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Who are these guys?

**Rob Worrall**
- PL - External Engagement UoS
- Award-winning researcher incl. P-BLD
- Leadership Development Facilitator (multiple sectors) and Consultant
- Led intersectoral collaboratives at international, European, regional, national and local levels

**Darren Leech**
- Director at NHS Elect
- Research focussed on leadership and competition in NHS
- Former NHS acute hospital background
- Professional background in pharmacy
What’s this all about?

- Where leadership in the NHS is at – context
- Policy background – competition to collaboration
- ‘Systems leadership’
- Challenges
- Place-based leadership – what is it?
- How might P-BL help?
- Warning – we want your views!
Context as we see it...

- Social policy espoused the virtues of competition in the health and care sectors¹
- ‘competition will reduce cost and increase quality’²
- Significant level of tendering, contracting, tariff development³
- Competitive behaviour and language adopted in the NHS⁴
Contextual consequences...

- Sectors responded with ‘commercial leadership’
- Collaboration and partnership in many areas had fallen
- No politically acceptable mechanism to manage those who fail
- ....Policy change
• Public spending squeeze
• Rising expectations on state to support citizens & businesses

• More localised and differentiated approach to the delivery of public services and tackling intransigent social problems has gained momentum in the era of financial crisis and austerity

• From the individual to the collective
• From the intra-personal to the inter-personal
• Little theoretical understanding of the process by which collective leadership development evolves
A new policy of collaboration...

• STPs seen as the mechanism to drive better planning and provision of health and care services, through collaboration\(^9\) - across traditional administrative, organisational and cultural boundaries in set geographical areas

• ‘Systems Leadership’ was added to the health and care lexicon\(^{10}\)
Challenges to ‘systems leadership’...

- Cultures – *compete to collaborate*
- Regulatory obligations
- Historical leadership development\(^{11,12}\)
- Political and public affiliation to ‘place’\(^{13}\)...
‘Place’ – why significant?

• Human geography – bonds between people in geographical locations\textsuperscript{14}

• Political geography – personal and emotional attachment (‘rootedness’ or ‘place identity’)\textsuperscript{15}

• Environmental psychology – Person (self-identity and socialisation processes), Place (physical and geographical aspects), Process (how group and individuals relate to place)\textsuperscript{16}
Demand for new leadership theories – reflecting complexity of working across boundaries with varied groups & interests

Collective Leadership (relational, shared, distributed)

(Pearce & Conger, 2003; Bennett et al, 2003; Uhl-Bien, 2006)

Public Integrative Leadership / Place-Based Leadership/

(Drath, 2003; Bryson & Crosby, 2005; Bolden, 2007, Brookes & Grint, 2010;)

Inter-Organizational Relations (IOR) Research
(Cropper, Ebers and Huxham 2008)

Leader & Leadership Development
(Day, 2000; Day and Harrison, 2007)

Theoretical Perspectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Development (singular)</th>
<th>Leadership Development (plural)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Social capital (social and relational construct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Leadership is a social process engaging members of a community with leadership an effect rather than a cause, an emergent property of social interaction in context.”

(Iles and Preece, 2006: 16)
Philosophy and Method

1. **Social constructionist & interpretive, induction**
2. **Mixed methodology - but predominantly qualitative**
   
   *(Moon and Moon, 2004; Tashakorri and Teddlie, 1998)*

3. **Triangulation – pre-interview questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, formal meetings and reports**

4. **Data interpreted grounded in the lived experience of participants**
The Balancing Act?

- Core themes represent a series of **paradoxical tensions** within self, between self and other(s), between self and organization, and in relation to wider place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrow versus wider focus</th>
<th>On self, self interest and self development</th>
<th>On collective interest (common good) and collective development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or many place(s)</td>
<td>Unconscious or deliberate rejection of other perspectives</td>
<td>Open acceptance of other perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to addressing issues</td>
<td>Linear, quantitative and controllable, cause and effect, similarity, uni-dimensional response</td>
<td>Multilayered, chaotic, qualitative, multiple causes and effects, novelty, difference and multi-dimensional response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An emerging model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’ development

- Developed between 2011-2015 based on
  - Initial conceptual framework
    - Previous experience as a progressively more senior leader – involved in developing and leading local, regional, national and international collaboratives
    - Considerable practice based experienced as a leadership development facilitator
    - Extensive policy and literature review
    - Initial scoping visits to three place
  - interrogating the lived experience of participants, programme directors and facilitators on three place-based collaboratives.
## Overview of Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study A</th>
<th>Case Study B</th>
<th>Case Study C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainly Rural shire county (small city and towns)</td>
<td>Rural county/Unitary city (large city and towns)</td>
<td>Rural and urban county (large town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two tier local government system</td>
<td>Two tier (but unitary city)</td>
<td>Two tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants from public, private and third sectors</td>
<td>Mainly public sector (limited third sector)</td>
<td>Public and not for profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders (including politicians)</td>
<td>Emerging Leaders</td>
<td>Senior Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of prosperity/ Pockets of deprivation</td>
<td>No politicians</td>
<td>No politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent facilitation</td>
<td>Academic element - delivered by a Higher Education Institution</td>
<td>Independent facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Prosperity/Significant areas of deprivation</td>
<td>High levels of prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pockets of deprivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding others’ perspectives</td>
<td>Being open to seeing more than one world view, a more globally-oriented perspective when considering what the causes of particular issues are, and how they should respond.</td>
<td>A movement away from perceived assumptions about people and organisations and a movement towards a different perspective, and appreciation of a different way of seeing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td>A collective awareness of the need for leadership to be construed and enacted in a different way and being comfortable with having values and assumptions challenged.</td>
<td>Positive collective response to a disturbance in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common (social) purpose</td>
<td>A coming together, a common agreement of what the social purpose of the collaborative actually is and what it is seeking to achieve beyond furthering the common good and by what means.</td>
<td>Clear individual statements on common purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense making</td>
<td>Seeing the main social issues from different perspectives and creating a shared understanding of what the problem is and potential approaches to resolve it</td>
<td>The telling of similar stories/descriptions from shared experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative space</td>
<td>This is about the potential use of the initiative as a thinking laboratory. The flow of ideas could lead to the incubation of new initiatives and potential spin off activities which would not have happened otherwise.</td>
<td>The reporting of new activities which happened because of connections made within the collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating social capital</td>
<td>The move from common agreement to common action which has led to increased shared capability to address issues.</td>
<td>There may have been significant benefits and/or added value from working together. This collaboration may have also had an influence on the development of other social initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a narrative of collective leadership</td>
<td>This is about the development of a common understanding of how leadership is construed, what its objectives should be and how it manifests itself.</td>
<td>Development of a common language in terms of how leadership is described potentially with shared metaphors or illustrative examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership development (plural)
Focus: place/system
Role: lead system/achieving outcomes [collective leadership]

Leader development (singular)
Focus: self/organisation
Role: lead team/dep/organisation achieving targets/outputs [management]

Responding to “Wicked Issues” Societal Challenges

Conceptual Framework
Illuminating the way: an Emergent Theory of Place Based Leadership Development

- Setting for social interaction
- Humans' subjective experience gives meaning to space

- Understanding other perspectives
- Mindset “getting it” recognition, awareness, same pagesness

- Creating social capital
- Common (social) purpose

- Collaborative space as a source or channel for innovation
- Sense making as a collaborative social process

- Creating a narrative of collective leadership—what do agents mean? What are the implications?

- Sense of Place
  Psycho-social feeling of emotional belonging/attachment

Emergent Theory of Place Based Leadership Development

© NHS Elect
An emergent model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’ development

• Emergent findings tested out with
  – public sector managers (July 2014) (Award winning BAM Paper)
  – and then with Collaboratives in Worcs and Suffolk (Nov & Dec 2016)

• Led to development of place-based leadership development framework

• Published in British Journal of Health Care Management (2018)\textsuperscript{10}

• Now being tested out in guiding and developing leaders working on intersectoral urban violence prevention in Kenya, Uganda and Guatemala

• Collaborative research also with NZ, Australia, UK and USA
Place-based leadership development framework – tensions and dilemmas (Handout 2)

- Ownership and Direction
  - Focus of development
  - Thinking & Being vs Doing

- Openness & Dialogue (relationality and mindset shift)
- Re-humanizing place
- Where and Who Enacts leadership

- Identity Purpose
- Purpose
- Identity

- Value Creation
- Versus
- Collaborative Disadvantage

- Effectiveness vs Transparency
- Representativeness vs Transparency

(Worrall, 2014 & 2015)
An emerging model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’ development

Cluster I – ownership and direction

• 1a Degrees of dependence The extent to which the sustainability of a collaborative is dependent/independent from its commissioner/founder/facilitator

• 1b Direction The extent to which dominant founders have a negative or positive influence on a collaborative’s direction
An emerging model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’
development

Cluster II – purpose and identity

• 2a Purpose The challenge of balancing a focus in individual participants’
development with wider development for the common good

• 2b Identity The tension between the collaborative being – as a think-tank and
influencer and doing – taking direction action for improvement

• 3a Effectiveness and transparency The tension between being selective to
ensure effectiveness and having an open and transparent selection process

• 3b Representativeness and accountability The degree to which collaborative
participants are and should be representative and accountable to wider place
An emerging model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’ development

Cluster III – process and experience

• 4 Differentiated place Tension between traditional hierarchical siloed management and the ambiguous and shared boundaries responsibilities of leading across complex, messy and multiple places

• 5 Re-humanising place The more rational, logical and controlled approach to development counterbalanced by a more emotionally connected, visceral and human response

• 6 Influencing and being influenced The extent to which people experience the collaborative as a means of influencing the external world or that they themselves are influenced by it

• 7 Where and who enacts leadership The extent to which the collaboratives are about the enactment of leadership development or have a direct role in the enactment of leadership itself
An emerging model for ‘Place-Based Leadership’ development

Cluster IV – outcomes

• 8 Creating value How value is defined and created through relational connections, difference and from intangible outcomes creating the conditions for more tangible ones

• 9 Collaborative disadvantage The more critical and negative outcomes and impact of the collaborative
Your views – 3 questions...

In groups can you please discuss the following questions:

- What do they see as the main barriers to collaborative working across the health and social care system?

- The model we presented – what’s missing, what’s wrong, what would improve it?

- Are there general thoughts and reflections you would like to share, that might inform, inflame or encourage this research and practice?

*Please use handout provided if that helps.*

*Appoint a rapporteur to report back.....*
Thank you

rob.worrall@sunderland.ac.uk
darren@nhselect.org.uk
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