cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supportive, collegiate management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sound understanding of, and experience with, people management frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Systems and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possesses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• experience in overseeing and/or managing organisational systems and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• planning skills and experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Clinical knowledge: Experience with relevant health systems, structures and standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and programme knowledge</td>
<td>• Integrity and professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics, skills and</td>
<td>• Demonstrates: achievement focus and drive; self-confidence; tenacity and resilience; flexibility and adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>• Remains calm and composed in pressured situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possesses highly developed critical thinking and decision-making skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committed to own professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Semi-structured interviews regarding leadership competency

The next phase of the project focused on capturing consortium managers’ perceptions of the leadership competencies required for successful service integration. Managers currently operating within consortia centres were interviewed as they were thought to have a valuable view of leadership and management based on their personal experiences during centre integrations. The managers were selected by the consortia senior manager who commissioned the research.
CHAPTER 4. LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY

4.2.2.1 Methodology

Upon receipt of ethics approval for the study (see Appendix C.1.7), seven key managers from the consortia were contacted and furnished with the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form (see Appendix C.1.8). All consented to participate in the study. Five were interviewed face-to-face and two were interviewed via telephone. The semi-structured interview schedule was informed by the literature review. The complete interview guide is presented in Appendix C.1.9.

4.4.2.1.1 Saville Consulting Wave Job Profiler Card Sort

For those interviews that were conducted face-to-face (i.e. with five of the seven managers), the Saville Consulting Wave Job Profiler Card Sort (2008) was used to elicit further information about the leadership and management competencies required for successful service integration. The Card Sort is a job analysis technique that elicits information about respondents’ perceptions of the importance of key work-related capabilities. The card sort enables rating scores to be obtained by asking respondents to review and rate a series of cards describing 36 dimensions of effective work behaviour and six dimensions of work-related ability. Respondents were asked to rate the series of cards using a 7-point rating scale of importance (from 1 = not important to 7 = critical).

While it was anticipated that the managers interviewed would be thorough in their responses to the semi-structured interview questions, the Card Sort was used as an additional prompt to ensure that they considered a comprehensive range of knowledge-sets, behaviours and abilities required by leaders and managers during service integration, beyond what was ‘top of mind’ during the interview.

4.2.2.1.2 Procedure

The semi-structured interviews were conducted by myself and one my supervisors, both of us adhering closely to the interview schedule to ensure consistency. The face-to-face interviews took up to two hours in duration; the telephone interviews were up to one hour in duration.

Participants were asked a series of questions regarding their perspectives on effective leadership and the knowledge, skills, abilities and
attitudes required to successfully lead and manage service integration. For example:

- How would you define successful leadership?
- Thinking broadly, what do you consider to be the important leadership and management knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes required for successful service integration?
- If you reflect on the leaders and managers of organisations / agencies that have joined the consortia to date:
  - What abilities have enabled them to integrate successfully into the consortia?
  - What leadership and management components do you consider it essential for potential leaders to possess prior to joining the consortia, versus those leadership components that are desirable (i.e. those they could develop once they are part of the consortia)?
- What are the specific challenges facing leaders and managers within the consortia?
  - What knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes enable them to deal effectively with these challenges?

During the semi-structured interviews, participants were also asked specific questions to determine their perceptions of the key factors that differentiate highly effective leaders from those that have found it more challenging to integrate into the consortia. The following questions were asked:

- Within the consortia, can you identify a leader or manager you consider to be highly effective? What differentiates this leader/manager from others?
- At times, I imagine not everything runs to plan and factors can slow progress towards service integration. If you reflect on the leaders that have taken longer/required more support to integrate into the consortia, what factors have affected their ability to integrate seamlessly and quickly?
Interviews were recorded and transcribed into Microsoft Word. The qualitative data were analysed independently by the two interviewers using thematic analyses (Braun & Clarke, 2006; C.P. Smith, 1992; Vaismoradi, Turunen, & Bondas, 2013), where they independently reviewed the interview transcripts (Boyatzis, 1998) to determine themes for leadership competency. The interviewers then convened to discuss their individual conclusions and converge on the key themes.

The Saville Consulting Wave Job Profiler Card Sort ratings obtained were entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to obtain average ratings of importance.

**4.3 Results**

**4.3.1 Research findings from the semi-structured interviews regarding leadership**

**4.3.1.1 Key themes from the semi-structured interviews regarding leadership**

The themes presented in Table 4.3 informed the preliminary leadership competency framework for service integration. The results of the interviews revealed that the personal characteristics the leader brings to the role, clinical knowledge and skills, leadership characteristics and skills, interpersonal skills, change management skills and experience and management skills and experience were all important competencies. These are discussed in more detail below.

**4.3.1.1.1 Personal characteristics the leader brings to the role**

The majority of those interviewed commenced their descriptions of effective leadership by citing the personal characteristics required of a leader within consortia. Characteristics such as honesty and integrity, passion and energy, personal commitment to and affinity with youth, determination, resilience, a sense of humour, self-mastery, intellectual capability and a willingness to learn were mentioned frequently—and emphatically—during interviews.

**4.3.1.1.2 Clinical knowledge and skills**

The majority of participants commented that a clinical background was advantageous in a leadership role within the consortia. Qualifications, and
experience, in areas such as health and primary care were considered important for the purposes of establishing credibility as a leader and being able to support professional staff in their decision-making and professional practice.

Table 4.3: Key Themes from Interviews Focused on Leadership Competency in Service Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Personal characteristics the leader brings to the role** | • Integrity and professionalism  
• A value set that reflects consortia’s vision and values (including a strong affinity with [client group])  
• Achievement focus and drive  
• Flexibility and adaptability  
• Ability to deal with ambiguity  
• Self-management skills  
• Cognitive capacity, critical thinking skills  
• Decision-making and judgement  
• Self-confidence  
• Resilience  
• Self-improvement focus |
| **Clinical knowledge and skills** | • Professional background and expertise in one of the four key service areas (ideally at a senior level)  
• Credibility in field (with strong linkages to profession and community)  
• Experience of managing in the health system (both people and services)  
• Experience in [client group] health (desirable) |
| **Leadership characteristics and skills** | • Strategic leadership  
• People leadership  
• Intellectual leadership |
| **Interpersonal skills** | • Communication  
  • Highly effective communication skills, both oral and written  
  • Relationship Management  
  • Strong prior relationships in community and sector  
  • Stakeholder engagement and management skills  
  • Political acumen  
  • Negotiation skills  
  • Conflict management skills  
  • Teamwork  
  • Team player—focuses on collaboration rather than competition  
  • Ability to effectively lead and manage multidisciplinary teams |
| **Change management** | • Possesses sound understanding of change management frameworks  
• Experienced at guiding organisations through complex organisational change |
| **Management skills and experience** | • Management capability and experience  
• Clinical governance capability and experience  
• Possesses mandate to make decisions ‘at the consortia table’  
• Financial management skills  
• Planning/project management skills |
4.5.1.1.3 Leadership characteristics and skills

The interviews provided an opportunity for participants to define, from their perspective, what constituted effective leadership skills and characteristics within the consortia’s model of service integration. The themes generally clustered into three aspects of leadership: (1) **strategic leadership** (i.e. the ability to define and articulate a vision, together with strategic thinking perspective, capability and experience); (2) **people leadership** (i.e. the ability to lead people, including understanding how to adapt one’s leadership style to meet the differing needs of staff); and (3) **intellectual leadership** (i.e. the ability to make and articulate clear links between various sources of information, fostering innovative thinking, and challenging the status quo).

4.3.1.1.4 Interpersonal skills

All those interviewed spoke of the importance of highly developed interpersonal skills, including verbal and written communication skills, the ability to develop and manage a range of (often complex) relationships and the ability to effectively lead and manage multidisciplinary teams. Strong prior relationships in the community and sector, stakeholder engagement and management skills, political acumen, negotiation and conflict management skills were also mentioned consistently throughout the interviews. Additionally, willingness to contribute as a team player—collaborating rather than competing with others—was seen as a highly desirable attribute for those leading and managing service integration.

4.3.1.1.5 Change management skills and experience

The ability to embrace and manage complex organisational change was frequently mentioned by those interviewed. Several participants commented on the value of understanding change management frameworks and processes, to assist consortia leaders to manage the change associated with the service integration process in a structured and ordered manner.

4.3.1.1.6 Management skills and experience

All those interviewed highlighted the importance of management skills in facilitating effective service integration. Their responses encompassed people management, financial management, managing the process of clinical governance, business planning and reporting and project management.
4.3.1.2 Managers’ perceptions: Verbatim comments

Verbatim quotations from the interviews were used to support the thematic analysis, and are presented in Table 4.4. Where used, the quotations have been de-identified and all attempts made to protect confidentiality and retain the anonymity of those interviewed.

Table 4.4: Verbatim Comments from Managers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Verbatim comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Personal characteristics the leader brings to the role | • Those that are still standing ... we’re strong characters. We’re probably seen as opinionated at times, but determined. I’d say we have an incredible passion and belief about what the project is about, and because of that belief we’re still standing. You know, this is reform, and to be part of that reform is incredibly exciting.  
• I don’t think you can be a leader and bullsh*t. You need to have integrity and credibility.  
• Perseverance. I’m determined to see the service developed and see it through to finally, actually functioning.  
• A ‘can do’ attitude. It’s a complex area; it’s not just about health.  
• ‘Activist’ thinkers—you need to be a ‘quick study’. You need to able to process information quickly and accurately … we very rarely get the luxury of time and often have to respond to issues and write papers, et cetera, ‘just in time’.  
• There’s a personality side to leadership as well: you need to have an ability to keep things in perspective, possess a sense of humour, be respectful … be honest and reliable. |
| Clinical knowledge and skills | • Actually understanding mental health and understanding primary care and understanding how the two can be ‘as one’ and complement ... I describe it as the umbrella, where ours is the front door, and the model that I work on is under the umbrella with the teams that I’ve got. So being aware of the model, the systems, the services and the linkages that are required.  
• Professional background and experience in the area you are trying to integrate. You need some credibility in the field.  
• I know people come from different perspectives on this, but I think you have to have some immersion in the content and some facility with the content ... In this field you have to be able to sift a lot of info and you have to be able to support good decisions by other people ... you really need to have a strong sense of different knowledge bases that relate to the care and delivery of services. And by that I’m referring to understanding drug and alcohol care, physical health care, mental health care, and vocational stream. |
| Leadership characteristics and skills | **Strategic leadership**  
• You have to have vision, and I think you have to have strategic thinking [capability]. To be able to think outside the square.  
• You need to have people who are skilled at conceptualising the consortia’s requirements and their organisation’s requirements and able to [pull everything together].  
• [The highly effective consortia leaders] are from very senior positions within their organisations, which gives them a strategic perspective. For example a lot of our senior managers have experience of sitting on boards, so they know how to work through partnerships, in consultation, governance issues, etcetera. |
Table 4.4: Verbatim Comments from Managers Interviewed, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Verbatim comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interpersonal skills          | **Communication skills**  
• Solid communication skills—verbally [sic] and written. This adds to [a leader’s] credibility.  
• Writing and review skills, because you are developing policies and frameworks ... you really need to be able to hear and translate the consultation.  
**Relationship management**  
• You need to have a desire to foster and maintain relationships. You need to prioritise the networking ... The majority of my time is spent on partnership and relationship management and maintenance.  
• Successful service integration is consultative. You need to be able to create a safe environment and partnerships where people feel they are able to express their views ... [it’s about] creating opportunities for people to contribute.  
• Strong negotiation skills—you need to be able to negotiate for the greater good, the better good for young people. You need to negotiate within a vision and framework.  
**Teamwork**  
• You need to develop camaraderie with your team.  
• [You need an] ability to have mutual respect across levels and professions ... see the value that people from other professions can bring to delivering effective services for youth.  
**Change management skills and experience**  
• Good change management skills and good timeframes—a bit like a project management schema. You’ve also got to be balanced ... it’s a bit hard in this role because you’ve got national expectations and regional expectations. It’s about keeping the balance between representing the two areas.  
• There’s a lot of organisational change associated with growing consortia.  
**Management skills and experience**  
• Basic management know-how: ‘HR’, accreditation, capability to manage a service.  
• Experience of managing different people ... knowing how to manage people with different styles and knowing how to adapt my style ... understanding that people are motivated by different things.  
• Being a good people manager, because that is that sort of a culture. A collegiate approach ... making sure you get the sit-down time with individual workers, as well as [staff] from the other services. Making sure you talk to people at different levels so you have different conversations. Demonstrating the same respect at every level.  
• The management role is about problem-solving. I see my role as a project manager (it’s just that I have 25 projects on at any one time!). It’s about being able to be a resource to people. |

4.3.1.3 **Key leadership competencies that differentiate highly effective leaders**

During the semi-structured interviews, participants were asked specific questions to determine their perceptions of the key factors that differentiate highly effective leaders from those that have found it more challenging to integrate into the consortia. The key themes are summarised in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5: Managers’ Perceptions of the Leadership Competencies that Differentiate Highly Effective Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key features of highly effective leaders</th>
<th>Factors that affect leaders’ ability to integrate seamlessly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High levels of understanding of and commitment to consortia’s vision and objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Insufficient understanding of and/or commitment to consortia’s vision and objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understands consortia’s vision and objectives</td>
<td>- Has incomplete understanding of the consortia model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is willing to adapt and compromise to align own organisation with consortia’s vision and objectives</td>
<td>- Retains own agendas rather than buying in to consortia’s vision and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is motivated to join consortia to deliver outcomes for youth (not for personal gain or benefit of own organisation)</td>
<td><strong>Weak networks and relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic perspective</strong></td>
<td>- Has few or no pre-existing relationships (in community and sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses a strategic perspective as a result of senior management experience in other organisations</td>
<td>- Has little or no experience with the concept of service integration and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses clarity of purpose</td>
<td>- Does not fully embrace opportunities to network and collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership skills and attributes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Insufficient support (i.e. managers not receiving and/or seeking adequate support from their managers)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is able to champion the consortia cause</td>
<td>- Does not have access to supportive managers (e.g. from lead agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses ability to obtain others’ buy-in through influencing and motivating skills</td>
<td>- Does not seek support from others when in difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses a range of skills and experiences relating to leading a diverse group</td>
<td><strong>Difficulty adapting to new ways of working</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive, open and accessible management style</strong></td>
<td>- Adheres to own agenda rather than adapting to the requirements of the consortia model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is accessible and responsive to staff; is mindful of maximising limited amount of time available with staff (and make it count)</td>
<td>- Is not open to considering alternative approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship management skills</strong></td>
<td>- Finds it difficult to change tactics when initial approach is not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is committed to, and experienced at, working in partnership with others</td>
<td><strong>Inappropriate level of seniority or influence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is skilled and experienced at fostering relationships</td>
<td>- Lacks mandate from own organisation to make decisions at consortia meetings (therefore delaying decisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses (or is committed to developing) extensive networks</td>
<td>- Does not consider self a ‘peer’ of some of the senior managers, which affects their ability to put forward their ideas and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is an active and interested listener</td>
<td><strong>Lack of experience/skill/judgement about how to traverse complex relationship issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has the ability to digest and manage different points of view</td>
<td>- Is not experienced at navigating through difficult and sensitive issues, where finer judgements are required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to challenge the status quo and engage in robust and honest debate</strong></td>
<td>- Is affected by the emotional and political content of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is prepared to challenge assumptions and different points of view</td>
<td><strong>Inability to foster trust amongst consortium members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is prepared to put forward point strongly, even if it is a dissenting view</td>
<td>- Is perceived as pursuing own agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal attributes</strong></td>
<td>- Gives the impression of not being focused on the ‘common good’ of the consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is energetic and committed,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possesses a sense of humour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: Managers’ Perceptions of the Leadership Competencies that Differentiate Highly Effective Leaders, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key features of highly effective leaders</th>
<th>Factors that affect leaders’ ability to integrate seamlessly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-management</strong></td>
<td>Demands of their own organisation/agency that impede their ability to deliver for consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is calm and composed under pressure</td>
<td>Decision-making capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is able to remain objective and</td>
<td>• Lacks agility of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove emotion from situations</td>
<td>• Lacks ability to be nimble in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is able to prioritise and manage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competing demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional experience and expertise</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possesses professional expertise in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is able to bring things to a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is able to exercise judgement on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it is important to consult, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it is time to make a decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key features of highly effective leaders and managers include: high levels of understanding of and commitment to the consortia’s vision and objectives; a strategic perspective; leadership skills and attributes; a supportive, open and accessible management style; relationship management skills; ability to challenge the status quo and willingness to engage in robust and honest debate; personal attributes, including a sense of humour and high levels of energy; self-management skills; professional experience and expertise and outcome focus.

The factors that negatively affected leaders and managers’ ability to integrate seamlessly into their consortium and the broader consortia included an absence of the success factors outlined above, with the addition of factors such as insufficient support (i.e. managers not having access to supportive managers themselves; not seeking adequate support from their managers when in difficulty), not possessing an appropriate level of seniority or influence (i.e. not having the mandate from their own organisation to make decisions at meetings resulting in delayed decisions; not considering themselves as peers of other senior managers, which affected their ability to put forth their ideas and influence outcomes); demands of their own organisation/agency impacting on their ability to deliver for the consortia and experiencing difficulties fostering trust among consortium members.
4.3.1.4 Saville Consulting Wave Card Sort results

As mentioned previously, participants that were interviewed face-to-face were asked to complete the Saville Consulting Wave Card sort to elicit information about their perceptions of the importance of key work-related capabilities in relation to leading and managing service integration. Participants reviewed and rated a series of cards describing 36 dimensions of effective work behaviour and six dimensions of work-related ability. Respondents were asked to rate the series of cards using a 7-point rating scale of importance (from 1 = not important to 7 = critical).

Table 4.6 presents the dimensions of effective work behaviour and work-related ability that yielded average ratings of 5 and above on the 7-point scale of importance (5 = very important; 6 = extremely important; and 7 = critical). The most important behaviours for leadership were identified as: giving support, adjusting to change, driving success, structuring tasks, providing leadership, creating innovation, building relationships and showing resilience.

Table 4.6: Saville Consulting Wave Job Profiler Card Sort—Dimensions with ratings 5 (= very important) to 7 (= critical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving support</td>
<td>• Understanding people, team working, valuing individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting to change</td>
<td>• Thinking positively, embracing change, inviting feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving success</td>
<td>• Taking action, seizing opportunities, pursuing goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring tasks</td>
<td>• Managing tasks, upholding standards, producing output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing leadership</td>
<td>• Making decisions, directing people, empowering individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating innovation</td>
<td>• Generating ideas, exploring possibilities developing strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships</td>
<td>• Interacting with people, establishing rapport, impressing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing resilience</td>
<td>• Conveying self-confidence, showing composure, resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2. The preliminary leadership competency framework

The leadership competency themes collated from the semi-structured interviews were then combined with the competency themes obtained from the literature review. These themes were summarised and used to inform the preliminary leadership competency framework.
The framework consists of 13 competencies within five competency domains, which are presented in Figure 4.1.

The 13 competencies are outlined in more detail subsequently in Table 4.7.

#### Table 4.7: The Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and governance in service integration</strong></td>
<td>1. <em>Organisational management:</em> The leader demonstrates full, visible and sustained support for service integration and is an enthusiastic local ‘change agent’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Clarity of shared vision:</em> The leader understands and is committed to the underlying purpose for the consortium formation and service integration; strong potential for a shared philosophy exists between the consortia and the leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Fostering organisational readiness:</em> The leader is committed to collaborative planning at regular intervals during and subsequent to consortium formation and is willing to adapt organisational, structural and team processes to facilitate successful service integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <em>Leadership:</em> The leader is able to effectively communicate the consortia’s shared vision, mission and values to staff, stakeholders and the community. The leader possesses effective leadership behaviours that develop the capability of others, enhance performance, and foster a positive working environment including: providing strategic and intellectual leadership; employing a multi-faceted approach to leadership; motivating and inspiring others; and effectively traversing difficult situations and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship management and communication skills</strong></td>
<td>5. <em>Collaborating with partners:</em> The leader possesses strong pre-existing networks in the local health sector, the [client] sector and community and a well-developed ability to establish and maintain effective professional relationships to improve health and wellbeing outcomes for [client base]. Additionally, the leader is able to navigate through complex and sensitive political issues (at the organisational, community, State and Federal levels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. <em>Communication:</em> The leader possesses a repertoire of communication skills, including an ability to listen and consult, adapt their communication style to suit the needs of the situation and audience, read “what is not being said” in an interaction and interact effectively with the [client].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.7: The Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship management and communication skills,</td>
<td>Possesses well-developed written communication skills, including an ability to write cogent reports under time pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continued</td>
<td>7. <strong>Multi-disciplinary teamwork:</strong> The leader is experienced at leading effective teams, including promoting group cohesion and achieving desired team, agency and/or consortium outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of people, organisational systems and</td>
<td>8. <strong>Management of people:</strong> The leader effectively manages team and individual performance, employing a supportive and collegiate management style. Possesses a sound understanding of, and experience with, people management frameworks systems and processes. Deals effectively with performance management issues and challenges, and is an effective coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes</td>
<td>9. <strong>Management of organisational systems and processes:</strong> The leader possesses relevant experience in overseeing and/or managing: clinical governance frameworks and practices; workgroup structures and systems; financial structures and systems (including managing funding cycles); communication systems; and information technology systems and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. <strong>Planning, evaluation and service improvement:</strong> The leader is experienced at developing and implementing plans in accordance with priorities agreed by key stakeholders, and evaluates and updates plans regularly and systematically to ensure they meet current needs and priorities. The leader possesses a service improvement orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice knowledge</td>
<td>11. <strong>Program and practice knowledge:</strong> The leader demonstrates knowledge of, and experience in, Australian health systems, structures and standards as they relate to the consortia’s key service areas. Ideally, the leader possesses experience in applying these to meet the needs of [the client group]. Additionally, the leader possesses knowledge of what represents ‘health’ for their client group, and the corresponding practices that facilitate good health. They also demonstrate an understanding of the specific health challenges and concerns [the client group] experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. <strong>[Client group] advocacy and community development:</strong> The leader demonstrates a strong commitment, and ability to advocate and negotiate, to achieve positive health and wellbeing outcomes for [client group]; Interacts effectively with diverse individuals, groups and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics and capabilities</td>
<td>13. <strong>Personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management:</strong> The leader operates with integrity and professionalism; demonstrates achievement focus and drive; is self confident; demonstrates tenacity and resilience; is flexible and adaptable; remains calm and composed in pressured situations; possesses a sense of humour; possesses highly-developed critical thinking and decision-making skills; and undertakes appropriate professional development practices, together with activities to facilitate and support his or her own health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary leadership competency framework was intended to describe a comprehensive range of competencies, and to be used as a reference by the consortia when evaluating potential leaders and managers (i.e., of potential agencies) wishing to join the consortia. For ease of reference, Appendix C.1.10 presents the summary of findings associated with leadership.
competency in service integration, incorporating the themes from the literature review, semi-structured interview, Saville Consulting Wave card sort, and the preliminary leadership competency framework.

4.3.2.1 Managers’ perceptions of the priority competencies within the preliminary leadership competency framework: Thematic analysis

The preliminary leadership competency framework encompasses the proposed full range of leadership competencies required by organisations and agencies wishing to join the consortia. To understand stakeholders’ perceptions of the priority competencies within the preliminary framework—should the consortia wish to utilise a subset of competencies rather than the full range—thematic analysis was conducted on the frequency each organisational competency was mentioned during the stakeholder interviews.

The 10 most frequently mentioned leadership competencies were: personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management; leadership skills and characteristics; professional liaison (including relationship management and networking skills); communication; clarity of shared vision; clinical knowledge; management of people; organisational management and organisational systems and processes.

The frequency ratings arising from stakeholders’ responses are summarised in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Frequency Each Leadership Competency was Mentioned During the Semi-structured Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary leadership competency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership skills and characteristics</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professional liaison</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communication</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity of shared vision</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clinical knowledge</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management of people</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Organisational management</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organisational systems and processes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client group practices and development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fostering organisational readiness</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teamwork</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluation and service improvement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Leaders’ role in fostering organisational identity and organisational identification during service integration

The current study combined the research focus of the broader PhD thesis with the information requirements of the consortia, which sought to further understand the leadership determinants of successful service integration. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the opportunity to work with the consortia arose serendipitously through the professional network of one of my PhD supervisors. Due to the limitations placed on the consortia’s leaders (i.e. in terms of time and resources), the research focused on the consortia’s priority of developing a preliminary leadership competency framework to assist their organisational development initiatives. Rather than focusing specifically on the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification in this study, I examined whether these constructs emerged as a natural priority amongst leaders when focusing on organisational change such as service integration.

Examination of the themes from the semi-structured interviews revealed that the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification were not mentioned explicitly—in terms of the use of the terminology ‘organisational identity’ and ‘organisational identification’—by the leaders that participated in the study. Further examination of the interview transcripts supports that organisational identity and organisational identification were not constructs that were part of the consortia leaders’ vernacular when describing the leadership competencies required for supporting organisational change such as service integration. However, there are clear connections between several of the leadership competencies included in the preliminary framework and the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification—namely the competencies ‘Clarity of shared vision’ (i.e. where the leader understands and is committed to the underlying purpose for the consortium formation and service integration; strong potential for a shared philosophy exists between the consortia and the leader) and ‘Leadership characteristics and skills’ and its associated subsets of strategic, people and intellectual leadership (i.e. where the leader is able to effectively communicate the consortia’s shared vision, mission and values to staff,
stakeholders and community; the provision of strategic and intellectual leadership; employing a multi-faceted approach to motivating and inspiring others). These findings are consistent with those obtained in Studies 1 and 2 of this thesis (i.e. the systematic literature review and meta-analytic review, respectively), which indicate parallels between providing clarity of shared vision and clearly articulating an organisation’s identity. Further, the current findings reinforce the significance of leadership behaviours such as communication (e.g. articulating and garnering support for an organisation’s identity) and engagement with staff to inspire, motivate and foster a strong connection to the organisation’s identity, thereby fostering organisational identification.

4.3.4 The Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework: Next Steps

The leadership competency framework resulting from this study was presented as a preliminary framework, requiring further refinement by the consortia. The leadership competency framework was oriented towards selection and, once tailored and finalised, intended to serve as a reference point in the consortia’s evaluation of potential leaders wishing to form consortiums under the auspices of the consortia.

Given the comprehensive range of competencies provided in the framework, it was suggested that the consortia might choose to utilise a subset of competencies rather than the framework in its entirety. The study aimed to provide a clear picture of the priority leadership competencies for service integration, based on available research and the perceptions of stakeholders and leaders of key organisational priorities at the time of the study.

Once tailored and finalised, the framework could serve as the basis of competency-based selection practices and tools. It could also be adapted for other purposes within the consortia, such as strategic workforce planning, performance management, training and development and career development (Marrelli, Tondora, & Hoge, 2005).

4.3.4.1 Future research

Whilst informative, further validation of the leadership competency framework is required. Study 4 of this research, involving a Delphi Study and
presented in Chapter 5, sought feedback from leadership practitioners and experts in the field of leadership regarding the competency framework. It was intended that further validation work be undertaken within the consortia, but this was not possible due to competing organisational priorities.

One limitation of this research is its basis on the working assumption that the consortia and leaders cited as ‘successful’ by those interviewed, have translated their perceived success into effective service integration. A recommended avenue for future research is further examination of how the behaviours described in the preliminary leadership competency framework translate into successful service integration outcomes, through the use of performance metrics. It would also be useful to interview stakeholders and leaders from organisations that were less successful in their attempts at service integration, to learn from their insights and experiences.

It is also recommended that, because the current study was focused on competencies required for agencies commencing service integration, with a strong focus on factors that contribute to leader readiness for integration, further research be conducted into the competencies required to effectively integrate services in the longer term. There may also be further opportunities to incorporate more nuanced competency definitions that reflect the complexities of the Australian health system and the unique needs of the client group the consortia is serving.

Additionally, future research could also extend beyond the definition of leadership competencies for successful service integration, to the development of competency-based tools and practices. A number of the consortia leaders interviewed indicated that they would be very receptive to validated tools and methodologies to assist them to successfully integrate services. Such tools are likely to be generalisable to other organisations collaborating to integrate or merge services.

Finally and importantly, the consortia—as reflective of the Australian health sector—continues to undergo rapid and complex reform that requires organisations and agencies to continually flex and change. Consequently, the preliminary leadership competency framework presented should be viewed not
as static, but as an organic framework that is expected to evolve with the consortia’s changing priorities.

4.4 Discussion

4.4.1 Organisational competency in service integration

Phase One of the literature review revealed very few studies that have specifically examined the organisational competencies required for successful service integration. The available literature emphasised leadership and governance (incorporating organisational leadership, clarity of shared vision, and organisational systems and processes), organisational readiness and staff engagement as important for service integration. On examination, these competencies place emphasis on the philosophical alignment of the organisations and agencies (and their key personnel) wishing to join the consortia, alignment of organisational systems and processes, and change management capacity. They do not relate specifically to, or reflect the complexity of, the health system and the unique needs of particular client groups.

In order to develop a comprehensive perspective on the competencies required for successful service integration, I also drew on literature describing organisational competency related to change management, mergers and acquisitions and various health sectors. As mentioned previously—and referenced in Appendix C.1.4—several competency frameworks served as valuable reference points.

4.4.2 Leadership competency in service integration

While the required leadership competencies in consortia mergers have not been adequately researched, the literature on leadership competencies deemed important for service integration highlighted five key competency areas: leadership and governance capability; relationship management and communication skills; management of people, organisational systems and processes; practice knowledge; and the leader’s personal skills and characteristics. The literature afforded a number of comprehensive leadership competency frameworks—outlined in Appendix C.1.6—that were used as reference points in this study.
The results of the interviews revealed strikingly similar themes to the literature review, giving weight to Beinecke’s (2009b) claim about the universality of core competencies. The personal characteristics the leader brings to the role; clinical knowledge and skills; leadership characteristics and skills (specifically strategic leadership, people leadership and intellectual leadership); interpersonal skills (specifically communication, relationship management and teamwork); change management skills and experience; and management skills and experience were considered important competencies by current consortia managers. In addition, the interviews provided valuable context-specific information and terminology that informed the preliminary leadership competency framework.

Of particular note is the frequency with which a leader’s personal characteristics—specifically their personal integrity, achievement focus and drive, and self-management (including their resilience, composure in pressured situations, ability to deal with ambiguity and sense of humour) were mentioned during the interviews. Such characteristics were seen by those interviewed to serve as useful touchstones for staff during complex organisational change, service integration and reform.

4.4.3 Leaders’ role in fostering organisational identity and organisational identification during service integration

While research into organisational identity and organisational identification is entering its third decade (Pratt et al., 2016; Wæraas, 2010), the findings of this study suggest that these constructs are still largely the domain of academic research rather than practical application. The constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification were not mentioned explicitly by the leaders that participated in the current study. However, clear connections can be drawn between several of the leadership competencies included in the preliminary framework, and the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification—particularly ‘Clarity of shared vision’ and ‘Leadership characteristics and skills’ and its associated subsets of strategic, people and intellectual leadership.

Building on the findings from the systematic literature review and meta-analytic review undertaken as part of this thesis, which found leadership
to have a positive relationship with organisational identity and organisational identification, it is apparent that organisational leaders would gain value from greater understanding of these concepts and their benefits in order to be more targeted about how they leverage their organisation’s identity and foster organisational identification in staff. In particular, the links between organisational identity and organisational strategy, vision, brand and culture; and the links between organisational identification and a range of positive individual and organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, employee engagement, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship behaviours, client satisfaction, and individual, team and organisational productivity and performance. Whilst it is evident that effective leaders undertake such behaviours (regardless of how their actions and behaviours are labelled), greater understanding of the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification has the potential to add another dimension to their leadership philosophies and practice.

4.5 Conclusion

Ideally, efficient health service management will lead to seamless and appropriate service delivery to consumers of health services. The required leadership competencies for consortia integration have been inadequately researched. However, delivering the right style and type of teams and leadership in order to manage service integration is both challenging and crucial. In the preliminary leadership competency framework, there was a high concordance between the themes derived from the literature reviews, and the research interviews. This study also suggests that, with the exception of industry-specific and technical competencies, the leadership competencies required in service integration are comparable to those required to effectively facilitate other types of organisational collaboration and partnership, further reinforcing the generalisability of many competencies.

These findings help to fill our knowledge gaps and contribute to the current literature by providing insight into the capabilities required by organisations and their leaders to effectively integrate services, and defining these capabilities in behavioural terms that could be applied directly to organisational practice. The leadership competency framework, once tailored
and finalised, could serve as a useful reference point for a range of organisations collaborating to integrate or merge services. However, whilst informative, the study findings are not conclusive and due to the importance of this research field, further validation of these findings is required, as undertaken in the subsequent study (Study 4) described in Chapter 5 of this thesis.
Chapter 5: Study 4—Operationalising Leadership Behaviours to Foster Organisational Identification during Change

5.1 Introduction

The systematic review undertaken in Study 1 of this thesis revealed that the relationship between the constructs of leadership and follower organisational identification was considered meaningful and enduring, regardless of whether the research was conducted using quantitative, qualitative or conceptual methodologies. This relationship was further substantiated through the significant and positive relationships reported in the majority of quantitative studies, in which followers’ perceptions of a range of leadership models (nine in total) were examined in relation to follower organisational identification. The subsequent meta-analysis undertaken in Study 2 reinforced both research and anecdotal evidence regarding the positive relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership models and followers’ organisational identification, with a pooled statistical correlation of $r = 0.47$, 95% CI [0.41, 0.54], $p < .0001$, $tau^2 = 0.04$, $SE = 0.01$, thereby supporting the premise that leaders have the potential to play an important role in fostering employees’ sense of connection to their organisation. However, there is more to understand about the role of leadership in fostering followers’ organisational identification, particularly regarding how models of leadership are translated into practice in organisational contexts, with a specific focus on the role of leadership in nurturing followers’ organisational identification during organisational change.

The study outlined in the current chapter (i.e. Study 4) was designed to capture the expertise and experience of experts—both practising leaders and experts in the field of leadership—regarding the leadership behaviours (and competencies) deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification. The experts provided observations regarding how they have seen such leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change. This study built on Study 3 of this thesis, and drew on action research methodology, in which those involved in research learn with and from each other as they attempt to identify and then implement solutions to their real-life issues (Patton, 1997) through evaluation cycles that involve
planning, action, observation and reflection. Specifically, this study sought to integrate the empirical findings of the systematic review and meta-analytic review (Studies 1 and 2) with the case study findings from Study 3.

An opportunistic sample provided the context for Study 3. Set within a health services consortia, Study 3 combined the research focus of this thesis with the requirements of the consortia, which sought further understanding of the leadership determinants of successful service integration. Study 3 focused on defining leadership competencies, with an emphasis on the observable behaviours underpinning these competencies.

Rather than focusing specifically on the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification in Study 3, the case study examined whether these constructs emerged as a natural priority among leaders when focusing on organisational change, such as service integration. The case study revealed that organisational identity and organisational identification were important constructs in determining successful service integration (and avoiding service integration failure), yet they were not consciously considered by the consortia leaders. Given the small sample of leaders involved in this study, and their location in one consortia, it was considered important to canvass the views of a broader set of leaders regarding these important organisational constructs, via a subsequent study. The current study also provided an opportunity to seek feedback on the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in Study 3.

As Study 4 of this thesis, the current study provided an opportunity to understand in more detail how leadership behaviours (and competencies) need to be operationalised to maximise the chances of successful organisational change, such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures. Via this study, the third and fourth aims of this thesis are addressed:

Aim 4: To obtain the perspectives of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts on the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change.

Aim 5: To refine the preliminary leadership competency framework to ensure its generalisability to the leadership of organisational change in all forms (i.e. beyond service integration).

Adhering to action research methodology, this study sought the
perspectives of leadership practitioners and experts who are currently practising in the field. The research questions addressed by this study were as follows:

- **Research Question 6**: What emphasis do organisational leaders place on fostering follower organisational identification during organisational change?
- **Research Question 7**: What are the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering follower organisational identification?
- **Research Question 8**: How do these leadership behaviours correspond to leadership competencies?
- **Research Question 9**: How are leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change, to foster follower organisational identification in employees?
- **Research Question 10**: What outcomes (i.e. individual, team and/or organisational) result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering follower organisational identification during change?
- **Research Question 11**: What perspectives do experts (i.e. practising senior leaders and/or experts in the field of leadership) have regarding the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in Study 3?

### 5.1.1 The Delphi technique

The Delphi technique is a commonly used—and validated—method for obtaining data from respondents from within their domain of expertise (Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Rowe & Wright, 2001; Yousuf, 2007). Originally employed at the RAND Corporation during the 1950s (Rowe & Wright, 2001), the technique is defined as ‘a group communication process which aims to achieve a convergence of opinion on a specific real-world issue’ (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 1). The technique is used in a range of disciplines to explore, correlate and crystallise the views of experts. Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975) outlined a range of applications for the Delphi technique, particularly its efficacy in:

1. Determining or developing a range of possible program alternatives;
2. Exploring or exposing underlying assumptions or information leading to different judgements;
3. Seeking out information which may generate a consensus on the part of the respondent group;
4. Correlating informed judgements on a topic spanning a wide range of disciplines; and
5. Educating the respondent group regarding the diverse and interrelated aspects of a topic. (p. 11)

Typically, Delphi respondents are invited to participate in a study if they have pertinent experience relating to the topic under examination, are prepared to share their views regarding the topic, and are prepared to adjust their views for the purpose of reaching consensus on the topic (Hasson, Keeney, & McKenna, 2000; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). As a result of their anonymity, Delphi groups can reduce the common biases associated with typical group processes by allowing group members to contribute privately. As such, ‘one may be able to diminish the effects of social pressures, as from dominant or dogmatic individuals, or from a majority’ (Rowe & Wright, 2001, p. 126). Additionally, by inviting insights over a number of rounds, participants are given the opportunity to adjust their judgements without repercussion.

A ‘classical’ Delphi procedure includes four key features: (a) anonymity, (b) iteration, (c) controlled feedback of participants’ (often called ‘panellists’) judgements and (d) statistical aggregation of group members’ responses (Rowe & Wright, 2001; Skulmoski et al., 2007). However, the Delphi process is often adapted and can be undertaken with qualitative data if the parameters of the research dictate (Brady, 2015; Cresswell, 1998). As indicated by Skulmoski (2007), “there is no ‘typical’ Delphi; rather … the method is modified to suit the circumstances and research question” (p. 3). In a chapter on employing the Delphi technique, Brady (2015) referred to ‘Dewey’s pragmatism’ (p. 61), where the Delphi method is flexible enough to be used with both quantitative and qualitative information, and is not necessarily concerned with having a generalisable sample (rather, a purposeful sample will suffice).

The Delphi technique has been employed in a range of studies that
explored leadership and management, including the creation of competency frameworks. For example, Brill, Bishop, and Walker (2006) employed the Delphi technique to determine project manager competencies and characteristics, employing two Delphi rounds (both using surveys). Round 1 required respondents to describe the knowledge, skills and abilities required of effective project managers. These themes were collated into a competency framework, and Round 2 asked participants to rate each competency according to importance, using a five-point rating scale.

In a later and broader study, Fletcher and Marchildon (2014) investigated the role of leadership in restructuring in the health system in Canada. They employed a modified Delphi process ‘in a significantly more open-ended and qualitative fashion than has previously been the case’ (Fletcher & Marchildon, 2014, p. 14). Round 1 involved open-ended interview questions regarding leadership (the key issues in health leadership). These responses were categorised into four meta-themes, and an expert panel developed potential solutions to those themes. Round 2 re-presented the key themes (and their solutions) and canvassed panellists’ rankings of the proposed solutions, alongside the opportunity to provide free-text responses.

Also focusing on leaders and managers in healthcare environments, Hudak, Brooke Jr, and Finstuen (1999) employed the Delphi technique to analyse six studies focused on the essential management expertise required in such roles. Gathering insights from experts in healthcare management, their study resulted in a number of management competencies recommended for the selection and development of both current and aspiring healthcare executives.

In another study focused on leaders in health, Misener et al. (1997) employed a five-round Delphi technique to identify the competencies required by nurse leaders in public health programs in the United States. Employing a mailed survey with major public health nursing associations and leaders in public health across the country, the study resulted in 57 competencies clustered into four groupings via factor analysis. These competencies formed a database for the development of curriculum for public health nurse leaders, together with the evaluation of programs.

The previous application of the Delphi technique for exploring leadership and management capabilities (and competencies) supported its use
in Study 4 of this thesis. The primary aim of Study 4 was to provide insights into how models of leadership are translated into practice in organisational contexts (via leadership competency frameworks), with a particular focus on the role of leadership in fostering organisational identification during organisational change.

5.2 Method

5.2.1 Participants

Fifteen experts participated in this study. These participants were practising senior leaders and/or experts in the field of leadership, with experience in either leading or supporting organisations through change (such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and/or joint ventures) or undertaking research on the topic. To be considered for inclusion in the study, the experts were required to possess at least 15 years of experience in their field. The practising senior leader experts held positions of senior leadership, including people management responsibility, responsibility for making significant decisions on behalf of their employing organisation, and experience in leading organisational change projects. The leadership experts were recognised as specialists in the fields of leadership and organisational change, in either academia or consulting.

The experts possessed experience in a range of sectors, including community leadership development, consulting, energy infrastructure, health insurance, government, manufacturing, mining, research and development, utilities and venture capital. Table 5.1 illustrates the number of participants represented in each sector. A number of the leadership experts also had prior experience as senior leaders within organisations; thus, these participants were able to comment from both perspectives. Sixty per cent of respondents were female and 40% were male.
Table 5.1: Sectors Represented by Participating Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># of experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leadership development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venture capital</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.1 Recruitment of participants

My primary supervisor and I drew from our existing academic and professional circles to determine a pool of experts to contact. Once approval for the study was obtained from the Human Ethics Advisory Group of the Health Faculty of Deakin University (see Appendix D.1.1), the potential participants were contacted via email as the first point of contact. The recruitment email, included in Appendix D.1.2, outlined the aims of the study and provided a Plain Language Statement and Consent Form.

Sixty-four potential participants were contacted via email, with 15 consenting to participate in the study (equating to a response rate of 24%). The names and contact details of those who agreed to participate were known only to my supervisors and I, and were not divulged to the broader participant group. During the data collection process, participants were allocated codes to ensure the anonymity of their responses.

Fifteen experts participated in the Round 1 interviews (seven leadership practitioners and eight leadership experts). Twelve experts responded to the Round 2 survey (six leadership practitioners and six leadership experts). Ten experts responded to Round 3 (four leadership practitioners and six leadership experts), with nine experts completing the survey and the tenth expert providing his overall agreement with the themes in an email.

5.2.2 Delphi rounds

The current study adhered to the Delphi process undertaken by Skulmoski et al. (2007, p.3), whereby participants were asked to respond to a series of questions, in three rounds. Figure 5.1 illustrates the process
employed.

5.2.2.1 Round 1—interview via telephone

Prior to the Round 1 (R1) data collection process, the interview questions were piloted with three associates of mine—all with backgrounds in human resource management—to check the clarity of questions prior to the interview process. Then, in R1, I contacted the participants via telephone, and asked a series of questions. These questions included:

- What is your understanding of organisational identification? How would you define it?
- In your planning of organisational change, how much emphasis (if any) have you placed on fostering employees’ identification with their organisation during change?
- Is there anything that you have undertaken specifically to foster employees’ organisational identification during times of organisational change?
  - If not, what other ‘people’ factors do you emphasise when focusing on organisational change?
- Are there any actions you or your organisation have taken specifically to foster employees’ organisational identification during times of organisational change? If so, what are they?
- What behaviours do you observe in your leaders when they are focusing their efforts on fostering organisational identification?
- What outcomes (individual, team or organisational) have resulted from encouraging your leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change?
- As an earlier component of this PhD research, we developed a leadership competency model focused on facilitating organisational change, such as service integration (note: the competency model was distributed to panellists the evening before the interview):
  - Would you add or alter any aspects of this competency framework, based on your own experiences of leading organisations through change?
  - In your experience, which of these leadership competencies are
most instrumental in fostering organisational identification in employees during change?

The complete interview schedule—including the preamble and conclusion—is outlined in Appendix D.1.3.

I conducted and transcribed the interviews, which were between 30 and 45 minutes in duration. Upon completion of the R1 interviews, my primary supervisor and I used thematic analysis to independently identify and summarise the key themes arising from the transcripts (Braun & Clarke, 2006; DeSantis & Ugarriza, 2000; C.P. Smith, 1992; Vaismoradi, Turunen, & Bondas, 2013). The thematic analysis process of Braun and Clarke (2006) was followed, which involved familiarisation with the data, generation of initial categories, searching for themes, reviewing themes, and defining and naming themes. These themes were discussed between my supervisor and I, with no significant differences in opinion emerging.
5.2.2.2 Round 2—survey via email

To ensure that Round 2 (R2) of the Delphi process was focused and made the best use of experts’ time (and was not too time consuming, thereby discouraging participation), a smaller subset of questions was presented in the R2 survey. The themes from the contextual questions relating to experts’ understanding and application of organisational identification in their environments were not presented in R2; rather, the focus was on the key research questions relating to: (i) leadership and its influence on organisational identification and times of change and (ii) the preliminary leadership competency framework.

In R2, the agreed themes—both relating to leadership and organisational identification, and the preliminary leadership competency framework—were presented to the participants via email approximately two weeks after the interviews were conducted (see Appendix D.1.4). Emails to participants were sent individually to ensure the confidentiality of responses.

5.2.2.2.1 Themes relating to leadership and organisational identification

In the first section of the R2 survey, the R1 interview themes regarding leadership and organisational identification were summarised and presented according to the relevant research questions that formed the basis of the study:

1. What are the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification?
2. How are leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change to foster organisational identification in employees (the actions taken by individual leaders or the broader organisation to foster employees’ organisational identification during times of organisational change)?
3. What outcomes (individual, team and/or organisational) result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change?

For each of the three sets of themes regarding leadership and organisational identification, the participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- How well do the summarised themes reflect the perspectives you
provided in your interview? Please rate the degree of alignment between the summarised themes and your perspectives using a 1 to 5 rating scale, ranging from 1 = ‘not at all aligned’ to 5 = ‘complete alignment’.

- Is there anything you would revise?
- Is there anything you would expand upon?

5.2.2.2.2 Themes relating to the preliminary leadership competency framework

In the second section of the R2 survey, the experts were re-presented with the preliminary leadership competency framework, together with the themes pertaining to the comments, additions and alterations to the competency framework offered in the R1 interviews (see Appendix D.1.4). The participants were then asked to respond to the following questions relating to the themes regarding the preliminary leadership competency framework:

- How well do the suggested additions/alternations to the preliminary leadership competency framework reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview? Please rate the degree of alignment between the summarised themes and your perspectives using a 1 to 5 rating scale, ranging from 1 = ‘not at all aligned’ to 5 = ‘complete alignment’.

- Is there anything you would revise?
- Is there anything you would expand upon?

Twelve experts responded to the R2 questionnaire (six leadership practitioners and six leadership experts). Upon receipt of the R2 replies, my primary supervisor and I again summarised the key themes arising from the participants’ responses, applying thematic analysis techniques (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These themes were discussed between us, with no significant differences in opinion emerging.

5.2.2.3 Round 3—survey via email

The agreed themes from R2 were then presented to the participants via email in Round 3 (R3). Appendix D.1.5 presents the email and survey sent to the participants. As with R2, the emails to participants were sent individually to ensure the participants’ confidentiality.
5.2.2.3.1 Themes relating to leadership and organisational identification

The participants were presented with the key themes relating to the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change, which were derived from the combined responses to the R2 email. They were then asked to rate each of these leadership behaviours according to importance, using a five-point Likert scale (1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important and 5 = extremely important).

5.2.2.3.2 Themes relating to the preliminary leadership competency framework

The participants were then presented with the key themes relating to the preliminary leadership competency framework, derived from the combined responses to the R2 email (see Appendix D.1.5). They were again asked to comment on how well the suggested additions/alternations to the preliminary leadership competency framework reflected the perspectives they provided in their interview. The participants were asked to rate the degree of alignment between the themes presented and their perspectives, on a 1 to 5 rating scale, ranging from 1 = ‘not at all aligned’ to 5 = ‘complete alignment’. As per R2, the participants were then asked whether there was anything they would revise or expand upon in the preliminary leadership competency framework.

To obtain a sense of priority associated with the leadership competencies deemed most instrumental in fostering organisational identification in employees during change, the participants were presented with the themes relating to this question in the R1 interviews. They were given the following instruction:

In the interview round, you were asked to indicate the leadership competencies you considered most instrumental in fostering organisational identification in employees during change. Please take the time now to rank the five competencies you consider most instrumental in fostering organisational identification in employees.

Ten experts responded to the R3 survey (four leadership practitioners and six leadership experts): nine of these completed the R3 survey, while the tenth expert provided general comments in an email.
5.2.3 Revision of the preliminary leadership competency framework

The feedback provided by the experts regarding the preliminary leadership competency framework was incorporated into a ‘revised’ leadership competency framework. I developed the revised draft of the framework, which was reviewed by my PhD supervisors. Additionally, I sought the input of one of my associates with 20 years of expertise in developing competency frameworks to ensure the revisions were understandable, observable and measurable to enable the leadership competency framework to be directly applicable in organisational settings (for leadership assessment, development and performance management).

5.3 Results

This section presents the findings from all three Delphi rounds, which are further illustrated in Tables 5.2 to 5.6. The findings are presented in three subsections, as follows: (i) contextual themes relating to leadership and organisational identification, (ii) themes relating to leadership and its influence on organisational identification during times of change and (iii) themes relating to the preliminary leadership competency framework.

5.3.1 Contextual themes relating to leadership and organisational identification

During the R1 interviews, the experts were asked a series of contextual questions to ascertain their understanding of the concept and definition of organisational identification as an organisational construct, the emphasis they and their organisations placed on fostering organisational identification during change, and the priority organisational identification has taken among other facets of the change process. The themes from these questions are presented below.

5.3.1.1 Understanding organisational identification as an organisational construct

The term ‘organisational identification’ did not appear to be commonly used in Australian organisations, according to those canvassed. For 14 of the 15 experts, their involvement in this study was their first exposure to the construct. Only one expert was already familiar with the term, through broader
reading undertaken in their current role. Two participants asked whether this was the latest ‘buzzword’ in academia and consulting. The definitions of organisational identification offered by experts included:

Expert 1: How an organisation differentiates itself from other organisations in terms of its offering from a people perspective, and what specifically identifies with that organisation as opposed to others. We are talking leadership obviously, in a leadership arena.

Expert 3: It’s not necessarily around the structural and the mechanics of change, but more the human dynamics [in] the organisation … how an organisation grapples with a shift in the environment that results in individual and collective values that also need to shift.

Expert 4: The extent to which an individual identifies with the strategy, vision [and] direction [in which] the organisation is going.

Expert 7: How much people ‘buy in’ to, fundamentally, the purpose and the vision of the firm.

Expert 8: What the organisation would say about itself … it might be to do with identifying with a certain image … it might also be to do with how you try and attract people.

5.3.1.2 Emphasis on fostering employees’ organisational identification when planning organisational change

Once the definition of organisational identification was confirmed with the participants—the working definition used in this study, was ‘a person’s degree of affinity to, or connectedness with, their employing organisation’ (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Patchen, 1970)—13 of the 15 experts commented that they placed some emphasis on fostering employees’ organisational identification when planning organisational change. However, their responses indicated that the emphasis on organisational identification was more implicit than explicit and planned, as illustrated by the following comments:

Expert 1: Yeah, I think that is almost innate in a very basic way. I think that is innate for an HR [human resources] person because you actually need to do the change in alignment with how the organisation operates, and what the organisation holds dear.

Expert 4: Yes, it is the foundation and cornerstone of change. It is critical to frame the identity [of the organisation], who we want to be, and [to] form a pathway around that.

Expert 9: [In] one change project that I did, I was the people change president [when moving the organisation to a different geographical location]. I don’t know if it was overt [the focus on organisational identification], but it was such a huge thing, and it was such a huge adjustment to the employee value proposition that it was difficult
not to disrupt the organisational identification through that.

Expert 13: Certainly when you talk about individual affinity [with an organisation] that rings very true for us, we spend a lot of time on that. Very early in [a change] program … we’ll undertake a group relationship session around purpose. So that we pose a question to the group, which is usually around the question of ‘why are we here?’: So getting to the heart of ‘who we are as an organisation’ and then trying to establish a common sense of purpose … People will go to the heart of the clarity of shared vision. And also we’ve worked very closely with the adaptive leadership model … and of making sure that the organisation as represented in the room has an appreciation of the adaptive challenges, as opposed to just operating it at technical levels … [While] I’m not as familiar with that term [organisational identification]… I guess we are operating at an individual level to understand and to identify with the organisation’s vision and strategy.

Many experts spoke about organisational constructs similar to organisational identification, rather than organisational identification per se, when discussing their planning of organisational change. The constructs discussed included the vision, mission, purpose and values of the organisation (n = 5); organisational culture (n = 4); employee engagement (n = 2); employee value proposition (n = 2) and emphasising organisational history (n = 1). Comments made by the experts in the R1 interviews included:

Expert 10: Probably not in [a] structured way … But we do talk the language of culture when we are thinking about organisational change. We … get key change leaders to think about what are the cultural shifts that might need to occur. But it’s interesting because it feels like, to me, it’s probably still a level above what you’re talking about, which is sort of a deeper construct around values and identity and purpose and some of those sorts of things.

Expert 14: [We focus on] how do we actually really connect with people [to create] the strong level of engagement. You know, an affinity with [our organisation regarding] who we are and attachment to who we are … We’re not just doing leadership development for the sake of doing it. We’re not just getting really good at recruitment and on-boarding processes for the sake of doing it. We’re doing it so that we can really get people to connect with who we are. That is the point of difference. They feel like they’re part of the [organisation’s] tribal family. And so, at any time in the [industry] cycle, whatever happens, there’s that strong emotional connection that will at least get them to think twice about jumping ship, and going chasing dollars [elsewhere] … [and when they leave the organisation] we still want to make sure that they feel there’s a sense of connection, that they feel that they’re being treated with dignity and respect.

Expert 15: It’s been the strongest thing in what I’ve done [as a leader]. In saying this,
of course, I’ve had the good fortune of only working for not-for-profit organisations for 20-something years now. And so people are often attracted to the organisation for the very reason that it has a purpose that resonates … One of the core leadership attributes is to be able to maintain that ‘light on the hill’ sort of story, at the same time you’re dealing with all the alligators in the swamp.

As a divergent theme, one expert commented on the challenges associated with over-identification with ‘silos’ within their broader (macro) organisation:

Expert 6: One of our challenges is a constant grappling with siloism, where people identify with narrow areas of [the organisation], without being able to see the bigger picture.

The experts who indicated they had not specifically focused on organisational identification in their leadership of change did emphasise other ‘people’ factors, including focusing on organisational culture throughout the change process and aligning organisational and individual values. One expert described how her organisation had encouraged its leaders and the broader organisation to be more adaptive throughout change processes. One expert described maintaining (or strengthening) levels of employee engagement as a priority, while another expert described ways to keep staff motivated throughout the change process. Another expert made particular mention of his organisation’s focus on individuals’ barriers to change (whether conscious or unconscious) and striving to assist individuals to ameliorate these barriers.

Comments made by the expert in the R1 interviews included:

Expert 10: [We do a] typical organisational change assessment, where we look at various factors that are impacted. So if it’s the organisation, if it’s roles, if it’s skills and knowledge [and] culture, then we also look at process-type impacts, system-type impacts [and] customer impacts. So we try to, early on in a change process or planned change program, to sit down with the leaders and try to brainstorm that with them … I guess it’s more the adaptive change piece.

Expert 11: The terminology that would normally be used [would be] around what levels of engagement do people have and what are the levels of motivation … and what are the attitudes towards the organisations, rather than using identification.

Expert 13: Our approach to it is quite different, I think, to how most organisations would approach [change at the individual level]. For us, it’s about surfacing the … subconscious obstacles for change, so we do a lot of work with ‘immunity to change’ and to Robert Kegan’s work around that as well. So it’s about the things that hold us back that are not surfaced which are very emotional … We also talk about the
systems thinking of change … We frame leadership as leadership without authority, so now everyone, regardless of that level of status that they hold in the organisation, can play a leadership role and choose. So that’s a very different perspective of leadership.

Interestingly, many of the descriptions provided by the experts who did emphasise organisational identification during change were very similar to the descriptions provided by the experts who did not emphasise organisational identification (such as organisational culture, employee engagement and focusing on values), thereby reinforcing an earlier finding that organisational identification is not a widely understood or applied construct in organisational settings.

5.3.1.3 Priority of organisational identification among other facets of the change process

The participants provided varied responses to the question, ‘What priority has organisational identification taken among other facets of the change process?’ The responses ranged from ‘top of mind’ to ‘not at all’; however, the majority of respondents placed some priority on the construct. For experts who placed priority on fostering organisational identification, common themes emerged around considering the ‘individual’ in the change process to foster individuals’ identification with the organisation as it undergoes change, and the importance of leaders demonstrating empathy and respect for staff throughout a change process.

The experts discussed the importance they and their organisations placed on ensuring that staff understood the organisation’s purpose, mission, vision and values, and how these feature in the change process ($n = 5$). They also emphasised ensuring staff had a clear understanding of the case for change ($n = 3$), and efforts to both mobilise individuals towards the common goals associated with the change and assist them to personally identify with the organisational changes ($n = 1$). Priority was also placed on the importance of understanding and managing individuals’ reactions to the change—including what they would lose (and gain) from the change process ($n = 2$). The experts discussed the value of understanding what is important to individual employees to emphasise what will be retained through the organisational change—as well as being honest about what will not. The
comments made by the experts in the R1 interviews regarding organisational identification as a key priority in change included:

Expert 1: It is absolutely top of mind.
Expert 12: Oh, massive, massive. Drives it.
Expert 2: It’s an important part of the buy-in process … it’s a foundational piece and you can’t really do other elements of the change if you haven’t got that part right upfront. People have got to understand what the case for change is, what we’re doing and why … and I think … if managers can’t actually articulate that, then they don’t know what they’re doing—and that does happen.
Expert 5: When we acquire an organisation … we would do a pulse check … a global survey and a local survey and we would actually ask the acquired company how they’re feeling … We also do the pulse check along the way … [and] we take that information into account [while conducting] due diligence, planning and strategic planning. [We ensure the acquired organisation understands] our values and identity, and we then try to highlight aspects of our organisational culture or our organisational identity that [are] somewhat affiliated with that.
Expert 8: It was the major priority. I mean, I’ve not called it organisational identification as such, but it’s a major priority … 70% of an organisation’s culture is contributed by leadership.
Expert 6: So what we really focus on more than anything else in change is purpose. And why this change taking place in the beginning, and in mobilising people around a purpose and a common goal … and involving people in determining [a] way forward.
Expert 11: I would probably be focusing on organisational purpose. I am not sure if that again is distinct to notions of identification, but if you are talking about the purpose for an organisation existing, certainly, that is really important … to what extent is the organisation’s purpose existing and whether you are looking at current issues or values or whatever. All of the words and all of the language around that I think [are] incredibly important to what extent it is understood through an organisation and to what extent the people understand it and feel aligned to it.
Expert 13: We spend a lot of time understanding and exploring what’s holding the organisation back and some of the … challenges of our experiences. We spend a lot of time in the problem, rather than moving too quickly to solutions … we personally spend a period of time trying to identify who the organisation is.
Expert 15: Until I came to [the current organisation] I wouldn’t have known that it was a specific term … I would have primarily lumped it under the section of ‘connecting people to purpose’.

One divergent theme emerged regarding the priority placed on organisational identification during change, with one expert stating that her
organisation’s emphasis on organisational identification during a change process has been ‘very low’. However, her organisation’s priorities during change (more focus placed on communicating the vision of the organisation, generating a sense of urgency for the change, and managing the key stakeholders associated with the change) were similar to the experts who stated they had placed priority on organisational identification during change. This finding again highlights the conceptual confusion surrounding the construct of organisational identification in organisational settings.

5.3.2 Themes for key research questions regarding leadership and organisational identification during change

Tables 5.2 to 5.6 outline the themes arising from the three Delphi rounds as they related to the key research questions regarding leadership and organisational identification during change:

1. The leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change.
2. How leadership behaviours are operationalised effectively during organisational change to foster organisational identification in employees.
3. The outcomes that result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change.

5.3.2.1 Leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change

Throughout the R1 interviews, when asked about the leadership behaviours that effectively foster organisational identification during change, two experts emphasised that change leadership is challenging and not an innate capability of leaders. Leaders were seen to frequently require support from internal and external specialists when leading change, regarding both how they lead others and how they manage themselves through the change process. The experts also commented that they had observed leadership behaviours that were both effective and ineffective when their organisations underwent change. Table 5.2 outlines the themes relating to these leadership behaviours, which were expanded on by experts in the R2 and R3 surveys.

The effective behaviours observed in leaders when they focused their efforts on fostering organisational identification were clustered into four
themes: (a) effective communication (both written and oral), (b) focus on relationships, (c) stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking and (d) management of self.

5.3.2.1.1 **Effective communication**

The effective behaviours relating to communication described by the experts in the R1 interviews covered the content, mode, style and frequency of communication. The themes relating to content included the ability to clearly articulate the organisation’s vision and purpose, as well as the reasons for the change, across the organisation (and not making assumptions that key messages are being disseminated) \( (n = 7) \); creating and delivering a strong narrative for the change by linking the history and context of the organisation to its future \( (n = 1) \); and being consistent with key messages \( (n = 2) \).

The themes relating to mode, style and frequency of communication included reiterating key messages frequently and in ways that are understood by diverse groups in the organisation \( (n = 3) \); focusing on communication delivery (pace, tone, volume and body language) to communicate with effect and sincerity and to ensure key messages are received \( (n = 5) \); active listening skills, including the ability to discern messages in non-verbal communication \( (n = 4) \); and asking effective questions to facilitate open discussion \( (n = 4) \).

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, two experts made further comments regarding effective communication. One expert emphasised the importance of ensuring that messages are delivered by appropriate levels of leadership within the organisation. This expert recommended that broad organisational messages about vision and purpose are most effective when delivered by the chief executive or executive team, whereas messages that relate to the effect of the change on individuals are most effective when delivered by direct supervisors who are able to personalise the messages. The experts made other comments regarding the importance of providing a range of different forums for dialogue with staff (such as ‘town halls’, planning days, roadshows, group and one-on-one meetings and online communication).

5.3.2.1.2 **Focus on relationships**

In the R1 interviews, the behaviours that experts considered contributed to an effective focus on relationships included being available to
staff (not just direct reports) by being visible, ‘checking in’ regularly and giving people the opportunity to be heard ($n = 9$). Three experts also spoke about fostering trust by being authentic and consistent with words and actions. Many experts ($n = 7$) referenced the importance of attending to the emotional needs of others, including sensing, acknowledging and working through others’ anxieties and loss associated with the change. One expert discussed the ability to know when to use ‘the moment’ to connect with people and reinforce key messages. In R2, one expert emphasised the importance of ‘delivering on promises’.

5.3.2.1.3 Stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking

The effective behaviours associated with leaders providing stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking described in the R1 interviews included taking ownership of the change process, and not over-relying on organisational structures and processes to facilitate the change ($n = 3$). One expert cited the effectiveness of implementing a planned and considered approach to the change to ensure that the phasing of the change is undertaken in a logical manner that makes sense for the teams and individuals involved. Prioritising was also mentioned—particularly knowing when it is important to transcend the operational pressures to focus on leading the change ($n = 1$). Two experts made particular mention of the importance of balancing the needs of the business with the needs of individuals within the business. Another expert cited the value of embracing diversity of thinking (and reactions) associated with the change process.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, five experts made further comments regarding stewardship. One expert emphasised the importance of ensuring that leaders and change champions model the behaviour expected of others during change (behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values). One expert underscored the importance of being able to make and stand by difficult decisions, together with the ability to appreciate the personal effect such decisions may have on organisational members (balancing the ‘hard calls’ with empathy). Another expert described the skill of judging when it is appropriate to outline the consequences of not implementing change (the disadvantages of remaining
with the status quo).

One expert wrote about leveraging the existing knowledge that individuals possess, having been through similar changes previously, to provide insights regarding what succeeded and what did not. She described the value of engaging with the ‘change resistors’ who may be able to enhance risk mitigation strategies during change (including logically analysing points of resistance). Finally, one expert referred to the construct of adaptive leadership (Heifetz et al., 2009), and advocated the importance of ‘adaptive’ behaviours, such as assisting an organisation and its members to cope with change by giving direction, providing protection, clarifying roles, managing conflict and shaping norms.

5.3.2.1.4 Management of self

The behaviours that the experts described in R1 relating to management of self were summarised as remaining calm and composed in challenging times \( (n = 2) \); demonstrating a sense of confidence that instils confidence in others \( (n = 1) \); demonstrating vulnerability, including sharing one’s own reactions and emotions associated with the change and not feeling the need to have all the answers \( (n = 2) \); and being open to feedback (about oneself and leadership of the change) \( (n = 1) \). When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, two experts commented further about the importance of understanding one’s own and others’ emotional responses to significant change processes, including what factors can impede progress (such as immunity to change and fear of loss). The experts also highlighted the importance of prioritising self-care (such as exercise, meditation, breathing exercises and peer support) for leaders to replenish and sustain themselves through change.

5.3.2.1.5 The importance of purpose

In R2, an expert suggested an addition regarding the importance of leaders possessing social purpose when fostering organisational identification during change (Expert 13). In R3, another expert commented:

Expert 7: The social purpose inclusion [added in R2] is especially powerful and speaks strongly to the Millennial/Y-Gen [sic] and to those Baby Boomers who are now moving to partial retirement and want to make an impact to the world in their further work unconstrained by financial or other pressures.
5.3.2.1.6 Less effective behaviours observed in leaders when fostering organisational identification during change

The less effective behaviours observed in leaders when focusing effort on fostering organisational identification were described by experts as essentially the inverse of the effective behaviours described. These behaviours included less effective communication \( (n = 5) \); not placing appropriate priority on the change management processes, both in the planning and implementation of change \( (n = 1) \); losing sight of what the organisation is seeking to achieve because of the pressures associated with the change \( (n = 2) \); distancing oneself from organisational decisions \( (n = 1) \); and avoiding the challenging work (and conversations) associated with the change \( (n = 1) \).

Communication skills were the primary focus of experts when discussing less effective behaviours, and were encapsulated as being less effective at articulating the strategy and vision for the change \( (n = 1) \), ‘telling’ rather than ‘selling’ (or modelling) the change \( (n = 1) \), moving through the communication process too quickly \( (n = 1) \), making assumptions that key messages have been processed by organisational members \( (n = 1) \) and making inappropriate comments when under pressure \( (n = 1) \). These behaviours were referenced in the R1 interviews, and, in R2, the experts referenced the ineffectiveness of focusing only on technical change solutions (and not enough on adaptive change) \( (n = 1) \) and micromanaging \( (n = 1) \).

5.3.2.1.7 Ratings of alignment with themes presented regarding effective leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change

In the R2 survey, participants’ degree of alignment with the themes presented attained a mean rating of 4.58 out of 5 (91.66% alignment). In R3, the mean alignment rating was 4.89 out of 5 (97.78%), with all ratings either ‘4’ (aligned) or ‘5’ (completely aligned). These ratings, together with the finding that the R2 and R3 themes built on the R1 themes, indicated that the experts were largely in agreement regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change.
## Table 5.2: Leadership Behaviours Deemed Most Effective When Fostering Organisational Identification during Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication (both written and oral):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effective communication (both written and oral):</strong></td>
<td>- Endorsement of the ‘social purpose’ inclusion (added in R2), particularly for those who want to have a broader societal effect, <em>n = 1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Articulating the organisation’s vision and purpose, as well as the reasons for the change, across the organisation, <em>n = 7</em></td>
<td>• Ensuring that messages are delivered by appropriate levels of leadership within the organisation, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being consistent with messages, and reiterating key messages frequently and in ways that are understood by diverse groups within the organisation, <em>n = 5</em></td>
<td>• Providing a range of different forums for dialogue with staff, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focusing on one’s style of communication to communicate with impact and sincerity, <em>n = 5</em></td>
<td><strong>Stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active listening skills, including the ability to discern messages in non-verbal communication, <em>n = 4</em></td>
<td>• Being able to make and stand by difficult decisions, while also appreciating the personal effect these decisions may have on organisational members, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asking effective questions to facilitate open discussion, <em>n = 4</em></td>
<td>• Demonstrating adaptive change behaviours, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating and delivering a strong narrative for the change, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td>• Ensuring leaders and change champions model the behaviour expected of others during change, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on relationships:</strong></td>
<td>• Leveraging existing knowledge that individuals may have, having been through similar changes previously, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being available to staff and giving them the opportunity to be heard, <em>n = 9</em></td>
<td>• Engaging with the ‘change resistors’ to enhance risk mitigation strategies during change, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empathy—attending to the emotional needs of others, <em>n = 7</em></td>
<td>• Knowing when it is appropriate to outline the consequences of not implementing change, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fostering trust by being authentic and consistent with words and actions, <em>n = 3</em></td>
<td><strong>Management of self:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowing when to use ‘the moment’ to connect with people and reinforce key messages, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td>• Prioritising self-care to replenish and sustain self through change, <em>n = 2</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking ownership of the change process and not over-relying on organisational structures and processes to facilitate the change, <em>n = 3</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking a planned and considered approach to the change, <em>n = 1</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Leadership Behaviours Deemed Most Effective When Fostering Organisational Identification during Change, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking, continued:</td>
<td>Management of self, continued:</td>
<td>Other suggested additions from experts during Round 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balancing the needs of the business with the needs of individuals in the business, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Understanding own and others’ emotional responses to significant change processes, including what can impede progress (such as immunity to change and fear of loss), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Prioritising ‘social purpose’—specifically leaders’ ability to emphasise purpose greater than the organisation, such as its broader effect on community and society, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritising—knowing when it is important to transcend the operational pressures to focus on leading the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Embracing diversity of thinking (and reactions) associated with the change process, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>Less effective behaviours:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embracing diversity of thinking (and reactions) associated with the change process, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>Management of self, continued:</td>
<td>• Focusing only on technical change solutions, and not enough on adaptive change, ( n = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of self:</td>
<td>• Remaining calm and composed in challenging times, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Micromanaging, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remaining calm and composed in challenging times, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Demonstrating vulnerability, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrating a sense of confidence that instils confidence in others, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Demonstrating an ability to lead the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being open to feedback (about self and leadership of the change), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Understanding own and others’ emotional responses to significant change processes, including what can impede progress (such as immunity to change and fear of loss), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-awareness, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>Less effective behaviours:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective behaviours:</td>
<td>• Less effective communication:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less effective communication:</td>
<td>o less effective at articulating the strategy and vision for the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ‘telling’ rather than ‘selling’ (or modelling) the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o moving through the communication process too quickly, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o making assumptions that key messages have been processed, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o making inappropriate comments when under pressure, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Losing sight of what the organisation is seeking to achieve because of the pressures associated with the change, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Leadership Behaviours Deemed Most Effective When Fostering Organisational Identification during Change, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less effective behaviours, continued:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not placing appropriate priority on change management processes, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distancing oneself from organisational decisions, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoiding the challenging work (and conversations) associated with the change, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.2.2 Leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change to foster organisational identification in employees

Throughout the R1 interviews, when describing the actions taken by leaders to foster organisational identification during times of change, the majority of experts spoke of using change management principles and practices to foster organisational identification. These practices fell into two categories: (i) actions taken by the broader organisation and (ii) actions taken by individual leaders in the organisation. Table 5.3 summarises the themes obtained for this topic in R1 and R2. This topic was not canvassed in R3.

5.3.2.2.1 Actions taken by the broader organisation to foster organisational identification during change

The actions taken by the broader organisation to foster organisational identification during change included activities undertaken by senior leaders on behalf of the organisation, and activities facilitated by the senior organisational members for the broader staff group.

Activities undertaken by senior leaders, as described by the experts in R1, included their participation in forums to discuss issues of purpose, culture and identity and how these were to be managed through the change process \( n = 1 \). Planning featured prominently, specifically the development of detailed change management plans outlining the purpose of, case for, and benefits associated with the change \( n = 3 \), and detailed communication plans ensuring frequent, tailored and multifaceted communication regarding upcoming changes to organisational structure \( n = 6 \).

A key theme throughout the R1 interviews was that organisations, via their leaders, must not underestimate the importance of extensive communication in these situations, alongside employing various communication methods. Eight experts mentioned consultation with staff, including planning days, roadshows, group meetings and online communication. These activities were considered important to provide opportunities for organisational changes (and the change process) to be discussed and challenged by staff.

Activities facilitated by senior organisational members for the broader staff group, as described by the experts in the R1 interviews, included the implementation of programs to support staff, including change mapping,
resilience and career management workshops \((n = 2)\). The provision of employee assistance programs for both staff and their families was also mentioned, particularly if the change precipitated loss for individuals, their families and their communities \((n = 2)\). Two experts spoke about using staff surveys (such as engagement surveys) to take ‘temperature checks’ throughout a change process.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, one expert referenced the importance of providing opportunities to ‘pilot’ aspects of organisational change in conjunction with staff to foster engagement and contributions to change. Another expert emphasised the importance of having change management plans that incorporated an element of flexibility to cope with changes in circumstance.

\[5.3.2.2.2 \text{ Actions taken by individual leaders in the organisation to foster organisational identification during change} \]

The descriptions of actions taken by individual leaders to foster organisational identification during change drew significant parallels to experts’ earlier descriptions of the leadership behaviours that effectively foster organisational identification during change. Two experts described how individual leaders in their organisations had provided clarity on the purpose of the organisation to serve as an anchor through the change process and to provide staff with something with which they could identify (as one expert commented, ‘the leadership question of “why are we here?” is a question of purpose and identification’). Eight experts outlined how their leaders had provided opportunity for frequent discussions with staff regarding the change process and what it meant for them as individuals (their roles, purpose and motivations). Others had been involved with organisations who had engaged coaches to assist individuals and teams to discuss the change and their reactions to it, including their sense of loss associated with the changes \((n = 6)\).

The experts again mentioned the importance of leveraging change champions, with the purpose of ensuring that the change was not perceived as being driven by the senior leadership team \((n = 2)\), together with actions taken by leaders and change champions to model the behaviour expected of others during the change \((n = 2)\). They placed particular emphasis on the importance
of leaders and change champions modelling appropriate behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values, and operationalise the desired change. Two experts spoke of specific training their leaders had undertaken regarding their verbal and non-verbal behaviour to ensure they were able to serve as effective role models for the organisation’s change process.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, one suggestion \((n = 1)\) was made to augment the self-awareness component mentioned in R1 by emphasising the importance of leaders assisting individual team members to understand what factors can hold them back throughout a change process, as well as the emotions experienced during significant change processes. Another expert cited the actions they had undertaken within a client organisation undergoing change:

**Expert 9:** One organisation I worked with focused specifically on answering what they called ‘the three critical questions’ for each of their direct reports during change to increase engagement and eliminate uncertainty for individuals. Leaders were encouraged to get clarity on the three critical questions as quickly as possible for each of the direct reports and to have conversations with them ASAP to answer ‘What’s my job going to be after the change?’ (which eases uncertainty), ‘How am I doing at my job during this change?’ (opportunity for positive feedback), ‘Where will I fit/what will be my contribution to this organisation after we change?’ (draw the connections to organisational purpose for the employee).

Another expert suggested refinements to a theme presented in R1. This expert stated that leaders and change champions should model the behaviour expected of others during change—that is, behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values, alongside ‘new ways of working or new behavioural norms’—to operationalise the change.

### 5.3.2.2.3 Ratings of alignment with themes presented regarding actions taken by leaders to foster organisational identification during change

In the R2 survey, participants’ degree of alignment with the themes presented—regarding the actions taken by leaders to foster organisational identification during times of change—attained a mean rating of 4.58 out of 5 (91.66% alignment). Again, this rating, together with the finding that the R2 themes typically built on the R1 themes, indicated that the experts were largely in agreement, with all ratings either ‘4’ (aligned) or ‘5’ (completely aligned). This theme was not canvassed in the R3 survey.
5.3.2.2.4 Divergent themes

Despite the overall alignment between the experts, two experts provided divergent themes on the actions taken to foster organisational identification during change in the R1 interviews. One respondent, who worked in a cyclical environment that encountered structural change every few years, commented that, while focusing on organisational identification was important, it was more important to implement actions that focused on the broader purpose of the organisation’s work. She stated: ‘I keep railing against the term organisational identification! Because it implies identification with the organisation, rather than identification with the purpose of the organisation’ (Expert 6). Another respondent commented that she and the organisations with which she had worked had never intentionally taken action to focus on organisational identification during change. She commented further that organisational identification may have been a focus, but ‘would probably be called something else’. In R2, one expert commented further on this theme:

Expert 8: Organisational identification per se has not been the purpose or focus of the change; however, consistency with the organisational brand has been—this leads to the identification of the culture and behaviours required to demonstrate identity with the organisation.
Table 5.3: Operationalising Leadership Behaviours to Foster Organisational Identification During Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions taken by the broader organisation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actions taken by the broader organisation:</strong></td>
<td>Not canvassed in Round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation with staff (including planning days, roadshows, group meetings and online communication); providing opportunities for changes (and the change process) to be challenged and discussed, ( n = 8 )</td>
<td>• Piloting aspects of organisational change in conjunction with staff to foster their engagement with and contribution to the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detailed communication plans, ensuring frequent, tailored and multifaceted communication regarding upcoming changes to organisational structure, ( n = 6 )</td>
<td>• Suggested refinements to a theme presented in R1 (in italics):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detailed change management plans that outline the purpose of, case for, and benefits associated with the change, ( n = 3 )</td>
<td>• Detailed change management plans (‘which are also adaptable and flexible’) that outline the purpose of, case for, and benefits associated with the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of programs to support staff (including change mapping, resilience and career management workshops), ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff surveys to take ‘temperature checks’ throughout a change process, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of employee assistance programs for both staff and their families, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forums for senior leaders to come together to discuss issues of purpose, culture and identity and how these will be managed through the change process, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions taken by individual leaders in the organisation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actions taken by individual leaders in the organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing opportunity for frequent discussions with staff regarding the change process and what it means for them as individuals, ( n = 8 )</td>
<td>• Expanding the self-awareness component—assisting individual team members to understand what factors can hold them back throughout the change process, and the emotions experienced during significant change processes, including the sense of loss, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using coaches (both internal and external) to assist individuals and teams to discuss their reactions to the change, ( n = 6 )</td>
<td>• Asking ‘three critical questions’ to increase engagement and eliminate uncertainty for individuals: (i) What’s my job going to be after the change? (ii) How am I doing at my job during this change? (iii) Where will I fit/what will be my contribution to this organisation after we change? ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested refinements to a theme presented in R1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leaders and change champions modelling the behaviour expected of others during change—that is, behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values, alongside ‘new ways of working or new behavioural norms’—to operationalise the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 Themes and Comments</td>
<td>Round 2 Themes and Comments</td>
<td>Round 3 Themes and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions taken by individual leaders in the organisation, continued:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Divergent themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing clarity on the purpose of the organisation to serve as an anchor through the change process and to provide staff with something with which they can identify, n = 2</td>
<td>• OID per se has not been the purpose or focus of the change; rather, consistency with the organisational brand has led to identification with the culture and behaviours required to demonstrate identity with the organisation, n = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leveraging change champions so that the change is not perceived as being driven by the senior leadership team, n = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leaders and change champions modelling the behaviour expected of others during change, n = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divergent themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While focusing on OID is important, focusing on the broader purpose of the organisation’s work is more important, n = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Another respondent commented that they or their organisation had never intentionally focused on OID during change (commenting further that OID may have been a focus, but “would probably be called something else”), n = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.2.3 Outcomes from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change

A range of positive outcomes was seen to result from leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification during change, when this theme was canvassed in R1 and R2 (it was not canvassed in R3). These outcomes fell into two categories: (i) individual outcomes and (ii) organisation and team outcomes. Table 5.4 summarises the themes obtained for this topic.

5.3.2.3.1 Individual outcomes from leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification during change

The individual outcomes outlined in R1 related predominantly to staff feeling connected, consulted, empowered and invigorated as a result of leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification during change. Two experts cited their observations of people remaining ‘on board’ with the organisation throughout the change process and feeling that their purpose was aligned with that of the organisation. Further, two experts observed quick acceleration of individuals’ connection to the new organisation (new organisational structure, merged organisation or acquiring organisation).

The experts also observed enhanced motivation levels of staff because of leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification ($n = 1$), together with enhanced creativity and willingness to contribute ideas ($n = 1$). As expected, other experts ($n = 2$) noticed that staff had felt adequately consulted because of the focus of their leaders.

One expert commented that he had been privy to individuals making informed decisions regarding whether to ‘select in’ or ‘select out’ of the altered organisation, with another expert making similar comments in the R1 interview. Two experts had observed individuals describing increased levels of comfort with the changed organisation post-implementation.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on the themes relating to individual outcomes in the R2 survey, one expert cited a quicker uptake of work and increased productivity post-change. Another expert suggested refinements to two themes presented in R1: (i) that people tend to be willing to contribute ideas ‘not just to the change process, but broader value-add’ and (ii) that individuals’ ability to make informed decisions regarding whether to ‘select in’ or ‘select out’ of the organisation was constructive, ‘as long as
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[there is] no values loss [to the organisation].

5.3.2.3.2 Organisational outcomes from leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification during change

A range of organisational and team outcomes arose from the R1 interviews, both implicit and explicit. The implicit outcomes included an enhanced shared purpose and vision, created and owned by individuals throughout the organisation (not just the senior leadership team) \(n = 2\). Other tacit outcomes noted by experts included change readiness \(n = 1\) and diversity of thinking across the organisation (when different subcultures and identities are valued and integrated effectively) \(n = 1\). An absence of issues with unions was also cited by one expert.

The explicit, more easily measured outcomes included an increase in employee engagement (as measured by surveys) \(n = 5\), lower than expected absenteeism \(n = 1\), lower than expected staff turnover \(n = 2\), quick acceleration up the ‘productivity curve’ post-change, \(n = 2\), financial success \(n = 1\) and organisational success (as measured by meeting key performance indicators) \(n = 4\).

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on the themes relating to ‘organisational and team outcomes’ in the R2 survey, one expert stated:

Expert 9: I think it is very important for the organisation to foster feelings of belonging and inclusion during change throughout the organisation by using ‘fostering’ phrases in key messages, communication, leader workshops, etc.

Another expert suggested refinements to a theme presented in R1—‘lowering’ of issues with unions, rather than an ‘absence’ of issues, as referenced in R1.

5.3.2.3.3 Ratings of alignment with themes regarding the positive outcomes associated with fostering organisational identification during change

In the R2 survey, participants’ degree of alignment with the themes presented attained a mean rating of 4.75 out of 5 (95% alignment), with all ratings either ‘4’ (aligned) or ‘5’ (completely aligned). This rating, together with the finding that the R2 themes typically built on the R1 themes, indicated that the experts were largely in agreement regarding the outcomes that result from encouraging leaders to foster organisational identification during change.
This theme was not canvassed in the R3 survey.

5.3.2.3.4 Divergent themes

One divergent theme emerged in R1 regarding outcomes associated with focusing on organisational identification during change. One expert noted one of the disadvantages of strong identification (over-identification) with an organisation and its culture during change—namely, that identification can affect individuals’ willingness to embrace change, and result in stress and loss associated with letting go of the status quo:

Expert 6: Focusing on organisational identification can have negative consequences … Focusing on identifying with an organisation and its history, and its heritage and its achievements [can] build a lot of shared commitment and at the same time it … can make culture change very, very difficult when we [encounter structural change] … Two very different cultures who have a very strong identification with their own areas and their own area’s pieces of policy can feel bereft when they come together … Sometimes it’s resulted in people going through a lot of distress and heartache about what they’re losing.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, one expert added:

Expert 8: If the change is one of many over a period of years, there can be an identification with ‘failure’ and therefore the sense that the change is not going to be permanent, leading to a potential rejection of, and inability to connect with, the change.
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Table 5.4: Outcomes When Encouraging Organisational Leaders to Focus on Fostering Organisational Identification during Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People remaining ‘on board’ and connected with the organisation throughout the change process, a sense of belonging, and people feeling their purpose is aligned with that of the organisation, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Quicker uptake of work and productivity increase post-change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals’ self-rated level of comfort with change post-implementation, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Refinements to two themes presented in R1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick acceleration of connection to the new organisation (new organisational structure, merged organisation or acquiring organisation), ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>o Creativity—people willing to contribute ideas ‘not just to the change process, but broader “value-add”’, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals making informed decisions regarding whether to ‘select in’ or ‘select out’ of the organisation, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>o Individuals making informed decisions regarding whether to ‘select in’ or ‘select out’ of the organisation, ‘As long as [there is] no value-loss’, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals feeling consulted, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Important to foster feelings of belonging and inclusion during change throughout the organisation by using ‘fostering’ phrases in key messages, communication, leader workshops, etc., ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased staff motivation levels, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Refinement to a theme presented in R1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creativity—people willing to contribute ideas, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>o ‘Lowering’ of issues with unions (rather than an absence of issues), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational and team outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in employee engagement (as measured by surveys)—note this was considered both an individual and organisational outcome, ( n = 5 )</td>
<td>• ‘If the change is one of many over a period of years, there can be an identification with “failure” and therefore the sense that the change is not going to be permanent, leading to a potential rejection of, and inability to connect with, the change’ (Expert 8), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared purpose and vision, created and owned by individuals throughout the organisation (not just the senior leadership team), ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Lower than expected staff turnover, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change readiness, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Lower than expected absenteeism, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower than expected absenteeism, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Organisational success (as measured by meeting KPIs), ( n = 4 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick acceleration up the ‘productivity curve’ post-change, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Quick acceleration of connection to the new organisation (new organisational structure, merged organisation or acquiring organisation), ( n = 2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of thinking across the organisation (when different subcultures and identities are valued and integrated effectively), ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Important to foster feelings of belonging and inclusion during change throughout the organisation by using ‘fostering’ phrases in key messages, communication, leader workshops, etc., ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divergent themes:

- ‘If the change is one of many over a period of years, there can be an identification with “failure” and therefore the sense that the change is not going to be permanent, leading to a potential rejection of, and inability to connect with, the change’ (Expert 8), \( n = 1 \)
Table 5.4: Outcomes When Encouraging Organisational Leaders to Focus on Fostering Organisational Identification during Change, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational and team outcomes, continued:</th>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Financial success, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Absence of issues with unions, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Divergent themes:}

• Organisational identification can affect individuals’ willingness to embrace change, resulting in stress and a sense of loss associated with ‘letting go’ of the status quo, \( n = 1 \)
5.3.3 Perspectives on the preliminary leadership competency framework

5.3.3.1 Aspects of the preliminary leadership competency framework considered most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change

A number of experts commented on the aspects of the preliminary leadership competency framework they considered most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change. Table 5.5 outlines these themes.

When canvassed during the R1 interviews, many experts mentioned the ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ competency as a fundamental aspect of the competency framework ($n = 9$). Eight experts deemed important the ‘relationship management and communication skills’ competency, particularly the ability to build effective relationships, the need for exceptional communication skills and a focus on stakeholder management. Seven experts mentioned the leadership competency in the ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ competency domain, with one expert making broader mention of the reference to ‘governance’, which was seen to provide a mandate for leading the change process.

Seven experts referenced the ‘clarity of shared vision’ competency as instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change, and five experts considered instrumental ‘fostering organisational readiness’. Three experts considered the ‘management of people, organisational systems and processes’ competency domain—and its role in supporting other aspects of the competency framework focused on enabling people—instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change. Additionally, one expert appreciated the emphasis on ‘multidisciplinary teamwork’ in the competency framework, stating that this was critical to mitigate the silo effect that can impede progress during change.

Several experts discussed the ‘practice knowledge’ domain during the R1 interviews. The actual content of this competency was removed for the Delphi process because it had been developed specifically for the consortium involved in Study 3 (as outlined in Chapter 4). However, during the R1 interviews, it was interpreted and discussed by experts as professional or
technical knowledge, and considered important for senior leaders to possess to establish and maintain the credibility required to lead change. As one expert commented, ‘You have to understand what is going on’ (Expert 1).

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on the R1 themes regarding the aspects of the leadership competency framework most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change in the R2 survey, none of the experts made additional comments. Instead, they focused on providing their feedback on the themes presented regarding adaptations to the preliminary leadership competency framework (discussed subsequently). In the R3 survey, when asked to confirm the five competencies they considered most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during change, the most frequently cited five competencies were as follows:

1. *Clarity of shared vision* (Competency 2, cited in the ‘top five’ by 100% of experts)
2. *Fostering organisational readiness* (Competency 3, cited in the ‘top five’ by 89% of experts)
3. *Leadership* (Competency 4, cited in the ‘top five’ by 89% of experts)
4. Personal characteristics and capabilities (Competency 13, cited in the ‘top five’ by 67% of experts)
5. *Relationship management and communication skills* (domain of Competencies 5 to 7, cited in the ‘top five’ by 56% of experts).
The competencies included in the preliminary framework considered by expert panel members to be most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during times of change were as follows:

- **Personal characteristics and capabilities** (Competency 13)—particularly managing self and personal integrity, *n* = 9

- **Relationship management and communication skills** (domain of Competencies 5 to 7)—particularly building effective relationships, exceptional communication skills and stakeholder management, *n* = 8

- **Leadership** (Competency 4)—particularly taking up the leadership mantle (and viewing it as a key part of the role), being prepared to be visible and accountable during change, mobilising people to achieve common goals, and fostering trust in oneself and the organisation, *n* = 7

- **Clarity of shared vision** (Competency 2)—particularly defining and articulating 'purpose', *n* = 7

- **Fostering organisational readiness** (Competency 3), *n* = 5

No revisions or expansions were offered by experts in R2

When asked to prioritise the top five competencies that were most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during times of change, the experts stated the following:

1. **Clarity of shared vision** (Competency 2), *n* = 9
2. **Fostering organisational readiness** (Competency 3), *n* = 8
3. **Leadership** (Competency 4), *n* = 8
4. **Personal characteristics and capabilities** (Competency 13), *n* = 6
5. **Relationship management and communication skills** (domain of Competencies 5 to 7), *n* = 5
5.3.3.2 Suggestions to revise the preliminary leadership competency framework

In all three Delphi rounds, the experts were invited to suggest revisions or additions to the preliminary leadership competency framework. Table 5.6 outlines the themes pertaining to these suggestions.

5.3.3.2.1 General comments and suggestions

In the R1 interviews, the experts offered a range of general suggestions, ranging from general suggestions about how the framework could be made more useable, to comments about the focus of particular competencies, to suggestions for specific wording changes. In R1, the suggestions regarding the overall usability of the competency framework included increasing reference to driving results and outcomes ($n = 2$), with comments including ‘[leaders need to have] some skin in the game’ (Expert 2) and ‘[the framework] appears more applicable to our mid-managers [receiving versus driving the agenda]’ (Expert 10). Two experts recommended further defining the framework by describing the behaviours that sit under the competency definitions—particularly to be of benefit in a range of organisational development activities, such as performance management, selection and development. Additionally, two experts advocated for refining the language of the framework through using verbs with a more definite action-orientation, to ensure it reflected senior leadership capabilities.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on these themes in the R2 survey, one expert commented that was important to emphasise the ‘systemic’ nature of the organisation (where everything inter-relates) and the effect of this on leader behaviour. Another expert provided general comments on the preliminary leadership competency framework in R3, commenting: ‘I like the “meeting people where they are in the change process” [addition made in R2], as that is crucial to understand that not everyone starts or moves at the same pace’ (Expert 7).

The experts also made suggestions to refine and enhance specific competencies in all three Delphi rounds. They devoted the most attention to the competency domains of ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’, ‘relationship management and communication skills’ and ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’.
5.3.3.2.2 ‘Leadership and governance in organisational change’ competency domain

In R1, one expert suggested that the ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ competency domain could be weighted more heavily than the other domains, as the competencies in this domain were considered critical, with other experts commenting that the other competencies cascaded from this domain. Other experts also commented that this domain required more emphasis on political acumen and the nuances associated with power and authority \( (n = 1) \); the understanding and application of key change management frameworks \( (n = 1) \); the importance of engaging, motivating and inspiring others (the transformational aspects of leadership) \( (n = 1) \); and leveraging previous learnings from change \( (n = 1) \).

The experts also suggested that the ‘leadership’ competency in this domain needed to be refined. Four experts queried whether there should actually be a ‘leadership’ competency within a leadership competency framework, and suggested alternative labels (such as ‘change leadership’ or ‘mobilisation of others’). They also commented that there needed to be clearer distinction between the behaviours that related to leadership versus management \( (n = 2) \).

When given an opportunity to provide further perspectives on the ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain in the R2 survey, the experts took the opportunity to reinforce the themes presented in R1. In particular, they discussed the need to place strong emphasis on the ‘why’ of change, so that people understand the rationale for the change and identify with it \( (n = 1) \), as well as acknowledging where people are positioned during times of change (meeting them there, allowing them to ‘let go’, and constructing and gaining momentum around new beginnings) \( (n = 1) \). As during R1, the experts again commented that the leadership competency in this domain needed to clearly differentiate the key leadership behaviours for them to be easily observed and identified by the organisation and those managing the performance of organisational leaders \( (n = 1) \). No suggestions or changes were provided for this domain in the R3 survey.
5.3.3.3.3 ‘Relationship management and communication skills’ competency domain

In R1, the ‘relationship management and communication skills’ domain was seen to require more emphasis on stakeholder management ($n = 1$) and the importance of creating and delivering a compelling narrative for the organisational change that also resonated with teams and individuals ($n = 1$). In R2, one expert commented further about the importance of making the theory associated with change real: ‘Human beings are emotional beings that have fears, hope, emotions and needs and this needs to be a key aspect of any change’ (Expert 14). The experts also emphasised the importance of mirroring people in terms of tone, supporting body language and speed of speech that paces people through the change, described as the ability to ‘go slow, to go fast’ (Expert 14).

In R3, the experts endorsed the themes relating to the ‘relationship management and communication skills’ domain presented in R2 ($n = 9$). They reiterated the importance of creating a compelling narrative through storytelling, with one expert commenting:

Expert 9: One of the critical skills of a leader is to be able to tell stories, use analogy and metaphor, and engage team members with their ‘story of the world’. Storytelling by leaders in the context of change helps employees to identify with the leader or the story and to use the connection they made in their mind to help them make sense of the ‘new world’.

Another expert provided further support for the emphasis placed on stakeholder management:

Expert 9: Good change leaders keep each of their stakeholder groups informed with customised key messages throughout a change. I have observed change leaders use a stakeholder map at the outset of a change and then forget to use it systematically and update it throughout the change—which becomes evident when a stakeholder becomes disengaged with the change because they were ‘forgotten’ in the change communications.

5.3.3.3.4 ‘Personal characteristics and capabilities’ competency domain

The ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain received much attention during the three Delphi rounds. In R1, the majority of experts viewed it as a critical competency, with five providing suggestions for its expansion
and refinement. One expert recommended more focus on authenticity and integrity—specifically, leaders being genuine and consistent, possessing a strong moral compass, and transcending their own personal interests for those of the organisation and the individuals within it. Five experts referenced self-management, which was described as leaders understanding themselves and their defaults and triggers when experiencing change, the strategies they employ when experiencing pressure and stress, optimism that sustains themselves and others through change, and the ability to modify their behaviour ‘in the moment’ to suit the context and audience. Three experts discussed emotional intelligence, including the self-management qualities outlined above and the ability to navigate interpersonal relationships skilfully.

Another suggested addition related to being prepared to have courageous conversations ($n = 2$). This included the ability to deal with conflict (conflicting values and views regarding the change) and the ability to speak about the loss people will experience through change, and support them as they process this loss (as Expert 6 commented, ‘to really acknowledge what people are losing, without being mired in it’).

Several experts ($n = 4$) considered judgement and decision making to be critical in this competency domain, as well as requiring more definition, including a focus on integrated thinking and the ability to deal with multiple ideologies and frames, ethical decision making, the ability to take (calculated) risks, and the ability to be decisive when the situation requires.

When given an opportunity to revise or expand on the themes relating to the ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain in the R2 survey, two components were re-emphasised: (i) judgement and decision making and (ii) being prepared to have courageous conversations. One expert reiterated the ability to make timely and effective decisions without necessarily having all the available information. This individual commented that it was pivotal for leaders to draw on ‘wisdom, good judgement and experience’ (Expert 9). The same individual emphasised a leader’s readiness to have courageous conversations, specifically dealing with performance issues associated with the change process, which she described as ‘having the conversations early so the success of the change is not compromised’ (Expert 9). In the R3 survey, one expert emphasised the importance of incorporating a ‘growth’ or learning
mindset: ‘The effective leader who fosters organisational identification constantly learns [and] is open to learning and applying experience’ (Expert 4).

5.3.3.3.5 ‘Management of people, organisational systems and processes’ competency domain

While the experts did not comment on the ‘management of people, organisational systems and processes’ domain in R1 or R3, in R2, an expert suggested emphasising the importance of enabling staff by understanding what happens subconsciously for them when organisational change occurs: ‘not just a technical, competency focus, but also vertical learning and exploring the subconscious’ (Expert 13).
### Table 5.6: Suggested Additions/Revisions to the Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General suggestions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>General suggestions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>General suggestions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More reference to driving results and outcomes (as leaders need to have direct accountability for achieving results), ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Important to emphasise the ‘systemic’ nature of the organisation (where everything inter-relates) and the effect of this on leader behaviour, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• The importance of understanding that ‘not everyone starts or moves at the same pace’, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide further definition by describing the behaviours that sit under the competency definitions, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Placing a strong emphasis on the ‘why’ of change, so that people understand the rationale for the change and identify with it, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Creating a compelling narrative through storytelling, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refine the language of the model to ensure it reflects senior leaders (rather than mid-level leaders) through using stronger verbs, ( n = 2 )</td>
<td>• Acknowledging where people are positioned during times of change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Keeping stakeholder groups informed with customised key messages throughout a change, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain:</strong></td>
<td>• The leadership competencies (in this domain) should clearly differentiate the key leadership behaviours so they are observable and measurable, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td><strong>The ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be weighted more heavily than the other competency domains, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporating a ‘growth’ or learning mindset, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires more emphasis on:</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The ‘relationship management and communication skills’ domain:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o political acumen and the nuances associated with power and authority, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Making the theory of change real by acknowledging the emotional component of change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Creating a compelling narrative through storytelling, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the understanding and application of key change management frameworks, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Matching people in terms of tone, supporting body language and speed of speech that paces people through the change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Keeping stakeholder groups informed with customised key messages throughout a change, ( n = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the importance of engaging, motivating and inspiring others, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td>• Enabling people by understanding what happens subconsciously for them when organisational change occurs, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td><strong>The ‘management of people, organisational systems and processes’ domain:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o leveraging the learnings from change, ( n = 1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 5.6: Suggested Additions/Revisions to the Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 2 Themes and Comments</th>
<th>Round 3 Themes and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain, continued:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ‘leadership’ competency in this domain needs to be refined:</td>
<td>• Judgement and decision making: emphasising the ability to make timely and effective decisions without necessarily having all the available information, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should there actually be a ‘leadership’ competency within a leadership competency framework? $n = 4$</td>
<td>• Having courageous conversations: promptly dealing with performance issues associated with the change process, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide clearer distinction between the behaviours related to leadership versus management, $n = 2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ‘relationship management and communication skills’ domain:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires more emphasis on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• stakeholder management, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• creating and delivering a compelling narrative for the organisation, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewed as a critical competency requiring expansion and refinement, $n = 5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specifically, more focus on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• self-management, $n = 5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• judgement and decision making, $n = 4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• emotional intelligence, $n = 3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• being prepared to have courageous conversations, $n = 2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• authenticity and integrity, $n = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.4 Final Leadership Competency Framework

5.3.4.1 Overall changes to the competency framework

Using the suggestions made by the experts during the three Delphi rounds, the preliminary leadership competency framework was revised. Figure 5.2 outlines the final framework, which features 12 competencies residing under a reduced set of competency domains (four competency domains, rather than the original five, as the competency domain ‘practice knowledge’ present in the preliminary framework was deleted from the final framework). For comparison, the preliminary leadership competency framework is presented in the R1 interview schedule in Appendix D.1.3, and outlined and discussed in Chapter 4.

As per the experts’ recommendations, each of the 12 competencies was defined more specifically to incorporate more detailed and observable behavioural indicators, beginning with verbs to emphasise the action orientation required by leaders mentioned in the R1 interviews. In addition, more emphasis was placed on describing how these leadership competencies manifest in the support of organisational change.

5.3.4.1.1 ‘Leadership and governance in organisational change’ competency domain

In the ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’ competency domain, the suggestions of experts were incorporated to place greater emphasis on leaders’ ability to lead and navigate organisational change. The ‘organisational management’ competency extant in the preliminary framework was absorbed into the ‘clarity of shared vision’ competency because, when the behaviours were expanded upon, they more naturally resided within that competency. The ‘clarity of shared vision’ competency was expanded and focused more on the behaviours required of leaders when guiding their organisations through change.

The ‘fostering organisational readiness’ competency outlined in the preliminary competency framework was adapted to ‘management of organisational change’, based on the feedback provided in the Delphi rounds regarding the importance of change management throughout the lifecycle of organisational change (rather than preparing for its commencement). This competency was also augmented with more detail, and more clearly defined in
behavioural terms.

The ‘leadership’ competency was removed from the framework, with the behavioural indicators associated with leadership absorbed into the other competencies within the framework (the ‘management of people’ and ‘communication’ competencies). Several experts queried the inclusion of a ‘leadership’ competency within a leadership competency framework, and the competency expert consulted also recommended its removal, stating that ‘the whole thing should be about leadership’.

5.3.4.1.2 ‘Relationship management and communication skills’ competency domain

Enhancements were made to the ‘relationship management and communication skills’ competency domain to reflect the priority placed on this domain during the Delphi rounds. Specifically, a ‘focus on internal relationships’ competency was added to capture the numerous suggestions made by experts during the R1 interviews regarding the importance of proactive, authentic and person-centred interactions with others when an organisation is undergoing change. The title of the competency, ‘collaborating with partners’, was changed to ‘stakeholder management’ to reflect the breadth of activities required of leaders when interacting with partners, beyond collaboration (such as navigating sensitive political issues and dealing with conflict). Finally, the behavioural indicators within the competency ‘multidisciplinary teamwork’ were absorbed into the ‘focus on internal relationships’ and ‘management of people’ competencies, based on feedback from the competency expert, who stated that they more logically resided there.

5.3.4.1.3 ‘Management of people, organisational systems and processes’ competency domain

Two of the three competencies within the ‘management of people, organisational systems and processes’ competency domain remained unchanged in title: ‘management of people’ and ‘management of organisational systems and processes’. As with the other competencies, they were further defined by behavioural indicators intended to be observable and measurable.

The title of the ‘planning, evaluation and service improvement’ competency was truncated slightly to ‘planning’, based on feedback from the
competency expert that the behavioural indicators residing under this competency were fairly typical of a ‘planning’ competency. The indicator referring to service improvement was moved to the ‘management of organisational systems and processes’ competency, based on feedback from the competency expert.

5.3.4.1.4 ‘Practice knowledge’ competency domain

As aforementioned, the competency domain ‘practice knowledge’ was deleted from the framework. It was viewed as a baseline competency domain for people in leadership roles—that is, leaders are expected to possess program and practice knowledge within their organisation to qualify for senior roles. Additionally, this competency domain was viewed as more of a selection requirement for the consortia involved in the case study, Study 3. Its removal was seen to enhance the generalisability of the competency framework, and to provide an opportunity to emphasise other competencies considered more important.

5.3.4.1.5 ‘Personal characteristics and capabilities’ competency domain

As with the ‘relationship management and communication skills’ competency domain, the ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ competency domain was expanded to contain the specific competencies of ‘personal integrity’; ‘achievement focus’; ‘analysis, decision making and judgement’ and ‘self-management’, which were further defined by behavioural indicators that are observable and measurable. Again, further attention was devoted to these competencies because of the frequency with which they were highlighted in the three Delphi rounds.

While the presence of an ‘integrity’ competency was queried by the competency expert (because of divided opinion regarding whether such a competency can be measured), it was retained in the revised framework because of the importance placed on integrity in the Delphi rounds.
Figure 5.2: Leadership competency framework to foster effective organisational change—revised.

The 12 competencies are outlined in more detail below in Table 5.7:

Table 5.7: The Revised Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and governance in organisational change</td>
<td>1. <strong>Clarity of shared vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The leader:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• demonstrates commitment to the purpose of the organisational change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensures alignment between the organisational change and the vision, mission and values of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clearly articulates the rationale for change throughout the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• facilitates a shared understanding of how the changes align with the vision, mission and values of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provides a compelling narrative for change through storytelling and use of analogy and metaphor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Stewardship of organisational change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The leader:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• assumes personal accountability for achieving key outcomes associated with change processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• uses change management frameworks appropriate to the organisation’s adaptation or formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• acts as an enthusiastic ‘change agent’ by demonstrating full, visible and sustained support for organisational change processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• recognises the range of reactions to change experienced by those affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• assists others to work through reactions to change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relationship management and communication skills       | 4. **Stakeholder management**                                                       |
|                                                        | 5. **Communication**                                                                |
| Management of people, organisational systems and processes | 6. **Management of people**                                                       |
|                                                        | 7. **Management of organisational systems and processes**                            |
|                                                        | 8. **Planning**                                                                    |
| Personal characteristics and capabilities              | 9. **Personal integrity**                                                           |
|                                                        | 10. **Achievement focus**                                                          |
|                                                        | 11. **Analysis, decision making and judgement**                                     |
|                                                        | 12. **Self management**                                                            |
### Table 5.7: The Revised Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Leadership and governance in organisational change, continued** | • leverages others’ experience of change to benefit from lessons learnt  
• embraces the diversity of thinking associated with change processes. |
| **Relationship management and communication skills** | 3. **Stakeholder management**  
The leader:  
• proactively establishes professional relationships with key stakeholders  
• uses understanding of stakeholders’ needs to maintain positive relationships  
• supports team members to effectively manage relationships with their key stakeholders  
• updates key stakeholders regularly regarding progress on key issues  
• customises key messages according to stakeholder requirements  
• collaborates to achieve outcomes that are constructive for all concerned  
• navigates complex and sensitive political issues  
• skilfully deals with conflict as it arises. |
| **Focus on internal relationships** | 4. **Focus on internal relationships**  
The leader:  
• orchestrates opportunities to connect with people throughout the organisation  
• demonstrates genuine interest in the perspectives of others  
• demonstrates authenticity in interactions with others  
• makes self available to others to provide opportunities for them to express themselves  
• listens actively, for both subject matter and intention  
• informally ‘checks in’ with others to gauge how they are progressing  
• attends to the emotional needs of others  
• considers the nuances associated with power and authority to interact effectively with people throughout the organisation  
• engages with others across the organisation to maximise cross-disciplinary synergies. |
| **Communication** | 5. **Communication**  
The leader:  
• communicates articulately and effectively to ensure key messages are conveyed  
• accurately assesses the appropriate mode of communication for the situation and/or audience  
• focuses on style of communication, including pace, tone, volume and body language, to ensure appropriate pitch |
### Table 5.7: The Revised Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relationship management and communication skills, continued** | • remains attuned to the non-verbal cues presented by others to determine whether the approach requires adaptation  
• conveys information at the frequency and level of detail required by others  
• does not underestimate how much communication others require  
• tailors the communication approach according to the stage of change the organisation is undergoing  
• proactively broaches difficult situations, engaging in courageous conversations  
• conveys ideas effectively in writing, including writing cogently under time pressure. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Management of people, organisational systems and processes</strong></th>
<th><strong>6. Management of people</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The leader:                                                 | • coordinates diverse teams to achieve desired organisational outcomes  
• fosters a positive working environment in which people are respected  
• employs a multifaceted approach to managing others, tailoring the approach to suit the requirements of the situation and/or person  
• uses a range of techniques to influence others to achieve shared outcomes  
• motivates and engages others, utilising a range of strategies  
• develops the capability of others through effective coaching techniques  
• sets clear accountabilities for staff  
• monitors staff performance  
• provides open and timely feedback  
• deals promptly with performance issues. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Management of organisational systems and processes</th>
<th>The leader:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The leader:                                         | • implements a systemic view of the organisation, taking account of inter-relationships between its systems and processes  
• applies appropriate corporate governance frameworks and practices  
• ensures the smooth functioning of organisational systems and processes  
• ensures existing systems and processes do not become a barrier to organisational change  
• fosters a service improvement ethos across the organisation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>8. Planning</strong></th>
<th>The leader:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader:</td>
<td>• develops plans that reflect key priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.7: The Revised Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Management of people, organisational systems and processes, continued | - oversees the smooth implementation of plans as they relate to the leader’s jurisdiction  
- systematically evaluates progress against plans  
- intervenes if desired progress is not being made against plans, involving appropriate personnel as required  
- reviews and adjusts plans to ensure they continue to reflect key organisational priorities. |

| 9. Personal characteristics and capabilities | 10. Achievement focus  
The leader:  
- operates with a strong moral compass, discerning what is the ‘right’ thing to do  
- adheres to a clear set of professional ethical standards  
- places the interests of the organisation (and the individuals within it) ahead of own interests  
- ensures words and actions are consistent  
- approaches situations with candour.  
  
- sets challenging goals for area of responsibility  
- is tenacious in pursuing goals  
- overcomes obstacles in the pursuit of goals  
- applies a ‘personal growth mindset’, continually seeking to extend his or herself.  |

| 11. Analysis, decision making and judgement  
The leader:  
- comfortably navigates complex and ambiguous issues  
- critically evaluates situations, discerning the logical connections  
- integrates multiple perspectives on issues  
- considers the broader effect of potential decisions  
- makes effective decisions without necessarily possessing all the requisite information  
- recognises when to act with haste when making decisions  
- takes, and advocates for, difficult decisions on behalf of the organisation  
- provides intellectual stimulation by facilitating discussion regarding complex issues.  |

| 12. Self-management  
The leader:  
- demonstrates self-confidence that instils confidence in others  
- remains composed in pressurised situations  
- demonstrates optimism that sustains self and others |
Table 5.7: The Revised Leadership Competency Framework—Competencies Defined, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency domain</th>
<th>Competencies Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Personal characteristics and capabilities, continued | • understands own emotional responses to challenging situations, including factors that can impede progress  
• demonstrates flexibility if situations do not evolve as predicted  
• invites and acts on feedback regarding self  
• demonstrates appropriate levels of vulnerability by sharing feelings and reactions  
• employs an appropriate sense of humour to provide perspective to challenging situations  
• undertakes relevant professional development  
• engages in regular activities to sustain own health and wellbeing. |

5.4 Discussion

The current study outlined in the current chapter enabled me to capture the expertise and experience of both practising leaders and experts in the field of leadership regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification. Via this study, I was also able to summarise experts’ perspectives on how such behaviours need to be operationalised to maximise the chances of successful organisational change. Using this expertise, together with specific feedback from the experts, I revised the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in the case study (Phase 3 of this thesis), thereby providing a contemporary and practical leadership competency framework for leaders who are guiding their organisations through change.

5.4.1 Understanding and application of organisational identification in an Australian context

The term ‘organisational identification’ does not appear to be commonly used in Australian organisations, according to those canvassed. For all except one of the participating experts, their involvement in this study was their first exposure to the construct. However, once the definition of organisational identification was confirmed, the majority of experts commented that they indeed emphasised fostering employees’ organisational identification when planning organisational change, yet it was more implicit, rather than explicit and planned. Further, the experts tended to focus on
constructs similar to organisational identification (organisational culture; the vision, mission, purpose and values of the organisation; emphasising organisational history; employee engagement; and the employee value proposition), rather than organisational identification per se. These findings reflect those revealed in Study 3, whereby the leaders responsible for evolving their organisation via service integration were not consciously focused on fostering employees’ organisational identification with the ‘new’ organisation.

The findings also suggest that organisational identification is not considered a distinct or discrete organisational construct outside of academia at this time. Correspondingly, the findings suggest there is an opportunity to socialise the concept of organisational identification more broadly in Australian organisations for leaders and their organisations to leverage it during their management of change. Specifically, organisations and their leaders would benefit from understanding how organisational identification is defined, organisational identification’s divergence (and convergence) with other key organisational constructs, the positive outcomes associated with fostering employees’ organisational identification, and the strategies that leaders and their organisations can employ to foster organisational identification in their employees.

5.4.2 Leadership and its effect on organisational identification during times of change

The current study identified four key themes associated with the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change: (i) effective communication, (ii) focus on relationships, (iii) stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking and (iv) management of self. These behaviours were further categorised into actions taken by the organisation as a whole, and actions taken by individual leaders within the organisation. These findings are unsurprising, and echo the findings of the previous phases of this thesis—particularly the systematic literature review conducted in Phase 1. Additionally, the range of positive outcomes (individual, organisational and team) that were seen to result from leaders’ focus on fostering organisational identification during change were also in accordance with those outlined in the literature, particularly as outlined in the systematic literature review.
5.4.3 The revised leadership competency framework

A key focus of Study 4 was to seek the input of a broad range of leadership experts and practising leaders in the revision of the preliminary leadership competency framework that was developed in Phase 3 of this research. The resulting leadership competency framework changed significantly. While the leadership constructs contained in the preliminary leadership competency framework remained relatively unchanged, changes were made to several of the competency titles and the placement of certain behavioural indicators. Additionally, each of the 12 competencies was defined more specifically in the revised framework, incorporating more detailed and observable behavioural indicators. Moreover, greater emphasis was placed on describing how these behavioural indicators manifest in the support of organisational change.

The ‘leadership and governance in organisational change’, ‘relationship management and communication skills’ and ‘personal characteristics and capabilities’ competency domains garnered the most attention from the experts during the Delphi process, and were expanded upon in the revised leadership competency framework. The revised leadership competency framework is now also generalisable to a broader range of sectors, evolving from its original focus on the leadership of service integration in the health sector.

As expected, there are considerable parallels between the effective leadership behaviours described by the experts throughout the Delphi process and the revised leadership competency framework. In effect, the revised leadership competency framework is a taxonomy of the leadership behaviours required to support organisations through change, which clusters the behaviours into discrete competency domains. However, the revised leadership competency framework is more encompassing than the key themes arising from the effective behaviours described by the experts. The framework has evolved from the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in Phase 3, which drew from a literature review regarding leadership competencies, as well as interviews with senior leaders within a consortium undergoing service integration. Further, within the revised leadership competency framework, the behavioural indicators are more
specific, observable and measurable, and can subsequently be applied in the selection, performance management and development of leaders responsible for organisational change.

5.4.4 Limitations of this research

There were several limitations associated with this research that could be ameliorated in subsequent studies wishing to further explore this area of enquiry. The key limitations of this research are associated with the population sample. First, the method used to recruit participants—in which my supervisors and I drew from our existing academic and professional circles to determine a pool of experts to contact—may have affected the generalisability of findings (despite this being an acceptable recruitment method in Delphi studies). Further, the small sample size of participants (15 experts) potentially limited the diversity of the information gathered. Additionally, an absence of academics participating in the study may have skewed the results more towards practitioners’ experiences and preferences. Future studies could source a broader range of experts, from a wider variety of organisations and institutions, to engage them in dialogue regarding the key research questions.

Another potential limitation of this research is associated with methodology. While it is commonplace for interviews to be conducted by telephone in a Delphi study, it is possible that face-to-face interviews may have yielded richer data.

5.4.5 Theoretical and practical contributions of this research

The contributions of this research provide a bridge between the theoretical findings of Studies 1, 2 and 3 of this thesis. The findings illustrate how the construct of organisational identification is understood and used within Australian organisations, beyond the confines of academia. The research also shows, in behavioural terms, the actions leaders are taking within Australian organisations to foster organisational identification during times of change. Further, the leadership competency framework, revised by leadership experts and senior leadership practitioners, is intended to be applicable in a range of organisations for organisational development activities, such as leadership selection, performance management and development.
5.5 Conclusion

The current study reinforces the available literature, which purports that organisational identification is considered an important organisational construct that can yield a range of positive outcomes for both individuals and organisations. Organisational identification is deemed worthy of leaders’ attention when guiding organisations (and their members) through change.

According to the leadership experts and leadership practitioners canvassed in this study, organisational identification currently appears to be more of an academic term than a concept employed in leadership practice in Australia. As such, there is merit in promoting the construct more broadly in corporate circles, and outlining how leaders can foster organisational identification within their organisations to maximise the success of organisational change.

The current study also reinforces that there is appetite for more guidance for leaders navigating their organisations through change. It is hoped that the revised leadership competency framework serves as a practical insight into the behaviours deemed most effective for leaders to employ when leading change, such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures. In its current form, the framework provides a ‘blueprint’ for leaders regarding the behaviours they need to demonstrate, articulated in understandable, observable and measurable terms, as defined by their peers (the senior leaders and leadership experts who participated in this study). Further, the framework could be used by organisational development and human resources functions as they select, develop, evaluate and support those charged with leading change within their organisations.
Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Objective of chapter

The objective of this chapter is to provide a general discussion, summarising and integrating the findings across the four studies that form the basis of this thesis. This chapter also presents an examination of the limitations of the research, implications of the research findings and topics for further research.

6.2 Objectives of thesis

This thesis was designed to examine the key elements of leadership that influence successful organisational change, including service integration (an emerging form of organisational change), mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures. Additionally, building upon the increasing body of research suggesting that the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification are important considerations when implementing organisational change, this research aimed to systematically review and integrate recent studies that have focused on the relationships between these three constructs within the context of organisational change.

The impetus to minimise change implementation failure in Australia and abroad, by contributing to the body of knowledge associated with the leadership of change, formed the basis of the two overall objectives of the thesis:

**Objective 1:** To review and synthesise the research that has focused on the relationships between various conceptualisations of leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change.

**Objective 2:** To define the key elements of leadership that influence successful organisational change, within a leadership competency framework.

These two broad objectives were achieved by means of four separate studies, which addressed five aims and 11 research questions, and are discussed subsequently.
6.3 Key findings, and theoretical and practical contributions

6.3.1 Study 1—Systematic review

The systematic literature review undertaken as Study 1 (Chapter 2) examined and integrated research conducted between January 2005 and May 2017 that focused on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, through the lens of organisational change, including service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures and strategic alliances. Study 1 focused on the first aim of this thesis:

**Aim 1:** To provide a systematic review and integration of research on the relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification, within the context of organisational change.

Via Study 1, the following research questions were addressed:

- **Research Question One:** What are the summary findings of existing studies examining leadership as it relates to organisational identity and follower organisational identification during organisational change, such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures?

- **Research Question Two:** How do the constructs of organisational identity and follower organisational identification converge (and diverge) in their relationship to the literature on leadership during organisational change?

This study makes a significant theoretical contribution by presenting the first known systematic review to examine the four research constructs jointly and therefore presents, examines and integrates a breadth of research relating to leadership and its relationship to organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification during times of change. It provides a content-rich integration of existing literature, synthesising the latest thinking on the inter-relationships between the four research constructs via the conceptual papers. Additionally, through the qualitative studies (incorporating case studies, and participant observation and interviews) the systematic review provides the nuanced perspectives of leaders, and their followers and stakeholders, navigating change processes within their organisations. It also provides the conduit for the meta-analytic review undertaken in Study 2, by
synthesising the quantitative papers examining the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification.

6.3.1.1 Key findings regarding leadership as it relates to organisational identity and organisational identification during change

As anticipated, leadership was found to be positively related to both organisational identity and follower organisational identification across studies, regardless of whether the research was conducted using quantitative, qualitative, or conceptual methodologies. Further, the relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification was empirically substantiated through positive correlations reported in the majority of quantitative studies. These findings reflect the body of literature I examined prior to commencing my systematic review, most notably the work of leading researchers who established a (typically) positive relationship between leadership and organisational identity (e.g. Corley & Goia, 2004; Haslam & Ellemers, 2001; Nag et al., 2007; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Reicher et al., 2005; van Dijk, & van Dick, 2009; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004; Weick, 1995), and followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification (e.g. Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Kark et al., 2003; D. van Knippenberg et al., 2004). The findings also laid the foundation for, and were reflected in the results obtained in, Studies 2 and 4 of this thesis, which will be discussed subsequently.

The current review also sought to determine whether a particular leadership model or style would prove more effective at fostering organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification than others. From a quantitative perspective, followers’ perceptions of all but one of the 11 leadership styles explored in the systematic review in Study 1 (i.e. authentic, authoritarian, charismatic, ethical, LMX, paternalistic, servant, self-sacrificing, transformational and transactional) yielded positive and (predominantly) significant correlations with followers’ organisational identification. Passive-avoidant (also known as laissez-faire) leadership was the exception, in keeping with the established perspective that it is the practice of ‘non-leadership’ (B.M. Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Hinkin & Schriesheim,
2008; Humphrey, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yammarino et al., 1993). The prevalence of transformational and transactional leadership as the leadership styles most frequently examined in conjunction with organisational identity and follower’s organisational identification is consistent with that noted by He & Brown (2013) in their conceptual review.

While organisational change provided the context for a number of the studies, only a subset of studies included in the systematic review specifically focused on the construct (i.e. seven of the 15 qualitative papers, six of the 23 conceptual papers, and none of the 65 quantitative papers). This was an unexpected finding, given the intense focus on organisational change—both in research and practice—over recent decades. One possible explanation for this finding is that the breadth of constructs focused on in this systematic review (i.e. leadership, organisational identity, followers’ organisational identification and organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures) meant that, in the interests of parsimony, more focus was placed on exploring the relationship between the first three constructs within studies. In the papers that explored organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification within the context of organisational change, as anticipated, both constructs were seen as important elements of the ‘human integration’ component of post-merger integration.

The systematic review signalled further categorisations of ‘identity work’ (e.g. logic ordering, logic bridging, advocacy and valorisation), in addition to established categorisations such as sense-making, sense-breaking, and sense-giving. This finding underscores such work as an area of expanding interest for researchers, with the potential to provide organisations and their leaders with a broader range of strategies to foster organisational identity and follower organisational identification. Furthermore, the systematic review highlighted that the constructs of leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification were examined alongside a broader range of societal, political, individual and organisational constructs. This suggests an increasing appreciation of the value of such constructs, together with their role in facilitating a variety of positive outcomes.

Also of interest was the breadth of countries (i.e. 25) that research relating to leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification
was conducted in, suggesting the potential relevance of these constructs in a range of cultural and organisational settings. North America (i.e. USA and Canada) was the most frequently cited location for studies \( (n = 23) \), followed by China \( (n = 14) \), Germany \( (n = 5) \), and Spain \( (n = 5) \). However, despite the “explosion” of research focusing on cross-cultural leadership (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003, p.730) very few of the papers included in this systematic review specifically explored the cultural nuances associated with the key research constructs. Only two of the studies, conducted within Chinese organisations, (i.e. Lian et al., 2011; Z. Liu et al., 2013) specifically examined the generalisability of Western models of leadership and human resource practices and their relationship to followers’ organisational identification: Both studies established positive and significant relationships between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, yet Lian et al. (2011) found cultural differences in the interpretation of certain leadership behaviours (e.g. that being an ‘exciting’ speaker was not seen as charismatic in the Chinese corporate context). Given that culture is shown to moderate the outcomes resulting from different kinds of leadership (Hanges, Aiken, Park, & Soo, 2016), the relationship between these research constructs in different cultural contexts merits further investigation, as advocated by van Dick and Kerschreiter (2016) in their conceptual paper.

6.3.1.2 The convergence (and divergence) of literature relating to leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification

Several convergent themes emerged in the literature sourced in the systematic review. These themes have been discussed previously, but to summarise: (1) Leadership (measured by perceptions of leaders’ demonstration of effective leadership models) was found to be positively related to organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification across the majority of studies; (2) Leaders’ role in ‘identity work’, regardless of its categorisation, was considered critical by the majority of researchers; (3) A range of leadership styles were seen to foster organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification, with transformational and transactional leadership featuring most frequently across studies; and (4) Organisational identity and organisational identification were seen as
important elements of the ‘human integration’ component of post-merger integration.

A divergent theme—and one of the significant findings of the systematic review—was the confirmation that the empirical studies were clearly differentiated by the methodologies used to examine organisational identity and organisational identification: All of the research studies included in the systematic review that focused on organisational identity ($n = 15$) employed qualitative research methods, whereas all of the research studies examining organisational identification ($n = 65$) employed quantitative methods. The one mixed method study that focused on both organisational identity and organisational identification (Ruediger et al., 2012) mirrored this divergence in research methods, as it also employed qualitative methods to examine organisational identity and quantitative methods to examine organisational identification. This divergence in methodologies has been given further attention in Chapter 2, and supports claims made by leading researchers in the fields of organisational identity and organisational identification who purport that organisational identification is a more tightly-defined—and therefore measurable—construct, whereas organisational identity is privy to multiple interpretations (Foreman & Whetten, 2002 & 2016; He & Brown, 2013; Pratt, 2003; Whetten, 2006).

As discussed in Chapter 2, the current findings differ somewhat from the systematic review conducted by Foreman and Whetten (2016), who examined the body of empirical research focused on organisational identity measurement and ascertained two clusters of measurement that were quantitative (i.e. survey data analysis via regression or ANOVA-type methods, and secondary data analysis such as event history techniques) rather than qualitative. Nevertheless, both reviews highlight that the measurement of organisational identity requires further investigation, with more research focusing on quantifying the construct using the measures summarised by Foreman and Whetten. Additionally, there may be merit in borrowing from measures of organisational culture and climate which are often seen as comparable constructs to organisational identity (Ravasi, 2016). Equally, the investigation of organisational identification could be enhanced by incorporating qualitative themes from participant observation, interviews and
focus groups.

6.3.2 Study 2—Meta-analytic review

The meta-analytic review presented in Chapter 3—conducted as Study 2 as an adjunct to the systematic literature review conducted in Study 1—sought to achieve the second aim of this thesis:

**Aim 2:** *To estimate the correlation between leadership effectiveness and followers’ organisational identification using a range of different leadership models.*

The meta-analytic review addressed the following questions:

- **Research Question 3:** *What is the size of the correlation between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?*
- **Research Question 4:** *What are the effects of key moderators on the relationship between follower perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification?*

The meta-analytic review makes a significant theoretical contribution by being first to focus on a range of leadership styles (rather than one leadership style) and their relationship to followers’ organisational identification. Consequently, the meta-analytic review has resulted in not only an overall correlation of the statistical relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification, but insights into the relationship between different leadership styles and organisational identification. By summarising the leadership styles deemed effective in fostering organisational identification in followers, this study also provides leadership practitioners with endorsement of a range of styles they could employ in their own leadership practice, rather than having to subscribe to one particular leadership style.

6.3.2.1 The correlation of the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

The meta-analytic study reinforced both empirical and anecdotal evidence regarding the positive relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification; the moderate correlation for these two constructs in the pooled studies corrected for
attenuation was 0.47 ($k = 62, N = 22,649$). This finding supported the theory that leaders can play an important role in fostering employees’ sense of connection to their organisation. Further, as expected, seven of the eight leadership models examined in the meta-analytic review yielded positive correlations with followers’ organisational identification, with the eighth (i.e. passive-avoidant or laissez-faire leadership) yielding an anticipated non-significant relationship. Specifically, when corrected for attenuation, large mean correlations were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between follower organisational identification and ethical, transactional, and transformational leadership. Moderate mean correlations were obtained for the studies that focused on the relationship between follower organisational identification and the four of the eight leadership types: authentic, charismatic, self-sacrificial and servant leadership.

Chapter 3 provides a detailed discussion of the leadership qualities and behaviours measured by the leadership models included in the meta analytic review in Study 2, including their similarities and differences, and reinforces the findings from Studies 1, 3 and 4 regarding the leadership qualities considered efficacious when fostering followers’ organisational identification. As such, this study provides further impetus for leaders to focus on their followers’ identification with their organisation when seeking to make a positive contribution to their organisation and its members.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that the correlations imply a relationship rather than causality, and should be interpreted as such. While the findings indicate that a leader’s demonstration of an effective model of leadership has a direct influence on his or her followers’ identification with their organisation, there are other possible explanations for the relationship. As discussed in Chapter 2, there are other major antecedents of organisational identification beyond leadership which may have contributed to followers’ ratings of organisational identification: organisational factors associated with perceived organisational identity attributes such as attractiveness, distinctiveness, prestige, and construed external image (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Dutton et al., 1994; He & Brown, 2013); and social exchange

---

9 The number of leadership styles investigated reduced from 11 in the systematic review to eight in the meta-analytic study, due to suitability of studies for inclusion in the meta-analysis.
factors such as the organisation’s fulfilment of employees’ socio-emotional needs (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2003), perceptions of procedural justice and the provision of organisational support (Edwards, 2009; Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Gibney, Zagenczyk, Fuller, Hester, & Caner, 2011; Sluss, Klimchak, & Holmes, 2008), and the strength of relationships between leaders and their followers (Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007). Furthermore, and as will be discussed subsequently, the correlations are based on followers’ ratings and as such are vulnerable to bias (such as rater affect).

As mentioned previously, Study 2 represents one of the first published meta-analytic studies examining the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and follower organisational identification, and is the first to focus on a range of leadership models and followers’ organisational identification. A meta-analytic review recently published by Horstmeier et al., (2016) provided an opportunity to compare findings as they pertain to transformational leadership and its relationship to organisational identification: Both Study 2 and Horstmeier et al. (2016) attained moderate correlations for the relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ organisational identification, reinforcing that followers’ perceptions of transformational leadership—focusing on leaders’ ability to influence, inspire and motivate, provide intellectual stimulation and demonstrate consideration for the individual needs of others (B.M. Bass, 1985; B.M. Bass & Avolio, 1997; B.M. Bass et al, 2008)—are moderately associated with followers’ organisational identification.

6.3.2.2 Effects of key moderators on the relationship between leadership and organisational identification

In the meta-analytic review, the majority of levels of the ‘leadership’ and ‘industry’ moderators examined via sub-group meta-analyses were found to have a statistically significant influence on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification: As reflected in the systematic review (i.e. Study 1) findings—where 10 of the 11 leadership styles were seen to (predominantly) positively relate to followers’ organisational identification—seven of the eight levels of the ‘leadership’ moderator examined in the meta-analytic review (i.e. authentic, charismatic, ethical, transactional, transformational, servant and
self-sacrificial leadership) obtained moderate to large correlations that were deemed significant. The significant correlations varied between 0.29 and 0.60, indicating variability in the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification, depending on the leadership style measured. Ethical \((r = .54)\), transformational \((r = .51)\) and transformational \((r = .60)\) leadership styles yielded the largest correlations with followers’ organisational identification.

Nine of the ten levels of the ‘industry’ moderator (i.e. education, health, hospitality, ICT, finance, manufacturing, a range of industries, retail and research and development) examined in the sub-group meta-analytic review obtained moderate to large correlations, or were characterised by moderate to large sample sizes that enhanced the power of the correlations. Because some industry groups included few studies, it would be tenuous to draw firm conclusions about the influence of the industry group on the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification. However, the results do indicate an opportunity for future research into the dynamics of different industries—including their cultures, values, ideologies, organisational identities, professional orientations, leadership preferences and skills—and the impact this has on followers’ organisational identification. Such insights may prompt the modification of leadership and change management practices focused on fostering organisational identification according to industry variances.

When post-hoc pairwise comparisons were undertaken with the leadership type moderator, significant differences were obtained between the mean correlations between several leadership styles, suggesting that different leadership styles may in fact yield a different impact on followers’ organisational identification. Several significant differences were also found when pairwise comparisons were undertaken with industry type, indicating that the industry context may also influence the relationship between leadership and followers’ organisational identification. Nevertheless, further research is recommended before firm conclusions can be drawn.
6.3.3 Study 3—Leadership competencies

The case study (i.e. Study 3) conducted as part of the research was outlined in Chapter 4. In a real-world context, the leadership competencies required for successful service integration were examined to achieve the third aim of this thesis:

Aim 3: To identify the key elements of leadership that contribute to successful service integration.

The research question focused on in Study 3 was:

- **Research Question Five:** What are the leadership competencies required for successful service integration?

Study 3 adds to the body of knowledge related to service integration, with a particular focus on the research related to the leadership factors that contributes to its success. At the commencement of this thesis there was little research pertaining to this important emerging organisational construct, and as such this study makes an early contribution to the research, recognised by the publication of a paper summarising its findings in the Leadership in Health Services Journal (i.e. Aitken & von Treuer, 2014).

As more organisations combine in increasingly diverse (and less traditional) ways, insights into the leadership of service integration may assist leaders and their organisations to traverse the complexities associated with such change. Such insights may also reduce the incidence of service integration failures (and consequent financial losses), which, as mentioned in Chapter 4, appear to centre upon the degree of effectiveness of organisational change management strategies such as people engagement and leadership (Glendinning, 2003).

Study 3 also highlighted that the required leadership competencies in consortia mergers—where a multitude of approaches to service integration are employed, ranging from loose organisational ties to fully integrated organisations (Fulop et al., 2005; Lewis et al., 2010)—have not been adequately researched to date. The main outcome from Study 3—and an aspect of this thesis that makes a significant practical contribution to the field of change leadership (and more specifically, the successful leadership of service integration)—is the preliminary leadership competency framework that was developed. It was intended that, once tailored and finalised, the
framework could serve as the basis of a range of organisational development practices aimed at maximising the success of organisational change such as service integration, including leadership selection and development, talent assessment and development, strategic workforce planning, performance management, training and development, and career development. Teams specifically focused on mergers and acquisitions—be they within organisations or consultancies—may also find the framework useful for building their integration capability.

The preliminary framework consists of 13 competencies within five competency domains: (1) *Leadership and governance in service integration* (incorporating the ability to provide clarity of shared vision, organisational management, fostering organisational readiness (for change), and leadership characteristics); (2) *Relationship management and communication skills* (encapsulating the ability to collaborate with partners, exemplary communication skills, and the ability to develop and foster multi-disciplinary teams; (3) *Management of people, organisational systems and procedures* (focusing on the management of people, management of organisational systems and process, and planning, evaluation and service improvement); (4) *Practice knowledge* (relating to leaders’ knowledge of, and experience in, the systems, structures and standards that relate to their service area or technical expertise, together with client group advocacy and community development); and (5) *Personal characteristics and capabilities* (emphasising personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management). The framework is described in detail in Chapter 4.

The preliminary leadership competency framework was derived from literature reviews regarding the organisational and leadership competencies required during successful organisational change such as service integration. The themes from the literature were then amalgamated with insights from consortia managers charged with leading service integration within an Australian organisation undertaking significant reform in its sector. There was a high concordance between the themes derived from the literature reviews, and the research interviews conducted with managers. Additionally, with the exception of industry-specific and technical competencies, the leadership competencies required in successful service integration were comparable to
those required to effectively facilitate other types of organisational collaboration and partnership (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005, 2008; B.M. Bass et al., 2008; Beinecke, 2009a, 2009b; Gebelein et al., 2001; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003; Stefl, 2008), further reinforcing the generalisability of many competencies. This is reinforced further by the findings of the Study 4 discussed in Chapter 5 (which will be summarised and discussed subsequently), where a range of leadership experts and leadership practitioners provided feedback that concurred with, and augmented, the preliminary framework, rather than suggesting wholesale changes. These combined findings give weight to Beinecke’s (2009a) claim about the ‘universality’ of core competencies.

Nevertheless, of particular note is the frequency with which a leader’s personal characteristics—specifically their personal integrity, achievement focus and drive, and self-management (including their resilience, composure in pressured situations, ability to deal with ambiguity and sense of humour)—were mentioned during the interviews with consortia managers. Such characteristics were seen by those interviewed to serve as useful touchstones for staff during complex organisational change, service integration and reform. As will be discussed subsequently, such innate qualities are perceived to be more difficult to develop than technical skills (Strebler, Robinson, & Heron, 1997), and consequently have implications for the selection and development of leaders, in addition to how early the ‘leadership pipeline’ (i.e. identification of leader successors) commences for prospective leaders of organisational change.

In order to test its validity and applicability in a broad range of settings (i.e. beyond the auspices of service integration, to the leadership of organisational change more generally), the preliminary leadership competency framework was further examined in Study 4. Its interrogation and revision are discussed below.
6.3.4 Study 4—Verification of leadership competencies and behaviours

Study 4, presented in Chapter 5, served to consolidate the first three studies of this thesis in a real-world context to achieve the fourth and fifth aims of this thesis:

**Aim 4:** To obtain the perspectives of Australian senior leaders and leadership experts on the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change.

**Aim 5:** To refine the preliminary leadership competency framework to ensure its generalisability to the leadership of organisational change in all forms (i.e. beyond service integration).

During the course of this study, the insights of senior leaders and leadership experts were sought regarding the leadership behaviours (and competencies) considered most effective when fostering organisational identification.

The research questions addressed in this chapter were:

- **Research Question 6:** What emphasis do organisational leaders place on fostering follower organisational identification during organisational change?
- **Research Question 7:** What are the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering follower organisational identification?
- **Research Question 8:** How do these leadership behaviours correspond to leadership competencies?
- **Research Question 9:** How are leadership behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change, to foster organisational identification in employees?
- **Research Question 10:** What outcomes (i.e. individual, team and/or organisational) result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering follower organisational identification during change?
- **Research Question 11:** What perspectives do subject matter experts (i.e. practising senior leaders and/or experts in the field of leadership) have regarding the preliminary leadership competency framework developed in phase three of this thesis?
With the aim to amalgamate the findings of the first three studies it is not surprising that, in Study 4, I explored the largest number of research questions involved in this thesis. Consequently, Study 4 is given substantive attention in this chapter.

The main contribution of Study 4 is the final leadership competency model, focused on the leadership of organisational change (incorporating service integration). This model was developed in conjunction with leaders and leadership development practitioners with significant experience and expertise in leading organisations through change, thus enhancing its applicability in a range of organisational settings.

6.3.4.1 Emphasis placed on fostering organisational identification during organisational change

A significant—and somewhat unexpected—finding from this study was that organisational identification was not considered a distinct or discrete organisational construct outside of academia at this time: All but one of the experts involved in Study 4 were unfamiliar with the construct at the commencement of their involvement in the study. While this finding reflects those attained in the Study 3 case study—where leaders responsible for evolving their organisation via service integration were not consciously focused on fostering employees’ organisational identification with the ‘new’ consortia—it was anticipated that, by canvassing a broader range of experts, there would be more recognition and application of organisational identification in organisational settings. These findings suggest that there is an opportunity to socialise the concept of organisational identification more broadly in Australian organisations (and potentially, internationally), in order for leaders and their organisations to leverage it in their management of change.

When discussing the construct of organisational identification, the majority of experts referenced other organisational constructs related to individuals’ sense of connection to their organisation (rather than organisational identification per se), namely: individuals’ alignment with the vision, mission, purpose and values of the organisation; organisational culture; employee engagement; and the employee value proposition. This finding reflects the argument made by some researchers (e.g. Ashforth et al., 2008)
that organisational identification overlaps somewhat with the constructs of affective organisational commitment, organisational loyalty, person-organisation fit, psychological ownership, and job embeddedness. And while Riketta (2005) established an empirical distinction between organisational identification and affective organisational commitment, more research could be undertaken regarding the distinction between organisational identification and these other constructs. Additionally, it would be interesting to examine the merits of focusing on organisational identification over and above other organisational constructs—a ‘utility analysis’ of sorts. Nevertheless, regardless of the terminology used, an employee’s connection with their employing organisation was seen to yield a range of positive outcomes, both tangible and intangible, that yield positive results and should be encouraged. These outcomes will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

6.3.4.2 Leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change

Study 4 identified four important themes associated with the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification during change: (1) effective communication; (2) focus on relationships; (3) stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking; and (4) management of self. These were in accordance with those outlined in the literature, particularly as outlined in the systematic literature review undertaken in Study 1 of this thesis.

Key recommendations arising from the papers included in the systematic review were that organisational leaders should err on the side of ‘over-communication’, as well as engage in substantive and sincere conversations about identity loss, ambiguity, and potential power and status differentials, to assist staff through complex and potentially disorientating organisational changes. The importance of forging authentic and positive relationships with staff, and the provision of practical and emotional support (including for the leader him/herself), were also viewed as critical leadership behaviours in the establishment and reinforcement of organisational identification.

Unsurprisingly, there was a high degree of consistency between the effective leadership behaviours identified by experts in both of the
organisationally-based studies (i.e. Studies 3 and 4) included in this thesis. Each of the studies was conducted entirely separately, with no crossover of participants or industries, yet similar themes emerged from both studies. This convergence of perspectives from Australian leaders and leadership experts from a range of industries (i.e. consulting, community leadership development, government, energy infrastructure, health insurance, manufacturing, mental health, mining, research and development, utilities and venture capital) gives weight to the effective behaviours identified in this thesis, and it is hoped will be of use to organisations and their leaders when planning how to affect change at a practical level.

It is anticipated that leaders of Australian organisations will be particularly interested in the manner in which a subsection of their peer group has described the behaviours deemed effective when fostering organisational identification during change—for their professional development, the development of others, and ensuring their own competitive advantage when applying for positions of change leadership. Furthermore, the final leadership competency framework may be of interest to professional bodies tasked with building the capability of their members.

**6.3.4.3 How leadership behaviours are operationalised effectively during organisational change, to foster organisational identification in followers**

The actions taken to operationalise leadership to foster organisational identification were categorised into: (1) actions taken by individual leaders within the organisation; and (2) actions taken by the organisation as a whole. At the individual level, leaders who engaged in frequent discussions with staff regarding change—both to provide clarity of purpose and to discuss the personal impact of the change—were seen to more effectively foster their organisational identification. Working with coaches to refine their leadership of change was also considered important, as was the value of role modelling the behaviours expected of others during change and leveraging change champions.

Organisations that encouraged their senior leaders to meet regularly to discuss change, created detailed change management and communication plans, consulted extensively, and provided support programmes for staff and
their families were seen to more effectively foster organisational identification in employees during change, than those organisations that did not. Engagement surveys to take ‘temperature checks’ throughout change processes were also considered invaluable.

These findings are unsurprising, and again echo the results of the previous phases of this thesis—most particularly the systematic literature review conducted in Study 1 and the leadership competency study (Study 3). However, of note is the finding that the leadership behaviours described mirror those employed in leading change more generally, rather than being uniquely associated with fostering organisational identification. This may in part be due to the fact that all but one of the experts involved in the Study 4 were unfamiliar with the construct of organisational identification before their participation in the study (and therefore potentially defaulted to discussing their involvement in change leadership, rather than how they and their leadership colleagues have specifically fostered organisational identification during change). As such, the distinction between the leadership of change, and the leadership behaviours required to foster organisational identification during change, may need to be further substantiated, with their differences described with more granularity. Another explanation for this finding in Study 4, which is reflected in the findings of the systematic literature and meta-analytic reviews (Studies 1 and 2), is that organisational identification is often considered a variable that mediates or moderates the relationship between leadership and other individual and organisational outcomes that contribute to effective organisational change, rather than being an end-point in itself.

6.3.4.4 Outcomes (i.e. individual, team and / or organisational) that result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change

The range of positive outcomes (i.e. individual, organisational and team) that were seen to result from leaders’ focus on fostering followers’ organisational identification during change suggest that it is indeed a construct worthy of consideration by organisations and their leaders. The individual and team outcomes identified by experts included: an aligned sense of purpose; people remaining ‘on board’ and connected with the organisation throughout the change process; comfort with change during and post-implementation;
individuals feeling consulted, motivation levels of staff, creativity, and individuals’ productivity post-change. Organisational outcomes included: a shared purpose and vision; positive employee engagement survey results; organisational change readiness; lower than expected staff turnover and absenteeism; organisational success (as measured by meeting performance, productivity and financial targets); diversity of thinking across the organisation; and absence of issues with unions.

These outcomes reflect the range of variables examined in relation to leadership and organisational identification in the systematic literature and meta-analytic reviews, as well the subsequent findings of these studies. While these variables have been given attention in Chapter 2, to summarise, researchers have explored the relationship between leadership and organisational identification, and a broad range of variables, including cognitive and affective, behavioural, relational, health-related, performance and outcome-related variables.

6.3.4.5 Leadership competencies deemed most instrumental in fostering organisational identification during organisational change

A key focus of Study 4 was to seek the input of a broad range of leadership experts and practising leaders into the revision of the preliminary leadership competency framework, which was developed in Study 3. While the resulting leadership competency framework is consistent with the preliminary framework at a thematic level, it evolved somewhat, with each of the competencies (12 rather than 13) outlined more specifically, and incorporating more detailed and observable behavioural indicators. More emphasis was also placed on describing how these behavioural indicators manifest themselves in the support of organisational change.

The final framework consists of 12 competencies within four competency domains: (1) Leadership and governance in organisational change (incorporating the ability to provide clarity of shared vision, and stewardship of organisational change); (2) Relationship management and communication skills (encapsulating stakeholder management skills, a focus on internal relationships, and exemplary communication skills); (3) Management of people, organisational systems and processes (focusing on the management of people, management of organisational systems and process,
and planning); and (4) *Personal characteristics and capabilities* (emphasising personal integrity, achievement focus, analysis, decision-making and judgement and self-management). The framework is described in detail in Chapter 5.

It is intended that, in its final format presented in Chapter 5, the leadership competency framework will make a significant and practical contribution to the leadership of change. Specifically, the framework was revised to ensure its applicability in a range of organisational settings, forming the basis of a range of organisational development practices, as mentioned previously.

The leadership competencies considered most instrumental in fostering followers’ organisational identification during organisational change were: (1) Clarity of shared vision; (2) Fostering organisational readiness; (3) Leadership; (4) Personal characteristics and capabilities; and (5) Relationship management and communication skills. These closely reflect the priorities given to the competencies by the consortia managers in Study 3, who cited (1) Personal characteristics (such as personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management); (2) Leadership skills and characteristics; (3) Professional liaison (including relationship management and networking skills); (4) Communication; and (5) Clarity of shared vision as the most important competencies for organisational change such as service integration.

Of note is the finding that the competencies emphasised most frequently by experts throughout Study 4 (and also in Study 3) were more related to personal characteristics that are more challenging to develop—many of which are more intrinsic, value-oriented and personality-based, such as a willingness to take ownership of situations, honesty, integrity, a genuine affinity for others, and a willingness to engage in honest (if sometimes difficult) conversations. In order to demonstrate these behaviours, leaders require knowledge, skills and abilities that are not easily attained in the short-term (or via training courses), rather are acquired through career and life experiences that allow a leader to hone their communication, influencing and relating skills—as well as their personal character—in corporate settings. Furthermore, it could be argued that the ‘development pipeline’ for these leadership competencies should not commence at the time an individual is
6.3.4.5.1 How leadership behaviours correspond to leadership competencies

As outlined in Chapter 5—and as anticipated—there are considerable parallels between the effective leadership behaviours described by leadership experts throughout Delphi process in Study 4 and the revised leadership competency framework. The key difference is that the revised leadership framework is more comprehensive than the themes arising from the effective behaviours described by the leadership experts. Within the revised framework, the behavioural indicators are more specific, observable and measurable, and therefore can be applied in the selection, performance management, and development of leaders responsible for organisational change.

6.3.4.6 Additional findings

While research into organisational identity and organisational identification is entering its third decade (Pratt et al., 2016; Wæraas, 2010), the findings of both organisationally-based studies (i.e. Studies 3 and 4) suggest that these constructs are still largely the domain of academic research rather than practical application. The current research highlights that organisational leaders could gain value from greater understanding of the concepts—and benefits—of organisational identity and organisational identification in order to be more targeted about how they leverage their organisation’s identity and foster organisational identification in staff. Whilst it is evident that effective leaders undertake such behaviours (regardless of how their actions and behaviours are labelled), greater understanding of the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification has the potential to add another dimension to their leadership schemas and practice.

Throughout the Delphi process in Study 4, the experts also provided additional insights into the leadership of change, which are worthy of mention in this chapter. First, the model of adaptive leadership (Heifetz et al., 2009) was mentioned by several experts in the Delphi rounds—the only time this model of leadership featured in in this research, as it did not emerge in the preceding literature reviews in Studies 1 and 3. Adaptive leadership is a
contemporary model which advocates that ‘leadership is a practice, rather than a position’ and can be exercised by anyone within an organisation (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997), and outlines ‘adaptive’ behaviours such as assisting an organisation and its members to cope with change by giving direction, providing protection, clarifying roles, managing conflict and shaping norms. Its absence in the systematic review suggests that it is an emerging area of leadership that is yet to be empirically examined alongside the other key constructs explored in this thesis (i.e. organisational identity and organisational identification). It is therefore anticipated that future systematic reviews may yield empirical research about this model of leadership as it relates to fostering organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification.

Second, the importance of leveraging ‘change champions’ was emphasised by a number of experts—consistent with themes in the systematic review (i.e. Study 1), and insights from managers interviewed in Study 3. This consistent finding reinforces the influence of those with informal authority, who may not necessarily be in formal leadership positions but still play a pivotal role in supporting (or hindering) an organisation’s transformation efforts. The premise that leadership is a practice that can be exercised by anyone (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Heifetz et al., 2009) appears particularly relevant in this instance.

### 6.4 Limitations of this research

The limitations associated with the four studies comprising this thesis have been discussed in detail in Chapters 2 to 4. Nevertheless, there are several worthy of further discussion in this concluding chapter.

First, the measures of leadership and organisational identification utilised in the meta-analytic review were solely obtained from the ratings of followers, thereby only providing the perspectives of one organisational cohort, and vulnerable to rater errors. Second, the potential presence of publication bias identified in the meta-analytic review indicates that the research published may not be representative of the population of completed studies. Furthermore, none of the studies included in the meta-analytic review reported randomised controlled trials, nor were longitudinal.
Fourth, Study 3 featured several limitations: At the outset of this thesis, it was intended to be the ‘foundational study’ upon which other studies within the participating organisation were to be based. However, this did not eventuate and the focus on organisational identity and organisational identification emerged after the case study was completed. Had the investigation been undertaken after the systematic literature review and meta-analytic review, the constructs of organisational identity and organisational identification would also have been examined in this component of the thesis. Additionally, Study 3 was based on the working assumption that the consortiums and leaders cited as ‘successful’ by those interviewed, had translated their perceived success into effective service integration.

6.5 Future research

The current thesis highlights a multitude of opportunities for future research relating to the interrelationships between leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification, within the context of organisational change. These have been expounded in Chapters 2 to 4, and are, summarised below.

6.5.1 The role of leadership in organisational change

Studies 1 and 3 both highlighted the need for more empirical research examining how leaders effectively guide their organisations through change such as mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, and service integration. The integrated findings from these studies support the claim made by Xing and Liu (2016) that “leadership in M&A is an important yet under-investigated research stream in the sociocultural integration process in M&A” p.2555. Specifically, the current thesis identified a dearth of extant research associated with the role of leadership in facilitating effective service integration, and the unique challenges and dynamics associated with integrating organisations—particularly when arrangements are looser, rather than more formal and dictated by structural changes (Fulop et al., 2005; Lewis et al., 2010).

6.5.2 The evolution of organisational identity and organisational identity during organisational change

As outlined in Chapter 2, the systematic review conducted in Study 1 identified that most of the research associated with leadership, organisational
identity and organisational identification did not also focus specifically on the construct of organisational change. This was particularly evident in the quantitative studies exploring the interplay between leadership and followers’ organisational identification, where none of the studies incorporated the construct of organisational change into their methodology. Organisational change provided the context for, rather than the focus of, much of the research.

One of the unrequited avenues of research planned for this thesis (which was not possible due to the changing circumstances of a participating organisation) was to explore the evolution of an organisation’s identity and follower’s organisational identification during a change process—including conducting pre- and post-integration measures of followers’ organisational identification. To date, few published studies have undertaken this type of research and it is without doubt that the findings from such studies would be received with interest. Furthermore, in the context of organisational change such as service integration, the constructs of transitional, interim, multiple and hybrid identities merit further research, particularly in terms of how organisational members forge identification with more than one (and potentially competing) organisational identity.

6.5.3 Examination of the constructs of leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification in different contexts

Whilst the systematic and meta-analytic reviews (i.e. Studies 1 and 2) undertaken in this thesis revealed that the constructs of leadership, organisational identity and organisational identification are being investigated across the globe and in a range of different contexts, there is little research specifically examining the convergence and divergence of findings across cultures, countries and industries. To date, such examinations have largely been explored conceptually (e.g. Haslam & Ellemers, 2001; He & Brown, 2013; Pratt et al., 2016) rather than in empirical studies.

In particular, the cross-cultural interrelationships between the key constructs appear under-researched and, as such, there are substantive opportunities for future studies. Researchers could therefore examine how organisational identity is defined, determined and manifested in different cultural contexts. Building on Lian et al.’s (2011) study, it would also be useful to understand whether different leadership styles are more (or less) effective at
facilitating organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification in different countries and cultural contexts. Such findings would provide both academics and practitioners alike with greater insights into the effective management of change in multinational organisations (particularly those seeking to merge, acquire or integrate services), and leadership across cultural borders. The same could be recommended for the examination of these constructs across industries, as well as across organisations of varying sizes and maturity.

6.5.4 Development of metrics to measure organisational identity

Future research could focus on the development—and application—of metrics to measure organisational identity. As mentioned, none of the 65 quantitative studies involved in the systematic review empirically measured organisational identity. The development of such metrics would contribute greatly to both theory and practice in this area, as has previously been advocated by Foreman & Whetten (2016), Haslam & Ellemers (2011), and He & Brown (2013).

Future researchers are encouraged to refer to the systematic review conducted by Foreman and Whetten (2016), who examined the body of empirical research focused on organisational identity measurement and application: As mentioned in Chapter 2, two of the five clusters of measurement that emerged in their systematic review were quantitative. Nevertheless, as with the current systematic review, their findings reinforce the need for further development of surveys that quantitatively measure and analyse organisational identity, potentially extending the work of researchers such as Bartel (2001); Brickson (2005); Dukerich et al. (2002); Dyer and Whetten (2006); Foreman and Whetten (2002); Glynn and Abzug (2002). Specifically, the development of metrics that allow comparison between the identities of organisations—akin to standardised measures of organisational culture (Alvesson, 2013; Schein, 2010)—would be particularly beneficial.

6.5.5 Meta-analytic reviews

This meta-analytic review was the first to explore the relationship between followers’ perceptions of a range of leadership models and followers’ organisational identification, adding to the body of knowledge on these two
important constructs. It is hoped that this review may serve as a catalyst for an expanded range of inquiry regarding these two constructs.

Future studies could augment research into the relationship between followers’ organisational identification and a range of leadership styles—particularly extending beyond the more frequently studied leadership styles of transformational and transactional leadership that comprise two of the three components of the Full-Range Leadership Model. As with earlier suggestions about research in different contexts, there is also opportunity to more closely examine whether there is a difference in the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leadership and followers’ organisational identification in different geographical locations and industries, including an examination of whether other mediating and moderating variables are at play in these circumstances.

6.5.6 Validation and application of the final leadership competency framework

While the leadership competency framework—developed in Study 3 and refined in Study 4—was based on input from senior leaders and leadership experts, it is yet to be tested in a real world context. Thus, an opportunity exists for a subsequent case study that yields feedback about the framework’s applicability, potentially in a range of different settings. Additionally, once the framework has been further validated, there could also be merit in examining whether its implementation (i.e. requiring organisational leaders to demonstrate the leadership behaviours outlined in the framework) indeed assists organisations to achieve the range of individual, team and organisational outcomes that were evident in the literature presented in this thesis.

It would also be interesting to examine whether the behaviours described in the leadership framework are relevant in different cultural contexts, as they were developed with the input of Australian leaders and leadership experts. An extension of studies such as that undertaken by Lian et al. (2011), who found cultural differences in the interpretation of certain leadership behaviours, could be undertaken with the leadership competency framework as a focus.
6.6 Conclusion

The current thesis focused on the key leadership elements that influence successful organisational change, in addition to investigating the role of leadership in fostering organisational identity and organisational identification during change. It makes a theoretical contribution by presenting the first systematic review to examine the constructs of leadership, organisational identity, organisational identification, and organisational change jointly, as well as the first meta-analytic review to focus on a range of leadership styles and follower organisational identification.

Positive relationships between leadership, organisational identity and follower organisational identification were confirmed. The empirical relationship between followers’ perceptions of effective leadership and followers’ organisational identification was further substantiated by the moderate and significant correlation obtained in the meta-analytic review.

Combining findings from empirical research with the insights of senior leaders and leadership experts operating in corporate settings, this thesis also identified the key elements of leading successful organisational change (including service integration). These elements are captured in a leadership competency model which has practical applications in the selection and development of leaders tasked with navigating organisational change.

An important finding across the four studies comprising this thesis was that a range of leadership styles have the potential to contribute positively to fostering organisational identity and followers’ organisational identification during change, rather than the pre-eminence of one leadership style. This suggests that leaders from a range of backgrounds, environments and cultures have the potential to facilitate a cogent understanding of their organisation’s identity (or identities), and nurture a sense of connection to that identity, during times of change.
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Appendix A

Study 1: Additional Materials

A.1 Materials

A.1.1 Systematic Review Search String

1. leader*
2. "organi?ation* identity"
3. "organi?ation* identification"
4. "organi?ation* change"
5. “service integration”
6. merger* and acquisition*
7. “joint venture*”
8. S2 OR S3: (OI OR OID)
9. S1 AND S8: leader* AND (OI OR OID)
10. S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7: (org change OR SI OR M&A OR JV)
11. S9 AND S10: leader* AND (OI OR OID) AND (org change OR SI OR M&A OR JV)
Appendix B

Study 2: Additional Materials

B.1 Materials

B.1.1 Random-effects model (not corrected for error of measurement)

Random-Effects Model (k = 63; tau^2 estimator: HS)

tau^2 (estimated amount of total heterogeneity): 0.03 (SE = 0.01)
tau (square root of estimated tau^2 value): 0.17
I^2 (total heterogeneity / total variability): 93.90%
H^2 (total variability / sampling variability): 16.40

Test for Heterogeneity:
Q(df = 62) = 1047.12, p-val < .0001

Model Results:
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
r & se & z & p & CI lower bound & CI upper bound \\
.37 & .02 & 16.36 & <.0001 & 0.32 & 0.41 \quad ***
\end{array}
\]

Note: r = mean raw correlation; se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

B.1.2 Random-effects model (corrected for error of measurement)

Random-Effects Model (k = 62; tau^2 estimator: HS)

tau^2 (estimated amount of total heterogeneity): 0.04 (SE = 0.0088)
tau (square root of estimated tau^2 value): 0.19
I^2 (total heterogeneity / total variability): 93.92%
H^2 (total variability / sampling variability): 16.45

Test for Heterogeneity:
Q(df = 61) = 1033.41, p-val < .0001

Model Results:
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
r & se & z & p & CI lower bound & CI upper bound \\
.47 & .03 & 14.32 & <.0001 & 0.41 & 0.54 \quad ***
\end{array}
\]

Note: r = mean correlation (corrected); se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
### B.1.3 Mixed effects model examining ‘leadership type’ as moderator

Mixed-Effects Model (k = 62; tau^2 estimator: HS)

- \( \tau^2 \) (estimated amount of residual heterogeneity): 0.02 (SE = 0.01)
- \( \tau \) (square root of estimated \( \tau^2 \) value): 0.16
- I^2 (residual heterogeneity / unaccounted variability): 90.92%
- H^2 (unaccounted variability / sampling variability): 11.02
- R^2 (amount of heterogeneity accounted for): 31.92%

Test for Residual Heterogeneity:
- QE(df = 54) = 723.35, p-val < .0001

Test of Moderators (coefficient(s) 2,3,4,5,6,7,8):
- QM(df = 7) = 18.59, p-val = 0.01

---

Model Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI lower bound</th>
<th>CI upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (Authentic)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sacrificial</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
### B.1.4 Pairwise Comparisons between ‘leadership type’ moderators

**Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for authentic leadership and other leadership types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Ethical</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Servant</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Transactional</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cf Transformational</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)*

***p < .001; **p < .01, * p < .05.*

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

**Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for charismatic leadership and other leadership types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic cf Authentic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic cf Ethical</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic cf Servant</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Charismatic cf Transactional   | 0.31                  | 0.10| 3.01  | 0.02  *
| Charismatic cf Transformational| 0.22                  | 0.08| 2.69  | 0.04  *

*Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)*

***p < .001; **p < .01, * p < .05.*

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

**Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for ethical leadership and other leadership types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Authentic</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Servant</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Transactional</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical cf Transformational</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)*

***p < .001; **p < .01, * p < .05.*

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for passive avoidant leadership and other leadership types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Authentic</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Charismatic</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Ethical</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.04  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Servant</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Transactional</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.01  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant cf Transformational</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.04  *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for self-sacrificial leadership and other leadership types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Authentic</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Ethical</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Servant</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Transactional</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial cf Transformational</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for servant leadership and other leadership types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Authentic</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Ethical</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Transactional</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant cf Transformational</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for transactional leadership and other leadership types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Authentic</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td>0.02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Ethical</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>0.01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Servant</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional cf Transformational</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

Simultaneous tests for general linear hypotheses: Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for transformational leadership and other leadership types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Authentic</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Charismatic</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>0.05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Ethical</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Passive-Avoidant</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>0.05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Servant</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational cf Transactional</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
B.1.5 Mixed effects model examining ‘industry’ as moderator

Mixed-Effects Model (k = 62; tau^2 estimator: HS)

tau^2 (estimated amount of residual heterogeneity): 0.02 (SE = 0.0042)
tau (square root of estimated tau^2 value): 0.14
I^2 (residual heterogeneity / unaccounted variability): 88.69%
H^2 (unaccounted variability / sampling variability): 8.84
R^2 (amount of heterogeneity accounted for): 43.71%

Test for Residual Heterogeneity:
QE(df = 52) = 608.82, p-val < .0001

Test of Moderators (coefficient(s) 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10):
QM(df = 9) = 22.78, p-val = 0.01

Model Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI lower bound</th>
<th>CI upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (Education)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)
*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
### B.1.6 Pairwise Comparisons between ‘industry ’ moderators

*Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Education industry and other industry types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Finance</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Health</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Hospitality</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf ICT</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Range of industries</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education cf Retail</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

*Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Finance industry and other industry types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Education</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Health</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Hospitality</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf ICT</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Range of industries</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance cf Retail</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

*Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Health industry and other industry types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Education</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Finance</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Hospitality</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf ICT</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Range of industries</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health cf Retail</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
**Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Hospitality industry and other industry types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Education</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Finance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Health</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf ICT</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Range of industries</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality cf Retail</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; **p < .01, *p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

**Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the ICT industry and other industry types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Education</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Finance</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Health</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Hospitality</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>0.01 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Range of industries</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT cf Retail</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>0.01 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; **p < .01, *p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

**Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Manufacturing industry and other industry types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Education</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Finance</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Health</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Hospitality</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf ICT</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Range of industries</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing cf Retail</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; **p < .01, *p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for ‘Industry not stated’ and other industry types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Education</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Finance</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Health</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Hospitality</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf ICT</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.01 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated Range of industries</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated cf Retail</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the R&D industry and other industry types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Education</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Finance</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Health</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Hospitality</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf ICT</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Range of industries</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cf Retail</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)

Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for a ‘Range of industries’ and other industry types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Education</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Finance</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Health</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Hospitality</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf ICT</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Manufacturing</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Not stated</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf R&amp;D</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of industries cf Retail</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
### Tests for General Linear Hypotheses – Pairwise comparisons between the mean correlations for the Retail industry and other industry types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>difference in effects</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail cf Education</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail cf Finance</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail cf Health</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail cf Hospitality</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Retail cf ICT            | .48                   | .12  | 3.97  | 0.01 ***
| Retail cf Manufacturing  | .29                   | .13  | 2.12  | 0.22 |
| Retail cf Not stated     | .03                   | .12  | 0.31  | 1.00 |
| Retail cf R&D            | .06                   | .18  | 0.35  | 1.00 |
| Retail cf Range of industries | .23               | .08  | 2.77  | 0.04 *

**Note:** cf = compared with, se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.

(Adjusted p values reported -- Shaffer method)
B.1.7 Mixed effects model examining ‘region’ as moderator

Mixed-Effects Model (k = 62; tau^2 estimator: HS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CU lower bound</th>
<th>CI upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (Asia)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: se = standard error; z = z-value; p = p-value; CI = confidence interval (95%)

*** p < .001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
Appendix C

Study 3: Additional Materials

C.1 Materials
### C.1.1 Literature regarding service integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Weiner, Shortell, Baker, and Becker (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 11).</em> Examined the role of organisational infrastructure in the implementation of quality improvement (QI) in hospitals. Focused specifically on four elements of hospital support and infrastructure for QI: (1) integrated data systems; (2) financial support for QI; (3) clinical integration; and (4) information systems capability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen and Stevens (2007)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 267).</em> Reported on a case study within one health service, which had attempted to integrate one area of its services. Health service integration was considered favourably by clinicians and administrators involved, however the change management process was not. Recommended more focus on planning and transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benn, Burnett, Parand, Pinto, and Vincent (2012)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 539).</em> Examined the impact of an intervention focused upon patient safety, with implications for hospital leadership, communication, organisation and safety climate. Multi-professional collaboration was seen to be a significant predictor of change in patient safety, climate and capability, together with individual programme responsibility, availability of early adopters, and process measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaly, von Treuer, Dodd, and Berk (2010)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 158).</em> Discussed the challenge of integrating youth mental health services. Argue that services must be designed so they may achieve certain outcomes apart from being accessible and acceptable. Cites that the biggest challenge is the integration of mental health services with other health services for young people such as mental health, drug and alcohol and physical care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaly, von Treuer, van Hamond, and Windle (2011)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 28).</em> Provides an overview of the headspace Barwon experience of service integration, two years on. Discusses critical considerations in the formation and maintenance of agency partnerships designed to provide integrated care for young people. Found that: (1) Structural and process considerations are necessary but not sufficient for successful inter-agency partnerships and integrated care, (2) Organisational culture change and staff engagement are very difficult, and planning for these is essential (but often neglected), (2) Agreeing on common goals and objectives is an essential first step in forming partnerships, however these agreements often over-rely on goodwill, and the literature consistently illustrates that the majority of collaborations fail to meet their objectives, and (3) Partnership planning should adhere to principles and lessons of organisational behaviour and management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry and Ham (2010)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from executive summary (p. vii).</em> Describes and summarises relevant evidence regarding high-profile integrated systems, including examples of integrated care in health that have most relevance to NHS in England. Clarifies meanings of different terms, and the various forms of integration in healthcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Amour, Goulet, Labadie, Bernier, and Pineault (2003)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 397).</em> Examined the integration of perinatal services, particularly accessibility, continuity and appropriateness. Provides background into the challenges of integrating services, citing duplication of services for 44.7% of newborns (thereby advocating for better integration of services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll, Acker, Goalstone, McLain, Zubia, Chavez … Hickman (2000)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 1).</em> Examined a community multi-agency service team, focusing on team cohesion during its formation and eventual disbandment. Discusses, and provides recommendations for dealing with, the challenges of establishing a multi-agency team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman and Peck (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 408).</em> Described a case study of integrated specialist mental health services, with a focus on evaluating partnerships. While the partnerships themselves were relatively easy to define, the attribution of improved outcomes to such arrangements was less straightforward. The partnerships were seen to be complex social interventions requiring enactment by individuals within specific contexts, typically involving many service changes against “a turbulent policy background” (p.408).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.1 Literature regarding service integration, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendinning (2003)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 139)</em>. Presented findings from the evaluation of two policy initiatives resulting in full integration of services, involving formerly separate health and social care organisations. Concluded that “structural integration can transform preoccupations over narrow sectorial responsibilities and boundaries to a ‘whole systems’ paradigm of service planning and delivery. However, major internal barriers to integration may remain” (p. 139). Cited potential barriers to service integration as: professional domains and identities and differential power relationships between newly integrated services and professionals. Concluded that the success of such inter-organisational arrangements is significantly impacted by the wider policy environment and governmental relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Ginsburg, Citko, and Cadogan (2005)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 300)</em>. Described the experiences of the California Coalition for Compassionate Care (a coalition involved in end-of-life care). Emphasised the importance of sustained and focused leadership to navigate the challenges of organisational change. Also confirmed that coalitions rely upon “personal commitments and relationships, a focus on practical products, and a consistent infrastructure” (p.300).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges and Hardiman (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 267)</em>. Identified the core features of consumer-run agencies, and discussed their potential for collaboration with Community Mental Health Agencies. Also suggested ways to promote healthy organisational partnerships between the two based on the model proposed by Gidron and Hasenfeld (1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killackey and Waghorn (2008)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 63)</em>. Summarises the early implementation challenges at the first Australian demonstration site of ORYGEN, a youth mental health service, which integrated vocational services into public mental health services. Described the challenges associated with service integration (i.e. resources—particularly alternative funding to government, organisational cultural differences, integration into the clinical team, and positive contamination of the control service) together with suggestions for how these could be overcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. King and Meyer (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 477)</em>. Defines ‘service integration’ and ‘service co-ordination’ and relates these to the provision of co-ordinated care for children with disabilities and their families. Presents a framework that outlines the three common types of approaches to the delivery of co-ordinated care: (1) system/sector-based service integration, (2) agency-based service integration, and (3) client/family-based service co-ordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. King, Waghorn, Lloyd, McLeod, McMahan, and Leong (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 471)</em>. Identified methods and priorities for enhancing employment services for Australians with severe mental illness through implementation of evidence-based practices. Identified that current policy settings support the provision of employment services for people with severe mental illness separate from clinical services. Also found that recent studies identified integration of clinical and employment services as a major factor in the effectiveness of employment services—usually achieved through co-location of employment and mental health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Rosen, Goodwin, and Dixon (2010)</td>
<td>Examined some of the new models of integrated care (via ‘integrated care organisations’, ICOs), and their potential for delivering better outcomes at lower cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myors, Schmied, Johnson, and Cleary (2013)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 1)</em>. Describes an integrative review undertaken to synthesise the research related to professionals’ perceptions and experiences of working in collaborative and integrated models of perinatal care for women with mental health problems. Identified eight key elements as central components of this process: (1) funding and resources for collaboration, (2) shared vision, aims and goals, (3) pathways and guidelines, (4) continuity of care, (5) building relationships and trust, (6) role clarity, (7) training and education of staff and (8) support to work in new ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.1.1 Literature regarding service integration, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Turnbull (2003)</td>
<td><em>Drawn from abstract (p. 48).</em> Presents a review of service integration in early intervention, determining interpersonal and structural factors for its success. Defines service integration and synthesises the factors that determine its success (as documented in the early intervention literature). Emphasises that interpersonal and structural factors both critically affect the success of service integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry and Kocakulah (2010)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 47).</em> Assessed the ongoing adoption of business process outsourcing (BPO) in mid-sized non-profit health systems in the United States. Discussed barriers to innovation and collaboration, as well as approaches to successful BPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, et al (2011)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 123).</em> Discusses information available on ‘implementation research’, that is, the implementation of evidence-based treatments relating to health and mental health delivery. Presents 68 implementation strategies and definitions, clustered according to six key implementation processes: (1) planning, (2) educating, (3) financing, (4) restructuring, (5) managing quality, and (6) attending to the policy context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers et al. (2001)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 16).</em> Examined service integration initiatives between programmes for infants and toddlers with disabilities, and Early Head Start. Effective service integration was seen to feature effective administrative structures and interpersonal relationships among the direct providers and families involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentino (2004)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 393).</em> Examines the role of middle managers in the transmission and integration of organisational culture. Interviewed middle managers, the CEO and other staff members of a recently merged healthcare organisation. Data was analysed using Bennie’s (1989) four competencies of leadership framework, along with Schein’s (1999) eight process steps for integrating and transmitting an organisation’s culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veysey, Anderson, Lewis, Mueller, and Stenius (2005)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 19).</em> Case study describing an experiment in rural services integration (i.e. integration of alcohol and other drug, trauma and mental health services). Studies of services and systems integration demonstrate that integrated systems reduce redundancy and costs, but have little direct effects on persons receiving the services, while integrated services for persons with co-occurring disorders have superior results to parallel or sequential services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Dietz, and Cairns (2009)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 11).</em> Presents a systematic review synthesising research on the integration of immunization services with other health interventions in the developing world. Concluded that the theoretical strengths of integrating other health services with immunization services remain to be rigorously proved in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner, Amick, and Lee (2008)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 379).</em> Presents a review of the literature in health services research and other fields, regarding the conceptualisation and measurement of organisational readiness for change. Assesses how organisational readiness for change has been defined and measured in health services research and other fields. Analysis of 106 peer-reviewed articles reveals “conceptual ambiguities” (p. 379) and disagreements in current thinking and writing about organisational readiness for change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.2 Literature regarding organisational competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Health Promotion Association (2009)</td>
<td>Presents a set of health promotion core competencies for health promotion practitioners, organisations, employers and educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubry, Flynn, Gerber, and Dostaler (2005)</td>
<td>Identifies the core competencies of community support providers working with people with psychiatric disabilities. <em>(Reviewed for background, given focus of consortium).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Cultural Competence Australia (2010)</td>
<td>Information pack describing the work undertaken by the Centre for Cultural Competence Australia, including definitions of what is meant by cultural competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beinecke (2009b)</td>
<td>Describes leadership training programs and competencies for mental health, health, public administration and business in seven countries (i.e. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, United Kingdom (England), United States, and United Kingdom (Wales)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyatzis (2008)</td>
<td>An introductory essay on competencies, providing a definition of ‘competency’ and overview of the link between competencies and performance. <em>(Background text).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabban, McGonagle, and Brooker (2006)</td>
<td>Presents ten essential shared capabilities that describe the core aspects of practice that support effective implementation and delivery of mental health care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryson, Ackermann, and Eden (2007)</td>
<td>Discusses the importance of public sector organisations’ ability to identity and build capability, particularly their distinctive competencies, in order to deliver value for key stakeholders. Describes the case of a major public sector training and consultancy unit that is part of the UK’s NHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Describes the development of an inter-professional competency model for healthcare leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnell and Kuperminc (2006)</td>
<td>Presents a multinational analysis of organisational cultural competence in mental health service delivery (part of a needs assessment commissioned by the Georgia Department of Human Resources’ Division of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse to determine needs for cultural competence training for state providers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frączkiewicz-Wronka, Austen-Tynda, and Wronka (2010)</td>
<td>Explores leadership and effectiveness in public healthcare organisations during change. <em>(More focused on leadership, but seen as useful context for this phase of the study).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garman and Johnson (2006)</td>
<td>Presents a practical introduction to competency modeling within the context of health. Outlines a model made available by the Healthcare Leadership Alliance. Examines competencies at both the individual (leader) and organisational level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson and Tarrant (2010)</td>
<td>Presents a 'conceptual models' approach to organisational resilience. <em>(Considered relevant in the context of resilience as an organisational competency).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habib and Mella-Barral (2007)</td>
<td>In the context of a merger, the authors distinguish between the merging organisations’ assets, ‘knowhow’ and core competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamel and Prahalad (1994)</td>
<td>Seminal text regarding core and organisational competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presents a tool for assessing the cultural competency of healthcare organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors / Year</td>
<td>Focus of document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Lin et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Describes an initiative whereby competencies were developed for remote and rural senior allied health professionals in Western Australia. <em>(Focused more on leadership competencies, but considered important background).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindgren, Henfridsson, and Schultze (2004)</td>
<td>Synthesises an action research study and outlines design principles for competence management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrelli, Tondora, and Hoge (2005)</td>
<td>Outlines strategies for developing competency models, with a specific focus on mental health environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New (1996)</td>
<td>Describes a three-tier model of organisational competencies (i.e. job specific, general management, and corporate specific).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahalad and Hamel (1990)</td>
<td>Seminal text regarding core and organisational competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Agency of Canada (2007)</td>
<td>Outlines core competencies developed for the public health sector in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Association of New Zealand (2007a)</td>
<td>Report to the Ministry of Health March 2007 describing generic competencies for public health (as below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Association of New Zealand (2007b)</td>
<td>Outlines generic competencies of public health in Aotearoa-New Zealand. The competency framework consists of 12 generic competencies under two broad domains: (1) Public health knowledge and (2) Public health practice (pp. 14-27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schippmann et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Describes a two-year investigation undertaken by a taskforce (under the auspices of the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology) into the antecedents of competency modelling and an examination of current range of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shewchuk, O'Connor, and Fine (2005)</td>
<td>Outlines core competencies needed for health administration practice, describing a case study in which healthcare executives from different regions (of the United States) developed a framework focused on the competencies required to deal with critical healthcare issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefl (2008)</td>
<td>Outlines the Healthcare Leadership Alliance model, describing common competencies for all healthcare managers. <em>(Focused on leadership competency but considered important background reading).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks and St Clair (2007)</td>
<td>Examines the balanced scorecard in the context of the healthcare environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Reviews the development of the Leadership Competency Framework by the National Public Health Leadership Development Network (United States) and discusses its significance. <em>(Focused on leadership competency but considered important background reading).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.1.3 Background literature regarding organisational change such as mergers and acquisitions (M&A) and joint ventures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiot, Terry, and Callan (2007)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 557).</em> Longitudinal study that examined the adjustment patterns of employees from low versus high status pre-merger organisations. As predicted, members of the low status group perceived the merger to be implemented in a less fair manner at the start of the merger and reported a decreased adjustment to the merger over time. Members of the high status group showed an increase in adjustment over time, lower in-group bias and a stronger identification with the new merged organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appelbaum, Lefrancois, Tonna, and Shapiro (2007a)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 128).</em> Article (part one of two) aims to provide managers with insight into how to prepare for M&amp;A. Factors identified as key for successful M&amp;A implementation and execution are: communication, leadership and trust, organisational culture, change and stress. Cite Messmer (2006), who identified two different strategies management should use to deal with the anxiety M&amp;A process can create: early communication and staff involvement. Also cites Bert et al. (2003), where communication is considered the primary reason for M&amp;A failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appelbaum, Lefrancois, Tonna, and Shapiro (2007b)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 191).</em> Article (part two of two) focuses on training managers for culture, stress, and change challenges associated with M&amp;A. Cites cultural incompatibility is the single largest cause of lack of projected performance, departure of key executives, as well as time-consuming conflicts in the consolidation of two firms. Emphasises that frequent and honest communication helps minimise the stress and anxiety felt by employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartels, Douwes, Jong, and Pruyn (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. S49).</em> Quasi-experimental case study exploring evolution of organisational identification during a merger. Organisational identification was measured as the expected identification prior to the merger. Five elements described employees’ expected identification: (1) identification with the pre-merger organisation, (2) sense of continuity, (3) expected utility of the merger, (4) communication climate before the merger, and (5) communication about the merger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert, MacDonald, and Herd (2003)</td>
<td>Highlights the reasons why timing is critical to merger success, suggesting that the window of opportunity is within the first two years. Sees urgency and execution as they two key contributors to effective mergers. Also highlights seven ground rules for successful M&amp;A, including selecting leaders quickly, establishing clear goals, and managing risks and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijlsma-Frankema (2001)</td>
<td>Focuses on the importance of managing cultural integration and cultural change processes in mergers and acquisitions. Estimates that between 60%-70% of M&amp;A’s fail to meet expectations. Identified several factors relating to the management of cultural adaptation that distinguished between successful and unsuccessful change processes (i.e. legitimisation of changes, communicating positive outcomes that are expected of the new structure, clarification of goals and expectations, monitoring and equity in the process, establishing conditions of psychological safety, and securing feedback on success and failure outcomes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boen, Vanbeselaere, Bребels, Huybens, and Millet (2007)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 380).</em> Describes an experiment which examined the impact of pre-merger identification (low, high), pre-merger group status (low, high) and relative representation (low, high) upon identification with a new merger group. Found that high pre-merger identifiers identified more strongly with the merger group than did low pre-merger identifiers, but only when the relative representation was high. Pre-merger status did not influence post-merger identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boen, Vanbeselaere, and Cool (2006)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 547).</em> Investigates the relationship between the perceived status of an organisation after a takeover (i.e. post-merger status) on employees’ identification with this new organisation (i.e. their post-merger identification). Found that post-merger status was positively related to OID among employees of the lower-status pre-merger company, but not among employees of the higher-status company. Additionally, post-merger status was positively related to OID among employees who had lower identification with their pre-merger group, but not among employees who had identified strongly with their pre-merger group. Concluded that post-merger status, in combination with premerger status and premerger identification, is an important predictor of post-merger identification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.3 Background literature regarding organisational change such as mergers and acquisitions (M&A) and joint ventures, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carleton and Lineberry (2004)</td>
<td>Comprehensive guidebook for achieving post-merger success, focusing on cultural due diligence, assessment, and integration. Stipulates that between 55-77% of all mergers fail to deliver on the financial promise announced when the merger was initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Elton, Rovit, and Vestring (2004)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from executive summary (p. ix).</em> Presents a blueprint for successful merger integration. Provides four key guidelines (based on Bain &amp; Co’s M&amp;A work): (1) Plan for ownership early by utilising the due diligence process to identify priorities for integration; (2) Integrate quickly, particularly in areas where it affects financial opportunities; (3) Prioritise cultural integration; and (4) Ensure staff are focused on core business during the integration process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartwright and Cooper (1993)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 57).</em> Explores the role of cultural compatibility in successful organisational 'marriage'. Also comments that many mergers do not meet financial goals. Outlines that many organisational alliances fail to meet expectations due to cultural incompatibility of partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epstein (2005)</td>
<td>Discusses the determinants and evaluation of merger success, concluding with six key determinants of success (pp. 38 – 41): (1) Strategic vision and fit; (2) Deal structure; (3) Due diligence; (4) Pre-merger planning; (5) Post-merger integration; and (6) External factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer, Greitemeyer, Omay, and Frey (2007)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 203).</em> Describes experiment based on Social Identity Theory involving mergers between two workgroups. Investigated the effects of merger related status on participants’ psychological responses to the mergers. Members of low status groups reported lower levels of (a) identification with the merger group, (b) satisfaction with the merger, (c) common in-group identity, (d) group cohesion, and (e) controllability than did members of the high status groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugate, Kinicki, and Prussia (2008)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 1).</em> Longitudinal study that sought to determine the appropriate theoretical structure for how employees cope with organisational change. Implications for coping theory and organisational change management are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giessner and Mummendey (2008)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 412).</em> Examines how cognitive representations of mergers interact with performance feedback to affect intergroup evaluations. Important finding of research: the interactive effect of performance feedback and cognitive representation of mergers on intergroup evaluations. The more members of the merging groups perceive themselves as members of two different organisations without a common bond, the stronger will be the risk of intergroup conflict after a perceived merger failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleibs, Mummendey, and Noack (2008)</td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 1095).</em> Investigated predictors of change in post-merger identification throughout a merger. Found that post-merger identification increased only slowly for members of both the dominant and the subordinate organisations. Confirmed that the predictive effect of premerger identification on post-merger identification for members of the dominant organisation dissipates over time. The effect of in-group typicality unexpectedly varied as a function of organisational membership and was stable over time. Perceived fairness in the merger process positively influenced post-merger identification across members of both organisations; over time the effect of fairness amplified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graetz, Rimmer, Lawrence, and Smith (2006)</td>
<td>Seminal text on managing organisational change. Outlines the principles, theories and terminology associated with change. Presents research, models and practical examples. Cites Bridges three-stage model of transitions (endings, the neutral zone, and new beginnings). To reinforce new beginnings, advocated being consistent, ensuring quick successes, symbolising the new identity, and celebrating successes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

C.1.3 Background literature regarding organisational change such as mergers and acquisitions (M&A) and joint ventures, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. S81). Examines the impact of leadership and change management strategy on organisational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. Reports a longitudinal study that examined mergers between three large multi-site public-sector organisations. From abstract: “Findings indicate that in many cases the change that occurs as a result of a merger is imposed on the leaders themselves, and it is often the pace of change that inhibits the successful re-engineering of the culture. In this respect, the success or otherwise of any merger hinges on individual perceptions about the manner in which the process is handled and the direction in which the culture is moved. Communication and a transparent change process are important, as this will often determine not only how a leader will be regarded, but who will be regarded as a leader. Leaders need to be competent and trained in the process of transforming organisations to ensure that individuals within the organisation accept the changes prompted by a merger” (pS81).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipponen, Olkkonen, and Moilanen (2004)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 391). Describes a study which investigated the effects of procedural justice perceptions on employee responses to an organisational merger. Hypothesised that perceived justice of merger implementation is positively related to post-merger organisational identification and perceptions of common ingroup identity. Post-merger identification and common in group identity, in turn, were hypothesized to be related to positive attitudes towards the employees of the merger partner and to extra role behaviour. Achieved partial support for hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messmer (2006)</td>
<td>Outlines leadership strategies during mergers and acquisitions: (1) Communicate regularly and early, (2) Get staff involved, (3) Give a realistic assessment, and (4) Stay focussed (pp. 15-16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitleton-Kelly (2006)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 36). Uses two examples of M&amp;A to illustrate a successful and a dysfunctional application of post-merger integration, seen from a complexity theory perspective. Proposes that synergies projected for M&amp;A are not achieved in 70-80% of cases; routinely cited as problems are people and cultural issues in failed integration; almost 95% of new products fail as a result of poor M&amp;A management. Describes a range of ‘enablers’ of post-merger integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riad (2005)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 1529). Discusses the power of ‘organisational culture’ as a discursive formation in merger. Argues that knowledge on ‘organisational culture’ has acquired authority and constitutes a ‘truth’ on mergers, a truth imbued with both enabling and constraining power effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riad (2007)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 26). Conceptual paper outlining an alternative perspective on M&amp;As, suggesting that individuals occupy temporary positions in dynamic dialogue, negotiating transitory, but temporarily cohesive, allegiances during organisational changes such as mergers and acquisitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Authors / Year | Focus of paper
--- | ---
Sastry (1997) | Abridged from abstract (p. 237). Discusses model of punctuated organisational change, suggesting that consistency of organisation and environment should be monitored and that, following an organisational reorientation, change should be suspended in favour of a trial period.
Shepherd (2009) | Outlines seven steps to merger success (pp. 11-12): (1) Encourage senior managers to involve human resources professionals asap, (2) Create project management office (with clear processes, roles and responsibilities) well in advance, (3) Conduct a cultural assessment, (4) Assess and plan for future staffing needs, (5) Assess and define the future structure of HR technology, (6) Don’t panic, and (7) Communicate early and clearly to staff.
Taplin (2006) | Abridged from abstract (p. 284). Examines the organisational changes and varied response amongst managers to those changes in seven subsidiaries of multinational firms. Focuses on the role of managers as agents of strategy implementation and discusses how they negotiate, accept or resist such changes.
Terry and O’Brien (2001) | Abridged from abstract (p. 271). Examined predictors of employee responses to an organisational merger. Findings were consistent with Social Identity Theory, where the most negative responses to the merger arose from the employees of the low status premerger organisation. Additionally, the study identified in-group bias among both groups of employees involved in the merger.
Todnem By (2005) | Presents a critical review of organisational change management, focusing on the major theories and processes associated with change management.
Wall (2005) | Examines merger integration, citing a study by Right Management that concluded that 77% of mergers do not achieve original purpose, and that three out of five acquirers do not plan effectively for cultural integration (see p. 41). Identified three human resource issues that highly correlate with achieving value and growth after a merger: (1) Accurate assessment of cultural differences and similarities, (2) Alignment of culture with strategy; and (3) Effective change management.
### C.1.4 Organisational competency models that served as reference points for the preliminary organisational competency framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core competencies for public health in Canada</th>
<th>Competencies for public health in New Zealand</th>
<th>The United Kingdom’s National Health Service’s Competency Framework for (General) Practice Management</th>
<th>Competency model for remote and rural senior allied health professionals in Western Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Public Health Agency of Canada (2007) involved staff from across the public health sector, as well as government representatives and stakeholders, in the development of their model for core competencies for public health in Canada.</td>
<td>The Public Health Association of New Zealand (2007) led a coalition of public health groups to develop a generic set of competencies for public health in New Zealand. Their competency framework consists of 12 generic competencies under two broad domains (pp. 14-27):</td>
<td>The United Kingdom’s National Health Service’s Competency Framework for (General) Practice Management (retrieved online October 2010) outlines seven overarching competency domains associated with running a health practice:</td>
<td>I. Lin et al. (2009) developed a competency model for remote and rural senior allied health in Western Australia, which consisted of 88 competencies under eight overarching competency domains (p. 7):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.5 Literature regarding leadership and leadership competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Abraham and Grant (2008)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 11). Focuses on factors that predict job satisfaction among workers in nursing homes, finding that leadership competencies are strongly associated with job satisfaction. Recommends that ageing services professionals focus on leadership competencies and workforce development, in order to maintain quality improvement efforts in nursing homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Daniels, and Compagni (2009)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 30). Examines the key mental health policy agendas of seven countries involved in reform of their mental health system (i.e. Australia, Canada, England, Italy, New Zealand, Scotland and the United States). Discusses implications of these efforts for leadership and the global mental health workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alban-Metcalf and Alimo-Metcalf (2009)</td>
<td>Part one of a feature on engaging leadership, where the authors conclude that personal qualities and values, and leadership competencies are necessary, but not sufficient for, effective leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alban-Metcalf and Alimo-Metcalf (2005)</td>
<td>Discusses research that led to the development of the ‘new paradigm’ model of leadership, focusing on transformational leadership and servant leadership. Also outlines 360-degree feedback tool that measures transformational leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alimo-Metcalf et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Report summarising the findings of a national longitudinal study of the relationship between quality of leadership in mental health crises resolution teams in the NHS, and staff attitudes and well-being, and organisational performance. Outlines the impact of leadership factors in implementing change in complex health and social care environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Avolio (2010)</td>
<td>Uses the full range leadership development model as an organising framework, and applies it to leadership at the individual, team and organisational levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Avolio and Bass (1991)</td>
<td>Describes the full range leadership development programmes, both basic and advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991)</td>
<td>Describes the ‘four I’s’ which constitute transformational leadership: 1) Individualised consideration; 2) Intellectual stimulation; 3) Inspirational motivation; and 4) Idealised influence (p. 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Balkanska, Georgiev, and Popova (2010)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 424). Explores the use of competency-based performance systems in health professions, developing guidelines for basic modelling of key management skills necessary to optimise training of health managers. Identified the most desired areas of excellence as: motivation skills, conflict resolution and team cohesion, communication skills, persuasion and influencing skills, and leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.M Bass and Avolio (1997)</td>
<td>Describes the full range leadership development model, within the Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Battilana, Gilmartin, Sengul, Pache, and Alexander (2010)</td>
<td>Describes leadership competencies (defined as effectiveness at person-oriented and task-oriented behaviours) for implementing planned organisational change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes documents that specifically referred to leadership competency frameworks.
### C.1.5 Literature regarding leadership and leadership competency, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Beinecke (2009a)</td>
<td>Abridged from executive summary (p. 2). Discusses leadership in the context of ‘wicked’ problems (i.e. those that are complex and without easy solutions). Claims that dynamic leadership (both transactional and transformational) is required at all levels of organisations. Describes five core leadership competency areas in ‘The Leadership and Management Skillset’: (1) Personal skills and knowledge, (2) Interpersonal (people) skills, (3) Transactional (execution, management) skills, (4) Transformational skills, and (5) Policy and program knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Beinecke (2009b)</td>
<td>Report that describes leadership training programs and competencies for mental health, health, public administration and business in seven countries (i.e. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, United Kingdom (England), United States, and United Kingdom (Wales). Note: Also referred to in the ‘organisational competency’ literature table in Appendix 4b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bennis (2007)</td>
<td>Introduces and discusses contemporary trends in leadership theory, as well as the social context of leadership research. Highlights four major threats to world stability that leaders must navigate (i.e. nuclear/biological catastrophe, a world-wide pandemic, tribalism, and the leadership of human institutions). Purports that all exemplary leaders have six competencies: 1) Create a sense of mission; 2) Motivate others to join them on that mission; 3) Create an adaptive social architecture for their followers; 4) Generate trust and optimism; 5) Develop other leaders; and 6) Get results (p.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bolden and Gosling (2006)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 147). Explores the competency approach to leadership, the merits (or otherwise) of competency frameworks, and argues that a more discursive approach is required to challenge organisational assumptions, and move to a more collectivist approach to leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Calhoun et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Discusses the development of an inter-professional competency model for healthcare leadership, the Healthcare Leadership Competency Model (HLCM). The model addresses three overarching domains: (1) Transformation; (2) Execution; and (3) People, subsuming 266 behavioural and technical competencies. (See Figure 1, p.378).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cragg and Spurgeon (2007)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 109). Focuses on the competencies and skills that a leader requires in order to be successful. Other concepts and leadership theories are explained. Compares leadership models, describes a ‘leadership qualities’ framework, and outlines Dye and Garman’s (2006) model of leadership describing 16 competencies for healthcare executives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* D’Amato, Henderson, and Florence (2009)</td>
<td>Discusses the leadership capabilities and competencies required to start and develop corporate social responsibility programmes and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Edmonstone (2011a)</td>
<td>Focuses on leader development in healthcare, providing a critique and describing alternative approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Edmonstone (2011b)</td>
<td>Describes a clinical leadership programme developed for the NHS in Scotland, addressing the underlying policy imperatives, processes for identifying and preparing future clinical leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Griffiths (2007)</td>
<td>An article which reviews the book ‘Leadership Competencies for Clinical Managers, the Renaissance of Transformational Leadership’ by Anne M. Barker, Dori Taylor Sullivan and Michael J. Emery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Guo (2009)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 19). Discusses core competencies that entrepreneurial health care leaders should acquire. Describes three key areas of competence, which are seen to overlap: (1) Health care system and environment competencies; (2) Organisation competencies; and (3) Interpersonal competencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes documents that specifically referred to leadership competency frameworks.
### C.1.5 Literature regarding leadership and leadership competency, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health Networks (2009)</td>
<td>Describes the ten basic skills leaders must possess: (1) Ability to run successful meetings, (2) Manage financial resources, (3) Handle tough questions, (4) Identify and hire right talent, (5) Deselect poor performers who are unwilling or unable to improve, (6) Practice critical thinking, (7) Have the ability to develop talent, (8) Understand the external environment and its impacts on the organisation, (9) Be positive, and (10) Communicate without blame (pp. 26-27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh and Yik (2005)</td>
<td>Background article, which focused on the role of leadership in the implementation of business strategy. Purports that organisations often underestimate the leadership capacity required to successfully implement new strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Leggat (2007)</td>
<td>* Abridged from abstract (p. 1). Describes a study which identified critical teamwork competencies for health service managers in Australia: leadership, knowledge of organisational goals and strategies, organisational commitment, respect for others, commitment to working collaboratively and to achieving a quality outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Liberman, Hilty, Drake, and Tsang (2001)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 1331). Focusing on teams involved in psychiatric rehabilitation, describes the properties and functions of the multidisciplinary team and key attributes of effective teams. Describes roles of various team members, including leadership roles and the unique role of the psychiatrist, in the context of newly emerging, evidence-based treatments for psychiatric rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I. Lin et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Describes a project whereby competencies were developed for remote and rural senior allied health professionals in Western Australia. Note: Also referred to in the 'organisational competency' literature table in Appendix C.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinelli-Poole, McGilvray, and Lynes (2011)</td>
<td>Provides an overview of leadership activities occurring within two large District Health Boards (DHBs) in New Zealand. Considered useful background regarding leadership in health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizrahi and Rosenthal (2001)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 63). Explores the complexities of coalition building (including collaborations and other inter-organisational approaches) when addressing complex community, social services and health issues. Competent leadership was the factor most often identified with coalitions' success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen and Mohamed (2011)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 206). Describes an empirical investigation into leadership behaviours, organisational culture and knowledge management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Robbins, Bradley, and Spicer (2001)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 188). Discusses the development of part of an integrated approach to leadership development in health services administration. Outlines definitions and domains of competency, and presents competency assessment scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sashkin and Sashkin (2003)</td>
<td>A book that draws on research that investigates leadership, culture and performance in dozens of organisations. Summarises leadership models of leading leadership theorists (e.g. Bennis &amp; Nanus, Kouzes &amp; Posner). Authors refined their earlier model, The Leadership Profile, which now focuses on four transformational leadership behaviours: (1) Communication leadership; (2) Credible leadership; (3) Caring leadership; and (4) Creating opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinioris (2010)</td>
<td>Abridged from abstract (p. 223). Studied the establishment, organisation, content, process, evaluation and evolution of executive leadership development programmes in the healthcare industry. Presented key findings, together with the contributions made by such programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes documents that specifically referred to leadership competency frameworks.
## C.1.5 Literature regarding leadership and leadership competency, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors / Year</th>
<th>Focus of paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stefl (2008)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 364).</em> Outlines The Healthcare Leadership Alliance model, advocating that the model contains common competencies for all healthcare managers: (1) Communication and Relationship Management; (2) Leadership; (3) Professionalism; (4) Knowledge of the Healthcare environment; (5) Business Skills and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas (2006)</strong></td>
<td>A book titled ‘Gurus on Leadership’, which serves as a guide to the world’s thought-leaders in leadership (e.g. Adair, Bennis, Blanchard, Drucker, Goleman, Machiavelli, McGregor, Kotter, Kets de Vries, McClelland, Reddin, Zatenik). <em>Considered useful background reading.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tobin and Edwards (2002)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 4).</em> Described a survey of fellows of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, designed to promote the discussion of leadership and management skills development among psychiatrists in Australia and New Zealand. Found widespread support for psychiatrists to be in management roles in mental health services. Nevertheless, identified that psychiatrists often felt inadequately trained and prepared for management roles. Recommended that greater attention to promoting the acquisition of relevant skills—throughout training and in the post-fellowship years—is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valentino (2004)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 393).</em> Discusses the role of middle managers in the transmission and integration of organisational culture. Researchers interviewed middle managers, the CEO and other staff members of a recently merged healthcare organisation. Data was analysed using Bennis’s (1989) four competencies of leadership framework (i.e. Management of Attention, Management of Meaning, Management of Trust), along with Schein’s (1999) eight process steps for integrating and transmitting an organisation’s culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** Victorian Leadership Development Centre**</td>
<td>The Victorian Public Service Leadership Framework, developed by the Victorian Leadership Development Centre. The model encompasses three broad competency domains, with ‘integrity’ as the model’s foundational attribute: (1) Integrity in thought; (2) Integrity in people; (3) and Integrity in self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellman (2007)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 62).</em> Describes a study which aimed to provide a framework for understanding the role of senior managers in the matrix organisation. The findings asserted that five critical behaviour constructs were instrumental in matrix organisation performance, and were strongly asserted by senior leadership behaviour: (1) Empowerment; (2) Support; (3) Decision-making; (4) Flexibility; and (5) Communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wells and Hejna (2009)</strong></td>
<td>Discussed the development of healthcare talent in leadership organisations. Cited McClelland’s characteristics of high-performing leaders: <em>Character:</em> Integrity and Honesty; <em>Personal capability:</em> Problem-solving, technical knowledge, being innovative, and practicing self-development; <em>Focus on results:</em> Drives for results, establishes stretch goals, and takes initiative; <em>Leading change:</em> Develops strategic perspectives, champions change, and connects the group to the outside world; <em>Interpersonal skills:</em> Communicates powerfully and prolifically, inspires and motivates others to high performance, builds relationships, develops others, and values collaboration and teamwork. Proposed that leaders are expected to master five basic competencies: 1) “Best people practices”, including effective change enablement; 2) Customer service management; 3) Resource management; 4) Process design and process improvement; and 5) Business development and volume growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West et al. (2003)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 393).</em> Explores the relationships amongst leadership clarity and team innovation in health care. Ascertained that leadership clarity was associated with clear team objectives, high levels of participation, commitment to excellence and support for innovation. Team processes predicted team innovation. Provided evidence for the importance of leadership clarity, in addition to style of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wren and Dulewicz (2005)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 295).</em> Explored leader competencies, activities and successful change in the Royal Air Force. Found that the specific dimensions of leadership that contribute to successful change were: (1) Delegation and involvement; (2) Communicating and motivating; (3) Strategic leadership; (4) External constraints vs generated early success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yukl (1989)</strong></td>
<td><em>Abridged from abstract (p. 251).</em> Reviews and evaluates the major theories of leadership, also summarising findings from empirical research on leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes documents that specifically referred to leadership competency frameworks.
### C.1.6 Leadership competency models that served as reference points for the preliminary leadership competency framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Leadership and Management Skillset</th>
<th>The Healthcare Leadership Alliance Model</th>
<th>The Personnel Decisions International Corporation (PDI) framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The five leadership competency areas encapsulated in Beinecke’s (2009a, pp. 56-59) ‘Leadership and Management Skillset’ are:</td>
<td>The Healthcare Leadership Alliance, a consortium of six major healthcare professional membership organisations, developed the Healthcare Leadership Alliance Model (Stefl, 2008) to be used as the basis for both individual and organisational assessment. Like the ‘Leadership and Management Skillset’, it also includes five broad leadership competency domains:</td>
<td>On behalf of PDI, Gebelein et al. (2001, pp. v-vi) present a framework with four broad leadership and management competency domains:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Personal skills and knowledge</strong> (including emotional intelligence, values and beliefs, ethics, adaptability, critical and conceptual thinking)</td>
<td>1. <strong>Communication and relationship management</strong> (including “the ability to communicate clearly and concisely with internal and external customers, to establish and maintain relationships and to facilitate constructive interactions with individuals and groups” p. 364)</td>
<td>1. <strong>Thought leadership</strong> (incorporating strategy, judgement, business knowledge and planning and execution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Interpersonal skills</strong> (including communication, relationship management and conflict management skills)</td>
<td>2. <strong>Leadership</strong> (including “the ability to inspire individual and organisational excellence, to create and attain a shared vision and to successfully manage change to attain the organisation’s strategic ends and successful performance” p. 364)</td>
<td>2. <strong>Results leadership</strong> (incorporating motivation, driving for results and leading courageously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Transactional (execution, management) skills</strong> (including human resource management, finance, organisational theory and design, project planning and management)</td>
<td>3. <strong>Professionalism</strong> (including “the ability to align personal and organisational conduct with ethical and professional standards that include a responsibility to the patient and community, a service orientation and a commitment to lifelong learning and improvement” p. 364)</td>
<td>3. <strong>People leadership</strong> (including leading others, interpersonal skills associated with building relationships, managing conflict and leveraging diversity and communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Transformational (leadership) skills</strong> (including setting strategic vision and mission, thinking innovatively, managing complex change, mobilising others, influencing and inspiring, creating and empowering organisational culture)</td>
<td>4. <strong>Knowledge of the healthcare environment</strong> (“the demonstrated understanding of the healthcare system and the environment in which healthcare managers and providers function” p. 364)</td>
<td>4. <strong>Self-leadership</strong> (including the self-management factors of inspiring trust, demonstrating adaptability and practicing self-development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Policy and program knowledge</strong> (including understanding local, state and federal government policies; political knowledge; experience in health; policy formation and development; clinical and service areas; knowledge of and experience in mental health, medical ethics)</td>
<td>5. <strong>Business skills and knowledge</strong> (“the ability to apply business principles, including systems thinking, to the healthcare environment” p. 364)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C.1.8 Plain Language Statement and Consent Form

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Employees, stakeholders of [name of consortia]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain Language Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 12th October, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Project Title: Organisational and management competencies of successful and sustainable service integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Researcher: Dr Kathryn von Treuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Researcher(s): A/Prof Petra Staiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kim Aitken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are invited to take part in this research project. This Plain Language Statement contains detailed information about the research project. Its purpose is to explain to you as openly and clearly as possible all the procedures involved in this project so that you can make a fully informed decision about whether you are going to participate.

Purpose

Service integration aims to reduce the fragmentation of service provision by filling any service gaps and smoothing the movement of a client between services. Effective service integration reduces the costs of services, by decreasing needless repetition, and thereby increasing efficiency. Service integration also increases the cost effectiveness of service provision by reducing the amount of inappropriate service usage by clients (King & Meyer, 2005; Weiner, Amick & Lee, 2008).

The main aim of this project is to understand the organisational, leadership and team competencies required for successful service integration. Because of the increasing amount of mergers/aquisitions/integrations it is imperative to understand the factors that underpin a successful service integration. By increasing our understanding of the competency required we can be better informed to enable, and potentially improve, change management practices.
Organisational change is challenging because it usually entails multiple, simultaneous adjustments in staffing, work flow, decision making, and communication. Both collective and co-ordinated behaviour change, by multiple organisational members, is required for effective organisational change. Given the complexity of this undertaking, many healthcare organisations achieve only partial implementation success (Alexander, Weiner, Shortell, Baker & Becker, 2006), or fail completely. The required organisational competencies in consortia merger, via partnership coalition, have not been adequately researched and this research will help to address this shortcoming.

Methods

There will be two phases of information gathering. One source of information gathering is through semi-structured interviews with key consortia stakeholders. The second phase of information collection involves conducting as many as four focus groups with various work teams with up to eight employees each. An invitation to participate in this study will be sent via email. Participants will be invited to partake in an interview or focus group only.

Sample questions include:

1. If you reflect on the organisations / agencies that have joined the consortium to date: What aspects have enabled them to integrate successfully into the consortium?

2. If you reflect on the organisations / agencies that have integrated less successfully (or taken longer / required more support to integrate) into the consortia: What factors have impacted on their ability to integrate seamlessly and quickly?

3. Within the consortium, which organisation / agency do you consider to be the highest performing (or has made the most significant contribution to the consortia)? What differentiates this organisation / agency from others?

Demands

The interviews and focus groups will take approximately 60 minutes to complete and will be conducted on site at your place of work, at the consortium. It is imperative that the people participating in the focus groups remain respectful of other participant’s views, and that they maintain group confidentiality. The focus groups will be held in small groups of approximately six to eight employees. You will be asked to respond and discuss information in a group setting. The focus groups will be audio-taped and will not be made available to the consortia. Those participating in focus groups may experience discomfort through their participation with other work
colleagues. To minimise the impact of this participants are reminded that they do not have to say things that they are uncomfortable to say. Participants are also reminded at the start of each focus group that group confidentiality must be maintained.

All information will be handled confidentially and participation is voluntary. The interview will be semi structured and involve the participant and one of the Deakin University research team.

**Risks and potential benefits to participants**

When mergers and acquisitions fail it can have a negative impact on the employees, the organisations and the community. Understanding the factors of merger success may assist in understanding important cultural factors which could be used when an organisation is considering merging with, or acquiring another. Possible benefits include the development of a better understanding of service integration. However, we cannot guarantee or promise that you will receive any specific benefits from this project.

It is not anticipated that there is any risk associated with this research. However, in the event you experience any anxiety associated with the research interview, or with the researchers please ring Lifeline on 131114.

**Any expected benefits to the wider community**

Failed service integration can have enormous financial cost to the organisations, employees and the community. Better understanding factors may lead to a more seamless integration, and could improve service delivery.

**How privacy and confidentiality will be protected**

All aspects of this study, including individual results will be confidential. No data provided within the questionnaires will be identifiable, as your name is not required for the survey. Only group level data are provided to organisations or in any publication. Storage of the data collected will adhere to the University regulations and be kept in secure storage at Deakin University for six years, after which time it will be destroyed. Involvement in this study may result in the disclosure, albeit anonymously, of potentially sensitive information and opinions concerning the dynamics of your workplace.

It is possible that the anonymous data collected in this study may be used for other purposes or research in the future. However, given the data is anonymous your identity cannot be disclosed in any way.

**The likelihood and form of dissemination of the research results, including publication**
The aggregate research findings and study results will be provided to the participating organisations only. Results of the project may be published in various academic journals. If you wish to be informed directly of the study results, please contact Dr Kathryn von Treuer on +613 5227 8476 or kathryn.vontreuer@deakin.edu.au. No individual participant results will be available; only group-level findings.

**How the research will be monitored**

The research will be monitored at least weekly by the Chief Investigator, Dr Kathryn von Treuer.

**Any payments to participants**

There will be no reimbursement for any of the costs associated with participating in this research project.

**The amounts and sources of funding for the research**

[consortia] National has provided funding for this research.

**Financial or other relevant declarations of interests of researchers, sponsors and institutions**

There are no other declarations of interest by researchers, sponsors and institutions.

**The participant’s right to withdraw from further participation at any stage, along with any implications of withdrawal [implications of withdrawal typically relate to health research only], and whether it will be possible to withdraw their data**

You are able to withdraw or suspend your participation at any time should you experience any discomfort or distress as a result of participating in the interview/focus group. If you choose at any point to withdraw from this study, there are no personal consequences. Your participation is voluntary and anonymous. However, once data has been recorded it can not be withdrawn as there is no way of identifying which data belongs to you.

**Contact details of the researchers**

If you require further information or if you have any problems concerning this project (for example, any side effects), you can contact the principal researcher Dr Kathryn von Treuer on +613 5227 8476 or kathryn.vontreuer@deakin.edu.au. Or by mail: School of Psychology, Deakin University Waterfront Campus, Geelong VIC 3217. Tel. 0409 562 311

**Complaints**

If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact: Secretary, HEAG-H, Dean’s Office, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing
and Behavioural Sciences, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125,
Telephone: 9251 7174, email: hmnbs-research@deakin.edu.au
Please quote project number 130/2010.
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO:  Employee – Focus Group

Consent Form

Date:

Full Project Title: Organisational and management competencies of successful and sustainable service integration.

Reference Number:

I understand the attached Plain Language Statement.
I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.
I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep.
The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity and personal details, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.
I understand the interview will be audio-taped.

Participant’s Name (printed) ……………………………………………………

Signature …………………………………… Date ……………………

Contact person regarding this consent form:
Principal researcher Dr Kathryn von Treuer on +613 5227 8476 or kathryn.vontreuer@deakin.edu.au. Or by mail: School of Psychology, Deakin University Waterfront Campus, Geelong VIC 3217. Tel. 0409 562 311

NOTE: The focus groups did not go ahead, due to changing circumstances within the consortia.
TO: Stakeholder Interview

Consent Form

Date:

Full Project Title: Organisational and management competencies of successful and sustainable service integration\textsuperscript{11}.

Reference Number:

I understand the attached Plain Language Statement.
I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.
I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep.
The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity and personal details, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.
I understand the interview will be audio-taped.

Participant’s Name (printed)

Signature ........................................ Date ................................

Contact person regarding this consent form:
Principal researcher Dr Kathryn von Treuer on +613 5227 8476 or kathryn.vontreuer@deakin.edu.au. Or by mail: School of Psychology, Deakin University Waterfront Campus, Geelong VIC 3217. Tel. 0409 562 311

\textsuperscript{11} NOTE: Only the interviews focused on management competency (leadership competency) were included as part of this thesis.
C.1.9 Interview Schedule regarding Leadership Competency

Consortia Leadership Competencies
Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders

Aim: To identify the key leadership and management determinants and competencies required to ensure successful service integration within a coalition framework.

Introduction: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. As a key stakeholder of the consortia I am interested in obtaining your perspectives on the key leadership and management determinants and competencies required for successful service integration into the consortia.

I would appreciate your insights into the key leadership and management determinants and competencies, based on your observations and experience of service integration within the consortia thus far.

Your responses will be incorporated, along with the responses of other key stakeholders and a review of organisational documentation and academic literature, into a paper describing the key leadership and management determinants and competencies required for successful service integration. These leadership and management competencies will assist with the selection of coalition partners for new centres, as well as inform the creation of organisational development processes for the consortia.

Stakeholders to:

1. Read Plain Language Statement
2. Sign Ethics form
Interview Questions

4. How long have you been in your current role?

5. How would you define successful leadership?

6. Thinking broadly, what do you consider to be the important leadership and management knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes required for successful service integration?

7. If you reflect on the leaders and managers of organisations / agencies that have joined the consortia to date:
   - What abilities have enabled them to integrate successfully into the consortia?
   - What leadership and management components do you consider it essential for potential consortia leaders to possess prior to joining the consortia, versus those leadership components that are desirable (i.e. those they could develop once they are part of the consortia)?

8. What are the specific challenges facing leaders and managers within the consortia?
   - What knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes enable them to deal effectively with these challenges?

9. At times, I imagine not everything runs to plan and factors can slow progress towards service integration. If you reflect on the leaders that have taken longer / required more support to integrate into the consortia:
   - What factors have impacted on their ability to integrate seamlessly and quickly?
10. Within the consortia, can you identify a leader or manager you consider to be highly effective? Note: The stakeholder doesn’t need to name/identify the individual in the interview, just reflect on their characteristics.
   • What differentiates this leader / manager from others?

11. Is there anything about you, and what you do, that has assisted with (or facilitated) successful service integration? Note: If the interviewee has difficulty answering this, reframe the question by asking “If I were to ask your managers about the things that you do that have assisted with (or facilitated) successful service integration, what would they say?”

12. [Interviewer: Summarise / list the key characteristics provided by the stakeholder in the interview and feed back to the stakeholder, then ask:]
   • If I was to ask you to prioritise the top 3-5 leadership characteristics required for successful service integration, what order would you place them in?

13. Is there anything else you would like to add before we move on to the next phase of the interview (i.e. the card sort exercise)?

Card Sort Exercise

Interviewer to explain the card sort process:
You are now going to look through a series of cards that describe effective work behaviours and abilities, with a view to answering the question: “How important are these areas in the work role?”

For the purposes of this exercise the ‘work role’ is defined as key leadership and management roles that are focused on service integration within.

As you evaluate the behavioural and ability dimensions on each of the cards, you are asked to rate them using a 7-point rating scale:
1. Not important
2. Marginally important
3. Fairly important
4. Important
5. Very important
6. Extremely important
7. Critical

Please place the cards under the 7 importance rating cards I have set out on the desk. You may find it useful to place them in columns under the rating cards as you sort them.

It is recommended that you move through the card sort fairly quickly and not spend too much time deliberating over any one card. Once you have completed the card sort you can go back and re-sort any that you think need to be reprioritised. Aim for an even distribution across the seven rating cards.

When you are sorting a card, focus on the behavioural dimension (i.e. the heading on the card) rather than the more detailed facets (A, B & C).

**Interviewer to:**
- Answer any questions the stakeholder may have.
- Provide the stakeholder with:
  - Behaviour dimension cards 17—52, then
  - Ability cards 56—61
- Take notes on any relevant comments the stakeholder makes as they are completing the card sort (which may assist to flesh out the competency model).
- When the stakeholder has finished the sort, record their responses on the Rating Form.
- **Note:** Aim for an even distribution of cards across the seven scales. If the stakeholder has a disproportionate number of cards in the 'Very important', 'Extremely important' and 'Critical' categories, encourage them to redistribute. (It may also be appropriate to get them to use the 3-point Rank Scale [1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High] to go back and re-rank the cards in the top 3 categories according to their importance. However, this is likely to be time-consuming).
### Leadership and Governance

**Organisational Management**
- Full, visible and sustained support for service integration
- Enthusiastic local ‘change agent’

**Clarity of Shared Vision**
- Understands the service integration model and is committed to the underlying purpose of service integration

**Fostering Organisational Readiness**
- Willing to adapt organisational, structural and team processes to facilitate successful service integration

**Leadership Skills and Characteristics**
- Effectively communicates a shared vision, mission and values
- Possesses a range of effective leadership behaviours

### Relationship Management and Communication Skills

**Professional Liaison and Communication**
- Relationship management skills
- Highly developed communication skills

**Teamwork**
- Experienced at leading effective teams, including promoting group cohesion

### Clinical Knowledge and Skills

- Professional background and expertise in one of the four key service areas (ideally at a senior level)
- Credibility in field (with strong linkages to profession and community)
- Experience of managing in the health system (both people and services)
- Experience in [client group] health (desirable)

### Leadership Characteristics and Skills

- Strategic leadership
- People leadership
- Intellectual leadership

### Literature Review Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Structured Interview Themes</th>
<th>Saville Consulting Wave Card Sort Themes</th>
<th>Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Governance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Giving Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership and Governance in Service Integration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Management</strong></td>
<td>• Understanding people, team working, valuing individuals</td>
<td>1. Organisational management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td>• Thinking positively, embracing change, inviting feedback</td>
<td>2. Clarity of shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fostering Organisational Readiness</strong></td>
<td>• Taking action, seizing opportunities, pursuing goals</td>
<td>3. Fostering organisational readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Skills and Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>• Managing tasks, upholding standards, producing output</td>
<td>4. Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Management and Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td>• Making decisions, directing people, empowering individuals</td>
<td>5. Collaborating with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Liaison and Communication</strong></td>
<td>• Generating ideas, exploring possibilities, developing strategies</td>
<td>6. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamwork</strong></td>
<td>• Interacting with people, establishing rapport, impressing people</td>
<td>7. Multi-disciplinary teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Characteristics and Skills</strong></td>
<td>• Conveying self-confidence, showing composure, resolving conflict</td>
<td>8. Management of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Management of organisational systems and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics and Capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Planning, evaluation and service improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Governance in Service Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Program and practice knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. [Client group] advocacy and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. <strong>Personal Characteristics and Capabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fostering Organisational Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.1.10 Leadership Competency in Service Integration: Summary of Findings, continued

### Management of People, Organisational Systems and Processes

#### Management of People
- Supportive, collegiate management style
- Sound understanding of, and experience with, people management frameworks

#### Organisational Systems and Processes
Possesses:
- Experience in overseeing and/or managing organisational systems and processes
- Planning skills and experience

### Policy and Programme Knowledge
- Clinical knowledge: Experience with relevant health systems, structures and standards

### Personal Characteristics, Skills and Knowledge
- Integrity and professionalism
- Demonstrates: achievement focus and drive; self-confidence; tenacity and resilience; flexibility and adaptability
- Remains calm and composed in pressured situations
- Possesses highly developed critical thinking and decision-making skills
- Committed to own professional development

### Interpersonal Skills

#### Communication
13. Highly effective communication skills, both oral and written

#### Relationship Management
14. Strong prior relationships in community and sector
15. Stakeholder engagement and management skills
16. Political acumen
17. Negotiation skills
18. Conflict management skills

#### Teamwork
- Team player—looks to collaborate rather than compete with others
- Ability to effectively lead and manage multidisciplinary teams

### Change Management
- Possesses sound understanding of change management frameworks
- Experienced at guiding organisations through complex organisational change

### Management Skills and Experience
- Management capability and experience
- Clinical governance capability and experience
- Possesses mandate to make decisions ‘at the consortia table’
- Financial management skills
- Planning/project management skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Review Themes</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interview Themes</th>
<th>Saville Consulting Wave Card Sort Themes</th>
<th>Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of People, Organisational Systems and Processes</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Management Skills and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of People</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Management capability and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical governance capability and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possesses mandate to make decisions ‘at the consortia table’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saville Consulting Wave Card Sort Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning/project management skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D.1.1 Ethics Approval

Memo

To: Prof Lina Ricciardelli, Dr Jeremy Anglin  
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Faculty of Health

CC: A/Prof Kathryn van Treur, Kim Aitken

Date: 22 February 2017

Re: HEAG-H 07_2017: Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change.

Approval has been given for Prof Lina Ricciardelli and Dr Jeremy Anglin, of the School of Psychology, to undertake this project for a period of 1 year from 22 February, 2017. The project has been given approval as it meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). The current end date for this project is 22 February, 2018.

The approval given by the Deakin University HEAG-H is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Secretary immediately should any of the following occur:

- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time
- Any events which might affect the continuing ethical acceptability of the project
- The project is discontinued before the expected date of completion
- Modifications that have been requested by other Human Research Ethics Committees

In addition you will be required to report on the progress of your project at least once every year and at the conclusion of the project. Failure to report as required will result in suspension of your approval to proceed with the project.

An Annual Project Report Form can be found at: http://www.deakin.edu.au/hmbs/research/ethics/ethicssubmissionprocess.php

This should be completed and returned to the Administrative Officer to the HEAG-H, Pro-Vice Chancellor’s office, Faculty of Health, Burwood campus by Friday 1st December, 2017 and when the project is completed. HEAG-H may need to audit this project as part of the requirements for monitoring set out in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007).

Good luck with the project!
Steven Sawyer

Secretary
HEAG-H
D.1.2 Subject Matter Expert Recruitment Email and Plain Language Statement and Consent Form

RECRUITMENT EMAIL:

Invitation to participate in a PhD study examining the leadership determinants of successful organisational change

Dear x,

As part of my PhD examining the leadership determinants of successful service integration, I am canvassing the insights of experts in the field of leadership, such as yourself.

As either a senior leader with experience of guiding organisations through change, or a leadership practitioner with expertise on the topic, I am interested in your views regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification \(^{12}\) and how you have seen such behaviours operationalised effectively during organisational change.

This research will employ the Delphi Technique, and will require you to answer a short series of questions, in one 30-minute telephone interview and then two subsequent rounds of emails (requiring 10-20 minutes of your time per round), regarding leadership, organisational identification, and organisational change. The interview and rounds of emails are to take place between March and May 2017. Over this period, the total time you would be expected to dedicate to this project is between one hour and one-and-a-half hours.

After each round of questions I will summarise the key themes from all participants’ responses in the previous round – removing all identifiers – then share with the broader participant group and invite all participants to revise or expand upon their original responses.

Your name and contact details will only be known to myself and two of my supervisors, Professor Kathryn von Treuer and Professor Lina Ricciardelli. As mentioned, all responses will be de-identified before they are disseminated to the broader participant group.

The outcomes of this research will contribute to the fourth and final study of my PhD, and will be collated in a chapter of my PhD thesis, a journal article, and a white paper.

\(^{12}\) Organisational identification is defined as a person’s degree of affinity, or connectedness, with their employing organisation.
paper. It is intended that the insights gleaned from this research will be of benefit to leaders and their organisations, when determining how best to facilitate organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions and joint ventures.

This research is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time during the research project. A number of subject matter experts are being contacted, with the expectation that a subset of those contacted would be available to participate. My PhD supervisors and I understand that people in senior roles such as yours are typically busy, therefore it is appreciated that you may not be in a position to allocate your time to this study, at this time. You will not be contacted again unless you reply to this email indicating you are willing to be involved.

I have attached a Plain Language and Consent (PLSC) form which provides more details about this research. If you would like to participate in this research, please confirm by responding to this email (and if you are ready to do so, attaching a signed copy of the PLSC).

Warm regards

Kim Aitken
PhD Candidate (and Principal Consultant at People Measures)
School of Psychology, Deakin University
TO: Subject Matter Experts invited to participate in research

Plain Language Statement

Date: February, 2017

Full Project Title: Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change – HEAG-H 07-2017

Principal Researchers: Professor Lina Ricciardelli, Professor Kathryn von Treuer, Dr Jeromy Anglim

Student Researcher: Kim Aitken

Dear Subject Matter Expert,

This letter is to invite you to participate in a research project that examines the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification\textsuperscript{13}, and how such behaviours are operationalised effectively during organisational change.

Overview of the research

This project will extend research on the impact of leadership on organisational identification during organisational change. Additionally, it will provide insights to leaders and their organisations when determining how to best facilitate organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures.

The project is being undertaken as part of a thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy. This research is totally funded by Deakin University.

The project researchers have canvassed their academic and professional circles to identify practising leaders and experts in the field of leadership, who have particular experience of assisting organisations and their members when undertaking organisational change. Via this process you have been identified as a subject matter expert.

Participation in any research project is voluntary. \textbf{If you do not wish to take part you are not obliged to.} Deciding not to participate will not affect your relationship to the researchers or to Deakin University. Once you have read this form and agree to

\textsuperscript{13} Organisational identification is defined as a person’s degree of affinity, or connectedness with, their employing organisation.
participate, please sign the attached consent form. You may keep this copy of the Plain Language statement.

Research method, and your participation

This project will employ the Delphi technique, whereby experts will be asked to respond to a series of questions, in 2 ‘rounds’. With your consent, your participation in the project will involve:

- an interview of approximately 30 minutes; and
- subsequently, responding to 2 emails to answer follow-up questions.

The duration of experts’ involvement in the project (from the 30-minute interview to responding to the second and final round of emails) is expected to be approximately 8 weeks. Over this 8-week period, the time you will be expected to dedicate to this project is between one hour and one-and-a-half hours.

Interview

As the first step in the study, you will participate in a 30-minute interview (either via telephone or face-to-face) where you will be asked a series of questions. We will take handwritten notes of the interview. Indicative questions include:

- In your planning of organisational change, how much emphasis (if any) have you placed on fostering employees’ identification with their organisation (OID) during change?
- Is there anything that you have done specifically to foster employees’ OID during times of organisational change?
- What behaviours do you observe in your leaders, when they are focusing their efforts on fostering OID?
- In your experience, what types of leadership help to foster OID?
- What outcomes (i.e. individual, team or organisational) have resulted from encouraging your leaders to focus on fostering organisational identification during change?
- As an earlier component of this PhD research we developed a leadership competency model focused on facilitating organisational change such as service integration: (This will be distributed to participants prior to their interview).
  - Would you add or alter any aspects of this competency framework, from your own experiences of leading organisations through change?
  - In your experience, which of these leadership competencies are most instrumental in fostering OID in employees during change?

Once the interviews with experts have been conducted, the researchers will
summarise the key themes from experts responses, in an anonymous form that does not identify individual participants.

Survey via email (2 rounds of questions via email)

In the first round of emails, the themes from the interviews will be disseminated – via email survey – to you and other participating experts, and you will be asked to respond to a series of questions relating to the summarised themes. Emails will be sent via ‘blind copy’ to ensure that participants do not know who else is responding. Indicative questions include:
- How well do the summarised themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview?
- Is there anything you would revise?
- Is there anything you would expand upon?

It is expected that it will take participants between 10-20 minutes to respond to the questions distributed in each round of emails. You will be given two weeks to respond to each round of questions via email.

In the second round of emails, the responses from the first round of emails will be then summarised and disseminated again via email survey to you and other participating experts, for further comment. Indicative questions include:
- How well do the summarised themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview?
- Is there anything you would revise?
- Is there anything you would expand upon?

As mentioned above, these questions should take you between 10-20 minutes to respond to, and you will be given two weeks to respond to each round of questions.

Option to withdraw
You may of course decide to withdraw from the project, at any point. You may also ask up to the time of the publication that any information collected at your interview, or via email, be destroyed and not used for the research.

Storage and dissemination of data
To comply with government requirements all data will be stored securely for a period of a minimum of 5 years after final publication. It will then be destroyed. The collated views of experts will be published in the student researcher’s PhD thesis, and will inform a journal article and white paper(s). No individual will be able to be identified in any part of the data collection process, or in any subsequent publication.
How the project will be monitored
The research team will meet face-to-face monthly during the project, with weekly to fortnightly phonecalls and regular email exchanges.

Additional information
If you require further information or if you have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researchers responsible for the project, who are: Professor Lina Ricciardelli, Professor Kathryn von Treuer, Dr Jeromy Anglim and PhD candidate Kim Aitken.

Complaints
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Ethics and Biosafety, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, Victorian 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number: HEAG-H 07_2017

Yours sincerely,
Kim Aitken
PhD Candidate
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Subject Matter Experts (both practising leaders and experts in the field of leadership), invited to participate in research

Consent Form

Date: February, 2017

Full Project Title: Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change

Reference Number: HEAG-H 07_2017

I have read and understand the attached Plain Language Statement.

I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.

I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep.

The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity, personal details, or any identifying material, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.

Participant’s Name (printed) …………………………………………………

Signature ………………………………… Date ……………………...
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Subject Matter Experts (both practising leaders and experts in the field of leadership), invited to participate in research

Withdrawal of Consent Form

(To be used for participants who wish to withdraw from the project)

Date:

Full Project Title: Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change

Reference Number: HEAG-H 07_2017

I hereby wish to WITHDRAW my consent to participate in the above research project and understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardise my relationship with Deakin University.

Participant’s Name (printed) ……………………………………………………………

Signature ………………………………………….. Date ……………………

Please email this form to:
Kim Aitken
[Email address]
D.1.3 Round One Interview Schedule

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Date:

Full Project Title: Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change – HEAG-H 07-2017

Subject Matter Expert Code:

Interviewer / Student Researcher: Kim Aitken

NOTE: Ensure expert has a copy of the Leadership Competencies (emailed the night before).

Overview of the research

This study is being undertaken as part of my thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy in organisational psychology. My research is designed to examine, in an Australian context, the leadership determinants of successful organisational change such as service integration, mergers and acquisitions, and joint ventures.

The current study—the fourth and final component of my thesis—aims to capture the insights of experts (such as yourself) regarding the leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification (OID) during change, and how these behaviours have been operationalised. I am also seeking experts’ perspectives on the leadership competency model developed in Study Three based on their own experience of leading organisations through change.

Your involvement

This study is employing the Delphi Technique, whereby participants will be asked to respond (confidentially) to a series of questions – involving one telephone interview, followed by 2 rounds of questions via email. During the current telephone call we will undertake the interview.

This research is voluntary and you are not obligated to participate. You can withdraw at any time without having to provide an explanation – even during this interview.

Storage and dissemination of data

To comply with government requirements all data will be stored securely for a period of a minimum of 5 years after final publication. It will then be destroyed.
The collated views of experts will be published in my PhD thesis, and will inform a journal article and white paper(s). No individual will be able to be identified in any part of the data collection process, or in any subsequent publication.

Do you have any queries before we commence the interview questions?

**Information about expert’s experience and current role:**

What are your key roles and responsibilities in your current role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Background questions for participants who are leadership practitioners</strong></th>
<th><strong>Background questions for participants who are leadership experts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you held positions of leadership (and in what capacity)?</td>
<td>How long have you specialised in the field of leadership (and in what capacity, i.e. academic, consultant)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What responsibility do you have in planning organisational change in your organisation – specifically when different groups and individuals come together in mergers, acquisitions, restructures, redesign and or service integration? Can you tell me more about what that entails?</td>
<td>What responsibility do you have in advising / supporting leaders to navigate organisational change – specifically when different groups and individuals come together in mergers, acquisitions, restructures, redesign and or service integration? Can you tell me more about what that entails?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantive interview questions:

1. What is your understanding of organisational identification (OID)? How would you define it?

2. In your planning of organisational change, have you placed any emphasis on fostering employees’ identification with their organisation (OID) during change? See page 1 for definition of OID to confirm with participant.

   If YES, proceed to questions 4 onwards; if NO, ask question 3:

3. If not, what other ‘people’ factors do you emphasise when focusing on organisational change?

   Then proceed to testing the Leadership Competency Framework with the SME (pages 7&8).

   If expert answers YES to the question regarding placing emphasis on fostering OID during organisational change, ask the questions on the following page (questions 4-7):

4. In your planning of organisational change, how much emphasis have you placed on fostering employees’ identification with their organisation (OID) during that change? What priority has it taken amongst other facets of the change process?

5. Are there any actions you or your organisation have taken specifically to foster employees’ OID during times of organisational change? If so, what are they?

6. What behaviours do you observe in your leaders when they are focusing their efforts on fostering OID?
7. What outcomes (i.e. individual, team or organisational) have resulted from you or your leaders focusing on fostering OID during change?

Questions regarding the Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework:
8. As an earlier component of this PhD research we developed a leadership competency model focused on facilitating organisational change such as service integration: See following page for the leadership competency model (which will have been sent to the expert prior to the interview for their review).
   o Would you add or alter any aspects of this competency framework, from your own experiences of leading organisations through change?

   o In your experience, which of these leadership competencies are most instrumental in fostering OID in employees during change?
   o NB: If the participant has not focused on OID during change, ask ‘In your experience, which of these leadership competencies are most instrumental in supporting employees during change?’

Confirm next steps
Round Two: The researchers will summarise the key themes from participants’ responses in the first round (i.e. the telephone interviews) and, in the second round of responses, invite participants (via email) to revise or expand upon their original responses provided in Round One.

Round Three: The process undertaken in Round Two will be repeated, whereby the researchers summarise the key themes from participants’ responses and invite participants to revise or expand upon their responses.

The results will be analysed qualitatively via thematic analysis.

Thank the participant very much for their time.
The Preliminary Leadership Competency Framework

Leadership and governance in organisational change.

- **Organisational management:** The leader demonstrates full, visible and sustained support for organisational change (i.e. service integration, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures) and is an enthusiastic local ‘change agent’.

- **Clarity of shared vision:** The leader understands and is committed to the underlying purpose for the organisation adaptation (or formation) and organisational change; strong potential for a shared philosophy exists between the organisation and the leader.

- **Fostering organisational readiness:** The leader is committed to collaborative planning at regular intervals during and subsequent to organisation adaptation (or formation) and is willing to adapt organisational, structural and team processes to facilitate successful organisational change.

- **Leadership:** The leader is able to effectively communicate the organisation’s shared vision, mission and values to staff, stakeholders and the community. The leader possesses effective leadership behaviours that develop the capability of others, enhance performance, and foster a positive working environment including: providing strategic and intellectual leadership; employing a multi-faceted approach to leadership; motivating and inspiring others; and effectively traversing difficult situations and issues.

Relationship management and communication skills.

- **Collaborating with partners:** The leader possesses strong pre-existing networks in the [professional industry], the [client] sector and community and a well-developed ability to establish and maintain effective professional relationships to improve outcomes for [client base]. Additionally, the leader is able to navigate through complex and sensitive political issues (at the organisational, community, State and Federal levels).
• **Communication:** The leader possesses a repertoire of communication skills, including an ability to listen and consult, adapt their communication style to suit the needs of the situation and audience, read ‘what is not being said’ in an interaction and interact effectively with the [client]. Possesses well-developed written communication skills, including an ability to write cogent reports under time pressure.

• **Multi-disciplinary teamwork:** The leader is experienced at leading effective teams, including promoting group cohesion and achieving desired team, agency and/or organisational outcomes.

**Management of people, organisational systems and processes**

• **Management of people:** The leader effectively manages team and individual performance, employing a supportive and collegiate management style. Possesses a sound understanding of, and experience with, people management frameworks systems and processes. Deals effectively with performance management issues and challenges, and is an effective coach.

• **Management of organisational systems and processes:** The leader possesses relevant experience in overseeing and/or managing: governance frameworks and practices; workgroup structures and systems; financial structures and systems (including managing funding cycles); communication systems; and information technology systems and procedures.

• **Planning, evaluation and service improvement:** The leader is experienced at developing and implementing plans in accordance with priorities agreed by key stakeholders, and evaluates and updates plans regularly and systematically to ensure they meet current needs and priorities. The leader possesses a service improvement orientation.

**Practice knowledge**

• **Program and practice knowledge:** Content removed as not pertinent for current research.

• **[Client group] advocacy and community development:** Content removed as not pertinent for current research.

**Personal characteristics and capabilities**

• **Personal integrity, achievement focus and self-management:** The leader operates
with integrity and professionalism; demonstrates achievement focus and drive; is self confident; demonstrates tenacity and resilience; is flexible and adaptable; remains calm and composed in pressured situations; possesses a sense of humour; possesses highly-developed critical thinking and decision-making skills; and undertakes appropriate professional development practices, together with activities to facilitate and support his or her own health and wellbeing.
D.1.4 Round Two Survey (via email)

Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change – HEAG-H 07-2017

Themes from the Round One interviews for Expert Panel members’ review and comment (Round Two)

We would appreciate it if you could review the key themes and note any comments, suggestions or revisions within the document for return to us by Friday 5th of May.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic One: The leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification (OID)(^{14}) during change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common themes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The majority of expert panel members emphasised that the leadership of change is challenging and not an innate capability of leaders. Leaders frequently require support from internal and external specialists to lead the change – both regarding how they lead others, and how they manage themselves through the change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Panel members had observed leadership behaviours that were ineffective, as well as effective, when their organisations have undertaken change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effective behaviours observed in leaders when they are focusing their efforts on fostering organisational identification (OID) include:

**Effective communication (both written and oral):**

- Articulating the organisation’s vision and purpose, together with reasons for the change, across the organisation (and not making assumptions that key messages are being disseminated).
- Creating and delivering a strong narrative for the change, linking the history and context of the organisation to its future.
- Being consistent with messages, and reiterating key messages frequently and in ways that are understood by diverse groups within the organisation.
- Focusing on one’s style of communication (i.e. pace, tone, volume, body language) in order to communicate with impact and sincerity and ensure key messages are received.
- Active listening skills – including the ability to discern the messages in non-verbal communication.
- Asking effective questions that facilitate open discussion.

**Focus on relationships:**

- Being available to staff (not just direct reports), including being visible and checking in regularly. Giving people the opportunity to be heard.
- Fostering trust by being authentic and consistent with words and actions.
- Empathy—attending to the emotional needs of others, including sensing, acknowledging and working through others’ anxieties and loss associated with the change.
- Knowing when to use ‘the moment’ to connect with people and reinforce key messages.

---

\(^{14}\) Organisational identification is defined as a person’s degree of affinity to, or connectedness with, their employing organisation.
• Taking ownership of the change process (and not over-relying on organisational structures and processes to facilitate the change).
• Taking a planned and considered approach to the change, ensuring that the phasing of the change is undertaken in a logical way that makes sense for the teams and individuals involved.
• Balancing the needs of the business with the needs of individuals within the business.
• Prioritising – knowing when it is important to transcend the operational pressures to focus on leading the change.
• Embracing diversity of thinking (and reactions) associated with the change process. 

Management of self: 
• Remaining calm and composed in challenging times.
• Demonstrating a sense of confidence that instils confidence in others.
• Demonstrating vulnerability – including sharing own reactions and feelings associated with the change and not feeling the need to have all the answers.
• Being open to feedback (about self and leadership of the change).

The less effective behaviours observed in leaders when they are focusing their efforts on fostering OID include: 
• Less effective communication:
  • being less effective at articulating the strategy and vision for the change;
  • ‘telling’ rather than ‘selling’ (or modelling) the change;
  • moving through the communication process too quickly (due to own discomfort with the change OR the fact that the leader has already processed the rationale for the change themselves);
  • making assumptions that key messages have been processed; and
  • making inappropriate comments when under pressure.
• Not placing appropriate priority on change management processes (including a lack of follow-through on key actions associated with the change management plan).
• Losing sight of what the organisation is seeking to achieve, due to pressures associated with the change, including focusing unnecessarily on the operational and day-to-day issues at the expense of the bigger picture.
• Distancing self from organisational decisions.
• Avoiding the challenging work (and conversations) associated with the change.

Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:
How well do the above themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview? Please rate your degree of alignment on the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Not at all aligned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 = Moderately aligned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 = Completely aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything you would revise?

Is there anything you would expand upon?


**Topic Two: How leadership behaviours are operationalised effectively during organisational change, to foster OID in employees (i.e. the actions taken by individual leaders or the broader organisation to foster employees’ OID during times of organisational change).**

**Common themes:**

When describing the actions taken by leaders to foster OID during times of change, the majority of experts spoke of utilising change management principles and practices to foster OID. These practices included:

**Actions taken by the broader organisation:**

- Providing forums for the senior leaders of the organisation to come together to discuss issues of purpose, culture and identity (i.e. associated with the new organisational structure, merged organisation, or acquiring and acquired organisations) and how these will be managed through the change process.
- Detailed change management plans that outline the purpose, case for, and benefits associated with the change.
- Detailed communication plans, ensuring frequent, tailored and multi-faceted communication regarding upcoming changes to organisational structure. (Note: a key theme was that leaders cannot ‘over-communicate’ in these situations. Another was the importance of communicating via various methods).
- Consultation with staff (including planning days, roadshows, group meetings, and online communication).
- Providing opportunities for changes (and the change process) to be challenged and discussed.
- Implementation of programmes to support staff (including change mapping, resilience and career management workshops).
- Staff surveys (e.g. engagement surveys) to take ‘temperature checks’ throughout a change process.
- Provision of EAP services for both the staff and their families – particularly if the change precipitates loss for individuals, their families and their communities.

**Actions taken by individual leaders within the organisation:**

- Providing clarity on the purpose of the organisation, to serve as an anchor through the change process and to provide staff with something to identify with. As one expert commented “The leadership question of ‘Why are we here?’ is a question of purpose and identification”.
- Providing opportunity for frequent discussions with staff (including one-on-ones) regarding the change process and what it means for them as individuals (i.e. their roles, purpose, motivations).
- Leveraging change champions, so that the change is not perceived as being driven by the senior leadership team.
- Leaders and change champions modelling the behaviour expected of others during change (i.e. behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values, and operationalise the change).
  - Several experts spoke of specific training their leaders had undertaken regarding their verbal and non-verbal behaviour, to ensure they were able to serve as effective role models for the organisation’s change process.
  - Utilising coaches (both internal and external) to assist individuals and teams to discuss their reactions to the change (including their sense of loss associated with the changes).

**Divergent themes:**

- One respondent who worked in a cyclical environment which encountered structural change every few years commented that, while focusing on OID was important, focusing on the *broader purpose* of the organisation’s work was more important.
- Another respondent commented that they or their organisation had never intentionally focused on OID during change (commenting further that OID may have been focused on but “would probably be called something else”).
Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:
How well do the above themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview? Please rate your degree of alignment on the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Not at all aligned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3=Moderately aligned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5=Completely aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Is there anything you would revise?*

*Is there anything you would expand upon?*

**Topic Three: Outcomes (i.e. individual, team and / or organisational) that result from encouraging organisational leaders to focus on fostering OID during change.**

*Common themes:*
A range of positive outcomes were seen to have resulted from leaders focusing on fostering OID during change:

**Individual outcomes:**
- People remaining ‘on board’ and connected with the organisation throughout the change process. A sense of belonging.
- People feeling their purpose is aligned with that of the organisation.
- Motivation levels of staff.
- Individuals feeling consulted.
- Creativity – people willing to contribute ideas.
- Individuals’ self-rated level of comfort with change post-implementation.
- Quick acceleration of connection to the new organisation (i.e. new organisational structure, merged organisation, acquiring organisation).
- Individuals making informed decisions regarding whether to ‘select in’ or ‘select out’ of the organisation.

**Organisational and team outcomes:**
- A shared purpose and vision, created and owned by individuals throughout the organisation (i.e. not just the senior leadership team).
- Increase in employee engagement (as measured by surveys). *Note this was considered both an individual and an organisational outcome.*
- Change readiness.
- Lower than expected absenteeism.
- Lower than expected staff turnover.
- Diversity of thinking across the organisation (when different subcultures and identities are valued and integrated effectively).
- Quick acceleration up the productivity curve post-change.
- Financial success.
- Organisational success (as measured by meeting KPI’s).
- Absence of issues with unions.

*Divergent themes:*
- One expert noted one of the downsides of strong identification with an organisation and its culture during change (i.e. that identification can impact on individuals’ willingness to embrace change, and result in stress and a sense of loss associated with letting go of the status quo).
Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:
How well do the above themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview? Please rate your degree of alignment on the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

1=Not at all aligned  2  3=Moderately aligned  4  5=Completely aligned
☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

Is there anything you would revise?

Is there anything you would expand upon?

Note: The preliminary leadership competency framework is attached to this document, for ease of reference when reviewing topics Four and Five below.

Topic Four: Aspects of the preliminary leadership framework experts felt were useful.
A number of experts commented on the aspects of the preliminary leadership competency framework they considered useful. Key themes included:

- The importance of the ‘Leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain – particularly the emphasis on governance, which provides a mandate for leading the change process.
- The emphasis on ‘multidisciplinary teamwork’ – in order to mitigate the silo effect that can impede progress during change. One expert commented that this was “often overlooked”.
- The ‘Management of people, organisational systems and processes’ competency domain – and its role in supporting other aspects of the competency model focused on enabling people.
- The ‘Practice knowledge’ domain (interpreted by experts as professional or technical knowledge), which was considered important to be able to lead a change process credibly. As one expert commented, “You have to know what is going on”.
- The importance of the ‘Personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain, which the majority of experts considered to be a fundamental aspect of the competency framework.

Topic Five: Additions or alterations to the preliminary leadership competency framework suggested by experts.
The experts suggested the following additions or alterations to the preliminary competency model:

General suggestions:
- The framework needs to make more reference to driving results and outcomes (as leaders need to have some accountability for achieving results – “some skin in the game”, as one expert commented).
- The framework could be further defined by describing the behaviours that sit under the competency definitions (particularly to be of benefit in a range of organisational development activities such as performance management, selection and training and development).
- The language of the model could be refined to ensure it reflects senior leaders (rather than mid-level leaders), through the use of stronger verbs.
The ‘Leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain:
- Could be weighted more heavily than the other competency domains – as the competencies within this domain were considered critical. Several experts commented that the other competencies ‘fall out’ of this domain.
- Requires more emphasis on:
  - political acumen, and the nuances associated with power and authority;
  - the understanding and application of key change management frameworks;
  - the importance of engaging, motivating and inspiring others (i.e. the transformational aspects of leadership); and
  - leveraging the learnings from change.
- The ‘leadership’ competency within this domain needs to be refined:
  - Several experts queried whether there should actually be a ‘leadership’ competency within a leadership competency framework, and suggested alternative labels (e.g. change leadership, mobilisation of others).
  - Several experts commented that there needed to be a clearer distinction between the behaviours that related to leadership versus management.

The ‘Relationship Management and Communication Skills’ domain:
- Requires more emphasis on:
  - stakeholder management; and
  - the importance of creating and delivering a compelling narrative for the organisation (that also resonates with teams and individuals).

The ‘Personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain:
- Was viewed as a critical competency, and many experts felt it required expansion and refinement. Specifically, more focus on:
  - Authenticity and integrity (i.e. the leader being genuine and consistent, possessing a strong moral compass, and transcending their own personal interests for those of the organisation and the individuals within it);
  - Self-management (i.e. the leader understanding themselves, their defaults and triggers when experiencing change; self-management strategies; the ability to modify their behaviour ‘in the moment’ to suit the context and audience);
  - Judgement and decision-making. Several experts considered this capability as critical, and requiring more definition, including a focus on: integrated thinking and the ability to deal with multiple ideologies and frames; ethical decision-making; the ability to take (calculated) risks; and the ability to be decisive when the situation requires;
  - Emotional intelligence, including the self-management qualities outlined above, and the ability to navigate interpersonal relationships skilfully;
  - Optimism, that sustains self and others through the change; and
  - Being prepared to have the courageous conversations, particularly the ability to deal with conflict (i.e. conflicting values, and views regarding the change), and the ability to speak to the loss people will experience through change (and support them as they process the loss).

Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:
How well do the above themes reflect the perspectives you provided in your interview? Please rate your degree of alignment on the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Not at all aligned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3=Moderately aligned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5=Completely aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything you would revise?

Is there anything you would expand upon?
D.1.5 Round Three Survey (via email)

Delphi Study: Operationalising leadership behaviours to foster organisational identification during change – HEAG-H 07-2017

Themes from Round One and Round Two for Expert Panel members’ review and comment (Round Three)

This document presents the summarised revisions to a subset of the topics canvassed in Rounds One and Two of the Delphi study, for your further and final comment. We would appreciate it if you could review the document and note any comments, suggestions or revisions within the document for return to us by Monday 5th of June.

Please note: The revisions suggested by Expert Panel members in the Round Two emails are included throughout this document in bold typeface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic One: The leadership behaviours deemed most effective when fostering organisational identification (OID)(^{15}) during change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common themes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The majority of expert panel members emphasised that the leadership of change is challenging and not an innate capability of leaders. Leaders frequently require support from internal and external specialists to lead the change – both regarding how they lead others, and how they manage themselves through the change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panel members had observed leadership behaviours that were ineffective, as well as effective, when their organisations have undertaken change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effective behaviours observed in leaders when they are focusing their efforts on fostering organisational identification (OID) include:

**Effective communication (both written and oral):**

- Articulating the organisation’s vision and purpose, together with reasons for the change, across the organisation (and not making assumptions that key messages are being disseminated).
- Creating and delivering a strong narrative for the change, linking the history and context of the organisation to its future.
- Being consistent with messages, and reiterating key messages frequently and in ways that are understood by diverse groups within the organisation.
- Focusing on one’s style of communication (i.e. pace, tone, volume, body language) in order to communicate with impact and sincerity and ensure key messages are received.
- Active listening skills – including the ability to discern the messages in non-verbal communication.
- Asking effective questions that facilitate open discussion.

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Ensuring that messages are delivered by appropriate levels of leadership within the

---

\(^{15}\) Organisational identification is defined as a person’s degree of affinity to, or connectedness with, their employing organisation.
organisation (i.e. broad organisational messages about vision and purpose are most effective when delivered by the CEO / Executive; messages that relate to the impact of the change on individuals are most effective when delivered by direct supervisors who are able to personalise the messages).

- Providing a range of different forums for dialogue with staff (i.e. ‘townhalls’, planning days, roadshows, group meetings and one-on-ones, online communication).

**Focus on relationships:**

- Being available to staff (not just direct reports), including being visible and checking in regularly. Giving people the opportunity to be heard.
- Fostering trust by being authentic and consistent with words and actions, and **delivering on promises**.
- Empathy—attending to the emotional needs of others, including sensing, acknowledging and working through others’ anxieties and loss associated with the change.
- Knowing when to use ‘the moment’ to connect with people and reinforce key messages.

**Stewardship of the organisation and the change it is undertaking:**

- Taking ownership of the change process (and not over-relying on organisational structures and processes to facilitate the change).
- Taking a planned and considered approach to the change, ensuring that the phasing of the change is undertaken in a logical way that makes sense for the teams and individuals involved.
- Balancing the needs of the business with the needs of **individuals** within the business.
- Prioritising – knowing when it is important to transcend the operational pressures to focus on leading the change.
- Embracing diversity of thinking (and reactions) associated with the change process.

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Being able to make and stand by difficult decisions, whilst also appreciating the personal impact these decisions may have on organisational members (i.e. balancing the ‘hard calls’ with empathy).
- Demonstrating adaptive change behaviours (e.g. assisting an organisation and its members to cope with change by giving direction, providing protection, clarifying roles, managing conflict, and shaping norms).
- Ensuring leaders and change champions model the behaviour expected of others during change (i.e. behaviours that reinforce the organisation’s purpose and values).
- Leveraging the existing knowledge that individuals may have, having been through similar changes previously, to provide insights into what worked and what didn’t.
- Engaging with the “change resistors” who may be able to enhance risk mitigation strategies during change. Including logically analysing points of resistance and asking: “Am I observing an individual reaction to be managed/empathised with? Or is the reaction I am observing the ‘tip of the iceberg’ which could be a realistic and potential risk to the success of the change?”.
- Knowing when it is appropriate to outline the consequences of **not** implementing change (i.e. the disadvantages of remaining with the status quo).

**Management of self:**

- Remaining calm and composed in challenging times.
- Demonstrating a sense of confidence that instils confidence in others.
- Demonstrating vulnerability – including sharing own reactions and feelings associated with the change and not feeling the need to have all the answers.
- Being open to feedback (about self and leadership of the change).

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Understanding own and others’ emotional responses to significant change processes, including what can impede progress (e.g. immunity to change, fear of loss).
- Prioritising self-care (e.g. exercise, meditation, breathing exercises, peer support)
in order to replenish and sustain self through change.

Other suggested additions from experts during Round Two:
- Prioritising ‘social purpose’, specifically leaders’ ability to emphasise purpose greater than the organisation such as its broader impact on community and society.

Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:
How well do the above themes reflect the perspectives you provided in rounds One and Two of this study? Please rate your degree of alignment on the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

1=Not at all aligned  2  3=Moderately aligned  4  5=Completely aligned
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Is there anything you would revise?

Is there anything you would expand upon?

Note: The preliminary leadership competency framework is attached to this document, for ease of reference when reviewing the following two topics.

Topic Five: Additions or alterations to the preliminary leadership competency framework suggested by experts.
The experts suggested the following additions or alterations to the preliminary competency model:

General suggestions:
- The framework needs to make more reference to driving results and outcomes (as leaders need to have some accountability for achieving results – “some skin in the game”, as one expert commented).
- The framework could be further defined by describing the behaviours that sit under the competency definitions (particularly to be of benefit in a range of organisational development activities such as performance management, selection and training and development).
- The language of the model could be refined to ensure it reflects senior leaders (rather than mid-level leaders), through the use of stronger verbs.

Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:
- It is important to emphasise the ‘systemic’ nature of the organisation (where everything inter-relates) and the impact of this on leader behaviour.

The ‘Leadership and governance in organisational change’ domain:
- Could be weighted more heavily than the other competency domains – as the competencies within this domain were considered critical. Several experts commented that the other competencies ‘fall out’ of this domain.
  Requires more emphasis on:
  - political acumen, and the nuances associated with power and authority;
  - the understanding and application of key change management frameworks;
  - the importance of engaging, motivating and inspiring others (i.e. the transformational aspects of leadership); and
  - leveraging the learnings from change.
The ‘leadership’ competency within this domain needs to be refined:

- Several experts queried whether there should actually be a ‘leadership’ competency within a leadership competency framework, and suggested alternative labels (e.g. change leadership, mobilisation of others).
- Several experts commented that there needed to be a clearer distinction between the behaviours that related to leadership versus management.

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Placing a strong emphasis on the ‘why’ of change, so that people understand the rationale for the change and identify with it.
- Acknowledging where people are ‘at’ during times of change. Meeting them there and allowing for them to ‘let go’, and construct and gain momentum around new beginnings.
- The leadership competencies [within this domain] should clearly differentiate the key leadership behaviours, which then can be clearly observed and identified by the organisation and those managing the performance of those involved.

**The ‘Relationship Management and Communication Skills’ domain:**

- Requires more emphasis on:
  - stakeholder management; and
  - the importance of creating and delivering a compelling narrative for the organisation (that also resonates with teams and individuals).

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Making the theory of change real – as one expert commented, “Human beings are emotional beings that have fears, hope, emotions and needs and this needs to be a key aspect of any change”.
- Matching people (in terms of tone, supporting body language, and speed of speech that paces people through the change). “Go slow, to go fast”.

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

**The ‘Management of people, organisational systems and processes’ domain:**

- Enabling people by understanding what happens subconsciously for them when organisational change occurs (i.e. not just a technical, competency focus but also vertical learning and exploring the subconscious).

**The ‘Personal characteristics and capabilities’ domain:**

- Was viewed as a critical competency, and many experts felt it required expansion and refinement. Specifically, more focus on:
  - Authenticity and integrity (i.e. the leader being genuine and consistent, possessing a strong moral compass, and transcending their own personal interests for those of the organisation and the individuals within it);
  - Self-management (i.e. the leader understanding themselves, their defaults and triggers when experiencing change; self-management strategies; the ability to modify their behaviour ‘in the moment’ to suit the context and audience);
  - Judgement and decision-making. Several experts considered this capability as critical, and requiring more definition, including a focus on: integrated thinking and the ability to deal with multiple ideologies and frames; ethical decision-making; the ability to take (calculated) risks; and the ability to be decisive when the situation requires;
  - Emotional intelligence, including the self-management qualities outlined above, and the ability to navigate interpersonal relationships skilfully;
  - Optimism, that sustains self and others through the change; and
  - Being prepared to have the courageous conversations, particularly the ability to deal with conflict (i.e. conflicting values, and views regarding the change), and the ability to speak to the loss people will experience through change (and support them as they process the loss).

**Additions / refinements from experts during Round Two:**

- Judgement and decision-making: Being able to make timely and effective decisions without necessarily having all available information (i.e. drawing on “wisdom, good judgement and experience”).
• **Being prepared to have the courageous conversations:** Promptly dealing with performance issues associated with the change process – having the conversations early so the success of the change is not compromised”.

**Opportunity for Expert Panel Members to comment:**

How well do the suggested additions / alternations to the preliminary leadership competency framework reflect the perspectives you provided in rounds One and Two of this study? Please rate your degree of alignment using the rating scale below (by placing a tick or an ‘X’ in the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Not at all aligned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 = Moderately aligned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 = Completely aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything you would revise?

Is there anything you would expand upon?

**Round One Interview Responses: The leadership competencies considered most instrumental in fostering OID in employees during change**

In the interview round of this study—Round One—you were invited to review the preliminary Leadership Competency Framework (presented again on the following pages) and indicate the leadership competencies you considered most instrumental in fostering OID in employees during change.

The competencies included in the preliminary framework considered by expert panel members to be most instrumental in fostering OID during times of change were:

- **Clarity of shared vision** (competency 2) – particularly defining and articulating ‘purpose’.
- **Fostering organisational readiness** (competency 3).
- **Leadership** (competency 4) – particularly taking up the leadership mantle (and seeing it as a key part of the role); being prepared to be visible and accountable during change; mobilising people to achieve common goals; fostering trust in self and organisation;
- **Relationship management and communication skills** (domain of competencies, 5-7) – particularly building effective relationships; exceptional communication skills; stakeholder management;
- **Personal characteristics and capabilities** (competency 13) – particularly managing self, personal integrity.

Please take the time now to confirm the five competencies included in the preliminary leadership competency framework you consider most instrumental in fostering OID in employees during change.

1. __________________________________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________________________
4. __________________________________________________________________________
5. __________________________________________________________________________

Would you like to make any further comments?