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Abstract

This research concerned corporate entrepreneurship which Chapter 1 argued results from subordinates' idea implementations and the nature of the relationship with their leader – a relationship which has experienced a paucity of prior research. Chapter 2 reviewed research philosophies and concluded that mixed methods should be utilised and thus three studies were undertaken in a complementary research strategy. Study I (Chapter 3) via the development and testing of hypotheses, demonstrated support for the relationship between transformational leader behaviour, leader-member exchange, autonomy, risk propensity, creativity and idea implementation. Study II (Chapter 4) via focus group meetings, demonstrated support for Study I results together with two models which purport to describe the interrelationship between leader behaviour and subordinates' idea implementation. Study III (Chapter 5) via a longitudinal autoethnography created by the researcher whilst embedded in the research subject Group¹, described an environment in which poor leader behaviour precipitated poor leader-subordinate relationships and a reduced willingness to implement ideas, whilst good leader behaviour was associated with more positive attitudes by subordinates and a willingness to take risks and implement ideas. The summary research findings, implications for practitioners and recommendations for future research are contained in Chapter 6.

The researcher was motivated to conduct this research based on his MBA dissertation (1999) which investigated the phenomenon of an organisation regaining market leadership which the researcher has subsequently recognised referenced the concept of corporate entrepreneurship and which left unanswered questions as to its antecedents. Further, with a background of thirty-three years as a practitioner with most being spent in increasing senior leadership positions, the researcher has long-been of the view that the subtleties and nuances of leader behaviour are crucial to organisational performance with that performance needing to be measured by the delivery of actions rather than by ideas which are generated but never realised.

¹ A major Anglo-American cultured assembly of strategically independent companies that form a publicly quoted Group on the London Stock Exchange and with a £1billion market capitalisation.
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Chapter 1 Foundations of the research

This chapter develops the foundations of the research. The point of departure is taken as the intention of an organisation to purposefully innovate, for example in order to achieve growth or perhaps simply to survive (Smith 1776/1993). In questioning why an organisation might innovate, this chapter introduces the concept of corporate entrepreneurship (Burgelman 1983b) and argues that it is associated with innovation in organisations. The chapter then continues by defining innovation, arguing that idea implementation is the ultimate expression of innovation and consequently the concept of idea implementation is subjected to scrutiny. Consideration of other arguments associated with innovation is then made, followed by an investigation into antecedents of innovation argued in prior research. Finally, the effects of corporate entrepreneurship and innovation are considered and the chapter ends with the postulation of a research question.

1.1 Why do organisations innovate?

The growth or survival of an organisation is argued to emanate from internal organisational purposeful actions to penetrate or develop markets or products (Ansoff 1957) but also from the acquisition, merger or strategic alliance with other organisations (Johnson, Scholes & Whittington 2006). However, it has been argued that whilst the acquisition, merger or alliance with another organisation may deliver profits to the host organisation more quickly than the internal organisational actions of market/product development (Collins 2003), with less risk (Maira 2005), and may provide new routes to market (Jenster & Barklin 1994), catalytically transfer entrepreneurial practice to the acquiring company (Salvato, Lassini & Wiklund 2007) and provide growth when markets are stagnant (Lynch 2006), such actions may also progressively eliminate the ability of the host organisation to develop markets/products itself (Drazin & Schoonhoven 1996). Furthermore, for those organisations which are publicly quoted or solicit external capital
investment, it has been argued that an internal organisational ability to develop markets and products is important (Rombel 2004, Ernst & Young 2008) and is more attractive to external investors (Dalton & Dalton 2006) since organisations with such internal organisational abilities are considered to offer more certain investment returns compared to those organisations who grow or survive only by a process of acquisition (Ragozzino & Reuer 2010), perhaps due to acquiring companies being seen as more risk-averse with their managers having less discretion and control in allocating investors' funds (Brown & Caylor 2004). For the above reasons, this research is focussed on organisations who purposefully intend to develop their internal organisational abilities to penetrate or develop markets or products, a process which has been associated with corporate entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship within organisations (Peterson & Berger 1971).

1.2 Corporate entrepreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship has been defined as the “process whereby organisations engage in diversification through internal development” (Burgelman 1983b: 1349) and many subsequent arguments support the notion that existing organisations can and need to be entrepreneurial in order to develop new products and markets (Kotler 1997; Sonfield & Lussier 1997; Hamel 2000; Chang 2001; Hamel 2002; West & Nichols 2003; Zahra, Korri & Yu 2005). In the existing literature, three models of corporate entrepreneurship are often proposed (Stopford & Baden-Fuller 1994): (1) intrapreneurship (Pinchot 1985), the creation of new businesses within existing organisations utilising corporate capital and differing from entrepreneurship per se whereby a new start-up company is created with capital raised by the entrepreneur themselves (Pinchot & Pellman 1999); (2) transformation or renewal of existing organisations (after Kanter 1983); (3) frame breaking, where an organisation changes the

---

2 A process arguably enshrined in the ‘Good Governance’ of public organisations, essentially a separation of ownership and management to prevent conflicts of interest (Fombrun 2006, Rose 2007)
rules of competition for its industry (Schumpeter 1934). However, it could also be argued that these three paradigms are highly similar, differing only in their temporal reference to an organisation’s lifecycle since if an organisation creates a new business venture, for that venture to be successful the organisation will almost certainly have to transform itself at some stage (Stopford & Baden-Fuller 1994). It has also been argued that corporate entrepreneurship is associated with innovation within organisations in that an entrepreneurial organisation has been defined as one which innovates and takes risks (Miller 1983). Innovation and risk-taking are central to this thesis however; organisations do not create, transform, renew, innovate and take risks, the members of organisations so do. Specifically, it has been argued that corporate entrepreneurship is enacted by an organisation’s employees, the outcome of which is dependent on the employees’ capabilities to recognise and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (Burgelman 1983b):

“... entrepreneurial participants at the product/market level, conceive new business opportunities, engage in project championing efforts to mobilize corporate resources, and perform strategic forcing efforts to create momentum for their further development” (Burgelman 1983a: 65).

The argument that corporate entrepreneurship is the result of employees’ actions is again fundamental to this thesis and naturally leads to the questions of why employees act in these ways and how corporate entrepreneurship is created and enacted. If these phenomena can be understood it might be possible to build better theories of corporate entrepreneurship and also leverage employee corporate entrepreneurial behaviour.

1.3 Antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship

At this point, it is apposite to acknowledge arguments proposing that corporate entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship per se share similar attributes in that they are both defined as being associated with innovation and risk taking and they both elicit pro-activity to gain market competitive advantage by satisfying customer needs (Kirby 2003).
Much of the literature describing such entrepreneurial phenomena may also therefore inform corporate entrepreneurship and specifically the question as to whether corporate entrepreneurs are ‘born’ or are ‘created’ by their contextual organisational environment (Thornton 1999; Dutta & Crossan 2005), or stating it conversely, whether organisational or personal characteristics, or a combination of them both (Åmo & Kolvereid 2005) are responsible for corporate entrepreneurial behaviour. Supporting the argument of a combined effect of personal and organisational influences on corporate entrepreneurship, it has been argued that the development of corporate entrepreneurship is akin to building a mosaic from multifarious sources (Burgelman 1983b) via both rare and creative acts of individuals and from systematic differences in economic or social contexts (Dobrev & Barnett 2005). It has also been argued that entrepreneurs create opportunities via a novel recombination of pre-existing elements (Peterson & Berger 1971; Zahra, Nielsen & Bogner 1999) as a result of their personality traits (Murray 1938, Tett & Guterman 2000) which creates market disequilibrium (Schumpeter 1934). Further, it has been argued that entrepreneurs discover opportunities as a result of their knowledge and subjectively, uniquely, influence them (after Cassell, Johnson, Symon & Bishop 2005; Johnson & Duberley 2003) to restore market equilibrium (Kirzner 1973, 1997). The latter argument is also supported by research which proposes that the more senior the employee, the greater propensity they have for being entrepreneurial based on their interaction with a more influential network of personal contacts (De Carolis & Saparito 2006).

In support of the argument that it is personal characteristics which determine corporate entrepreneurship, it has long-been argued that risk-taking propensity, desire for autonomy, need for achievement, goal orientation and internal locus of control are all positively related to corporate entrepreneurship (Hornsby, Naffziger, Kuratko & Montagno 1993) with subsequent research also suggesting that whilst formal corporate
entrepreneurship activities may be developed in pursuit of an organisation's strategic intentions, informal corporate entrepreneurship activities will be initiated by individuals and groups in pursuit of personal goals (Zahra et al 1999) with personal values such as self-efficacy arguably creating the motivation for individuals to act on issues which are important to them, regardless of the organisational culture (Axtell, Holman, Unsworth, Wall, Waterson & Harrington 2000; Hemingway 2005). It has also been proposed that individuals who have high aspiration, a high perception of their market worth, good general skills and knowledge and a low personal risk aversion are more likely to become corporate entrepreneurs, rather than just employees, and produce new, innovative and valuable initiatives compared with individuals who have relatively low aspiration and perception of their market worth (Lee & Venkataraman 2006).

It has also been argued that corporate entrepreneurship results from supply-side cognitive bias and demand-side dynamics of social capital (Thornton 1999; De Carolis & Saparito 2006) where supply focuses on the number of entrepreneurs present at any one time and primarily references personal traits such as the need for achievement, risk-taking propensity, innovativeness and confidence, and demand focuses on the number of entrepreneurial opportunities that exist at any one time, referencing the contextual situation and environment within which corporate entrepreneurship occurs. One such contextual situation is argued to be 'organisational slack' or surplus resources within organisations (Cyert & March 1963) which is argued to positively impact on organisational innovation via the capacity to experiment (Daniel, Lohrke, Fornaciari & Turner Jr. 2004) whilst also, however, potentially having a negative impact on innovation due to it being an 'idle inefficiency' (Love & Nohria 2005). Thus, if research into entrepreneurship per se is applied to organisations, the external and internal contexts are both germane to any discussion of the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship. With
respect to the external environment, early studies into corporate entrepreneurship and innovation have argued that environmental turbulence leads to the emergence of corporate entrepreneurs (Peterson & Berger 1971) and that organisational innovation is externally induced (Terreberry 1968). Externally induced market forces, which have been termed “precipitating events” (Hornsby et al 1993: 33), are argued to include increased market competition (Hornsby et al 1993), technological change (Stevenson & Gumpert 1985), or political and social change (de Vries & Florent-Treacy 2003; Kumar, Ressler & Ahrens 2005; Munir & Phillips 2005). Furthermore, research has argued that competitively aggressive, turbulent, fast moving markets quicken innovation cycles, leading to the suggestion that “the most important elements of an organisation’s environment are other formal organisations” (Lawless & Anderson 1996: 1186-1189).

With respect to the internal environment, it has been argued that the nature of business planning cultures in organisations influence the development of corporate entrepreneurship (Miller 1983): (1) in ‘simple’ firms, small and with their power centralised at the top of the organisation, corporate entrepreneurship is primarily determined by the characteristics of the leader; (2) in ‘planning’ firms, bigger and whose goal is to operate smoothly and efficiently by the use of formal controls and which typically have an abundant store of slack resources, corporate entrepreneurship is facilitated by explicit and well integrated product marketing strategies and only planned, regular and predictable entrepreneurship is palatable; (3) in ‘organic’ firms, who strive to be adaptive to their environments and who emphasise expertise-based power and open communications, corporate entrepreneurship is a function of factors such as market dynamics and a decentralised structure. It has also been proposed that corporate entrepreneurship is not natural, it must be actively created:
“Where the conventional wisdom goes wrong is in its assumption that entrepreneurship and innovation are natural, creative or spontaneous. If entrepreneurship and innovation do not well up in an organisation, something must be stifling them. That only a minority of existing successful businesses are entrepreneurial and innovative is thus seen as conclusive evidence that existing businesses quench the entrepreneurial spirit. But entrepreneurship is not ‘natural’; it is not ‘creative’. It is work” (Drucker 1999: 137).

The concept of a deliberate, positive need to take action in the development of corporate entrepreneurship is again central to this thesis. At this juncture and in summary thus far, arguments as to the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship emanate, on the one hand, from the view that a corporate entrepreneur’s success is primarily the result of the organisational setting they are operating within rather than any personal attributes they may possess, where the corporate entrepreneur cannot and does not influence the environment and where potential entrepreneurs perhaps adopt a “voluntarist” view (Hayes 2002: 17) of entrepreneurial opportunities in that they consider themselves to be a passive recipient of market change and to attempt to influence the market is futile. On the other hand however, further arguments also recognise that some individuals just “have what it takes” (Dobrev & Barnett 2005: 436) and possess the alertness and other personal attributes needed to recognise and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (see Kirzner 1973) and so become corporate entrepreneurs. This raises other interesting questions however, as to why individuals who apparently possess such business venturing capabilities decide to exploit opportunities within an organisational setting and why they do not create their own company in a classic entrepreneurialism approach instead.

1.4 Innovation in organisations

As argued above, corporate entrepreneurship is associated with innovation within existing organisations (Miller 1983) and previous research has proposed that the development of new products and markets is axiomatic to innovation (Schumpeter 1934 – see below).
The extant literature does not however provide a clear, unambiguous and consensual definition of innovation, or its constituent parts, but one of the most cited definitions is that innovation consists of two interrelated factors: (a) creativity, the generation of novel, useful ideas; (b) the implementation of those ideas (Amabile 1988). This thesis will adopt this definition since it abstracts and identifies further phenomena which are of fundamental concern to the research, namely, creativity and the implementation of ideas. Furthermore, innovation has also been conceptualised in terms of an “innovation value chain ... a sequential three-phase process that involves idea generation, idea development, and the diffusion of developed ideas” (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007: 122) reminiscent of Porter’s value chain (Porter 1980) in which a company determines in which business activities its value-added expertise resides. However, whereas Porter’s value chain attempts to identify and nurture the area of greatest value, the innovation value chain identifies the strongest, and therefore by definition the weakest link in the innovation chain, and it is the weakest link, as argued, that companies should concentrate on improving (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007).

Synthesising the propositions of Amabile (1988) and Hansen & Birkinshaw (2007) it is argued that idea implementation not idea generation should be the specific focus of organisations who desire to be innovative in order that they achieve a change in the pattern of resource deployment and the creation of new capabilities (Stopford & Baden-Fuller 1994), i.e. that they achieve the practical realisation of an innovative idea:

“Intrapreneurs [Corporate entrepreneurs], like entrepreneurs, are not necessarily inventors of new products or services. Their contribution is in taking new ideas or even working prototypes and turning them into profitable realities” (Pinchot 1985: 32).

The incontrovertible logic that an idea must be generated before it can be implemented is naturally accepted but the concept of idea implementation as the ultimate expression of
successful organisational innovation is nonetheless the central precept of this thesis and a concept which has gained support in literature (for example, Macrae 1982, Pinchot 1987, Charan & Colvin 1999, Ferreira 2002). Specifically, researchers have argued that: (a) “idea generation wasn’t the problem ... brainstorming sessions actually aggravated the innovation process – employees were pumping more and more ideas into an already badly broken system” (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007: 122); (b) ideas will be created, if not shared, “even when the organisational system set to receive the ideas is considered unresponsive” (Frese, Teng & Wijnen 1999: 1148); (c) an organisation needs to exploit the results of its experimentation since a company “is not a research institute” (Zahra et al 1999: 178). Thus, having argued that idea implementation is the ultimate determinant of innovation and corporate entrepreneurship, to assist in the wider understanding of these constructs, consideration is now given to other scholarly contributions namely: the definition of idea implementation, a fundamental perspective on innovation by Schumpeter (1934) and arguments on innovation from other subsequent research.

1.4.1 Idea implementation

Idea implementation will now be considered from the three perspectives of idea implementation as a process, resistance to change, and the influence of leadership.

1.4.1.1 Idea implementation as a process

It has been suggested that idea implementation is a process of developing a detailed feasibility analysis and business plan, acquiring the resources necessary for the new venture and overcoming organisational barriers (Hornsby et al 1993). It has also been argued that idea evaluation is an important part of implementation to check ‘fit’ against market needs, corporate strategy and relative value versus other ideas (Johnson et al 2006: 388) and provide a mechanism for refining and augmenting the idea (Barlow...
Furthermore, it has been proposed that idea evaluation should begin with a forecast of the likely resources needed and potential outcomes resulting from idea implementation, with these being appraised against an agreed standard as to whether the idea should be implemented, dropped or revised (Mumford, Lonergan & Scott 2002; Dailey & Mumford 2006). However, previous research has also argued that “a general optimism pervades forecasting” (Kahneman & Lovallo 1993: 28) which could decrease forecast accuracy and may therefore lead to poor ideas being pursued (Dailey & Mumford 2006). Furthermore, Dailey & Mumford (2006) suggest that prior involvement with an idea could lead to an underestimation of the resources needed for its implementation and an over estimation of the positive outcomes but that appraisers of new ideas who are familiar with the subject matter produce more accurate forecasts of resources and outcomes. These arguments suggest that employees who generate an idea should not appraise it alone; it should be evaluated together with others who have a familiarity and expertise in the subject and are willing to contemplate implementation (Dailey & Mumford 2006). The positive intention or otherwise to contemplate idea implementation is a factor in the appraiser’s rating of the resource requirements and likely outcomes (Armor & Taylor 2003; Lonergan, Scott & Mumford 2004).

An alternative perspective on idea implementation as a process is provided by the model whereby corporate entrepreneurs undertake an “intuiting” process (Dutta & Crossan 2005: 436) as a first stage in utilizing their knowledge to consider an idea, after which they clarify, value and interpret the opportunity. The idea is then shared, arguably for most effect with middle level ‘manager champions’ and operational level ‘product champions’ (Burgelman 1983b: 1353) in the attempt to elicit support and which results in the idea being further clarified in the mind of the corporate entrepreneur. It is at this stage that the idea should be evaluated and subjected to experimentation (Hamel & Getz 2004).
Indeed, a significant body of research has argued that a problem presented heuristically, whereby the desired outcome is clearly stated but the solution is not obvious, is non-routine, is ill defined and is complex, presents a greater chance that the resulting solution will be creative and useful, i.e. innovative and not simply a bizarre idea (Amabile 1992; Scott & Bruce 1994; Besemer & O’Quin 1999; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange 2002). It is argued that this “integrating” process (Dutta & Crossan 2005: 438) of sharing and evaluating the idea is a crucial stage in its implementation and that an idea has a greater chance of being implemented if it has gone through the interpretation and integrating stages. It has also been suggested that early stages of idea evaluation should rely on divergent thinking which must be subsequently eliminated from the implementation phases in favour of convergent thinking (Vincent, Decker & Mumford 2002).

In related studies it has been argued that since idea generation is primarily an internal, personal process whilst idea implementation involves others in a social process (Van de Ven, Angle & Poole 1989) it is therefore reasonable to suggest that environmental factors may have a greater impact on idea implementation than personal factors. However, it has also been argued that personal factors are more important than environmental factors in idea implementations made by professional employees (Bunce & West 1995) which infers that professional employees may have superior ready-access to the tools of implementation compared to, for example, shop-floor employees may be more reliant on group and organisational factors during idea implementation (Axtell et al 2000). Finally, it has been argued that whether or not an employee starts to implement an idea is determined by answers to three main questions they ask themselves namely, how meaningful is it for me to bring myself into this activity and do I feel worthwhile, useful and valuable?, how safe is it for me to do so, i.e. can I engage in the activity without fear of negative consequences to my self-image, status or career?, and, how available am I to
do so, i.e. do I have the physical, emotional or psychological resources to personally engage at this particular moment? (Kahn 1990: 703-714).

Thus, whilst the above discussions may help the understanding of idea implementation as a process, they do not address the issue of the acceptance of the new status quo which is created once an idea has been implemented, a status quo which logically will have undergone change as a result of the implementation. Attitude to change and specifically the resistance to it would therefore seem to be an important factor in implementing ideas.

1.4.1.2 Resistance to change

Resistance to change is argued to emanate from the fear that change may result in an insecure future, inadequate working conditions and inadequate treatment by the organisation (Kiefer 2005). These negative emotions may affect employees’ trust in the organisation and produce withdrawal behaviours (Kiefer 2005). Negative emotions towards the organisation may emanate from employees’ perceptions that resources are being distributed on the basis of favouritism rather than what is best for the organisation as a whole, that there is no link between what employees do and the strategy of the company with top management making no effort to bridge this gap, and that an “organisational silence” exists (Beer, Voelpel, Leibold & Tekie 2005: 451) with employees’ opinions being suppressed by a management team who lack the ability to generate a public discussion about strategy and change (Beer et al 2005).

In terms of dealing with resistance to change, it has been argued that action be taken ‘upstream’ of problems rather than ‘downstream’ after changes have occurred (Kiefer 2005). It has been proposed that successful implementation of change should begin with an open and honest discussion about problems within the organisation (Kotter &
Schlesinger 1979; Kotter 1995) with the change programme consisting of small incremental, "sprint" steps of change rather than one large initiative, with the steps interweaved with periods of "pause" and "reflection" so that change is allowed to settle (Gosling & Mintzberg 2003: 61-62) thereby creating intuitive, rhythmic (Brown & Eisenhardt 1997) but nonetheless permanent change as a natural constituent of organisational activity. The time-period of each sprint and pause phase may be determined by the nature of the change, namely, whether it is a small evolutionary change or perhaps a fundamental paradigm shift (Buchanan, Fitzgerald, Ketley, Gollop, Jones, Lamont, Neath & Whitby 2005).

In related studies, improvisation has been argued to be important to the successful implementation of change, resulting from tacit approval from leadership that all rules, procedures and bureaucratic norms would not necessarily need to be followed during the change process (Leybourne 2006). Conversely, it has been argued that where improvisation is discouraged in the sense that ineffective results are not tolerated, improvisation still nonetheless occurs but it does so surreptitiously which prevents the cross-fertilisation of improvised and innovative techniques to assist the change programme in the rest of the organisation (Leybourne 2006). It is noteworthy that Leybourne's argument was based on empirical research in which a conservative, risk-averse parent company implemented centralised controls on its entrepreneurial operating divisions which discouraged improvisational practices due to operating company employees perceiving that to improvise and fail would result in personal career risk. Leybourne also found that the subsidiary organisations were not at risk of being out of control because parent company control could have been affected by the sharing of base values, honesty and transparency from senior management to all employees. Finally, some functional areas were seen to embrace the idea of improvisation better than others.
with customer facing activities being fertile to the idea, but financial controllers being unconvinced (Leybourne 2006: 86).

In consideration of the stage at which the idea has been implemented and the status quo has subsequently changed, it has been argued that to maintain the new status quo requires a culture of continuous individual and organisational learning (Leroy & Ramanantsoa 1997 see below). Changed working practices, though, at some stage become the new norm and it has been argued that, over time, some elements of a new working practice may need to be allowed to decay before the next change program can begin (Buchanan et al 2005). Ultimately, however, successful change requires a leadership regime which has clarity of purpose, promotes trust, and actively supports improvisation, autonomy and is tolerant of experimentation and associated risk (Gilmore & Gilson 2007).

1.4.1.3 Nature of leader-subordinate exchange relationship

The nature of the leader-subordinate exchange relationship is argued to directly impact organisational performance (DeConinck 2011) and specifically, whether or not employees feel encouraged to implement ideas (Zhou & George 2003) possibly as a result of employees feeling favoured or not by their leader (Vidyarthi, Erdogan, Liden, Anand & Ghosh 2010, plus see extended discussions on leader-member exchange in Chapter 3). Furthermore, the nature of the support by one’s management is argued to send “a clear message to employees that implementation of the innovation is important [or not]” (Choi & Chang 2009: 246). The influence of leadership is also argued to be an important factor which “affect[s] implementation effectiveness by shaping employee reactions to innovation” (Choi, Sung, Lee & Cho 2011: 108). Specifically a leader’s emotional intelligence can play a crucial role in awakening and fostering employee creativity by assisting and encouraging employees to implement ideas by a process of:
“manage[ing] the followers’ negative emotions so that the employees will continue to believe in the value of their ideas, make necessary compromises and negotiate joint gains, and continue to be optimistic about the eventual implementation of these ideas” (Zhou & George 2003: 562). Previous research has also suggested that the influence of leadership throughout the organisational hierarchy may be important to idea implementation with middle management playing an important role in negotiating and sanctioning ideas proposed by their subordinates (Lassen, Wachrens & Boer 2009). The quality of leader-subordinate relationship is also argued to affect subordinates’ intentions to implement ideas (Ohly, Kase & Škerlavaj 2010). Moreover, in relation to innovation, it has been posited that leaders will positively impact innovation in new product development projects by applying pressure for momentum, by providing a clear vision (plus the autonomy to realise it) and by creating a culture that tolerates mistakes and risk-taking (Sundström & Zika-Viktorsson 2009).

In terms of the style of leadership behaviour influencing innovation, different stages of the innovation process may require different leader behaviours (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa 2009) in that:

“... the importance of leadership in building an innovative organisation is not in question. What is less clear, however, is the process by which leadership relates to or affect innovation processes such as creativity and implementation and innovation activities such as exploration and exploitation.” (Oke et al 2009: 68).

“It would appear that the transformational style of leadership is more likely to encourage such creative behaviour ... since transformational leaders seek to change, which is a main driver for the creative process.” (Oke et al 2009: 68).

“The transactional form of leadership – through its focus on management, clear structures, formal systems, reward and discipline – is likely to be more effective in the implementation stage of an innovation than transformational leadership.” (Oke et al 2009: 69)

---

3 Transformational leader behaviour (Burns 1978) is a concept of fundamental importance to this thesis and related detailed arguments are developed in Chapter 3.
since “such processes ensure discipline, focus, timeliness and reduce the risk of failure of new ideas” (Oke et al 2009: 69).

The above research is clearly important to the current thesis. However, it is argued here that Oke et al (2009) offer a confusing synopsis as to the causal relationships between transformational and transactional leadership and creativity and idea implementation, and that Oke et al (2009) do not offer a compelling argument as to whether leader behaviour is the influence, or result, of organisational context. For example, they argue that:

“transformational leadership is likely to be more effective in environments where creative processes and exploratory activities thrive” (Oke et al 2009: 71),

whereas previously they argue that transformational leadership would:

“encourage such creative behaviour” (Oke et al 2009: 68).

Furthermore, they argue that:

“The impact of transactional leadership on innovation processes and activities will be higher where such organization contexts [standard processes and policies that guide product development efforts] are present and actively used” (Oke et al 2009: 71),

whereas previously they imply that:

“the transactional form of leadership through its focus on clear structures, formal systems, reward and discipline” (Oke et al 2009: 69),

creates this optimum contextual environment. The arguments of Oke et al (2009) are not being unduly criticised since discovering the originating influence of idea implementation is not underestimated and, indeed, is the subject of this current thesis. However, it would appear that Oke et al (2009) have succeeded only in producing a cyclic argument which is not convincing to the extent that within an organisational environment which is so designed to produce the implementation of ideas, a positive feedback effect operates. However, the task for researchers is to discover the nascent, primary influences of the organisational environment. In summary, Oke et al (2009) fail to offer compelling insights into how an optimum organisational environment for creativity and idea
implementation might be created other than to suggest cyclic arguments of the form ‘transformational leadership leads to creativity’ and ‘creative environments are most effective for transformational leadership’. This debate is germane to the goal of this thesis. Finally, considering the condition where leader support for the implementation of ideas is not forthcoming, it is argued in a body of literature that in such circumstances entrepreneurial employees may leave their company and create similar, new organisations (Lamont 1972; Pinchot 1985; Jones & Butler 1992; Kassicieh, Radosevich & Umbargar 1996; Audia & Rider 2005; Hellmann 2007; Wright, Hmieleski, Siegel & Ensley 2007) and particularly where employees feel a low level of dependence on their organisation to achieve idea implementation (Burgelman 1983b).

In sum: the above arguments suggest that unless the corporate entrepreneur is able, willing and encouraged by their leader to overcome resistance to change and implement ideas within their current organisation, the idea may be lost or used to generate innovation outside the organisation; a premise which will presently be tested by this current research.

1.4.2 Schumpeter

A seminal perspective on innovation is presented by Schumpeter (1934) within his argument for a theory of an exchange economy in which a circular flow of goods occurs, in perfect balance, based on a match between supply and demand between each and subsequent levels of the economy, up- and down-stream, production and consumption in balance and equilibrium, an economic system in continuity and constancy and without profit. In asking the question “how do such changes take place?” (Schumpeter 1934: 62), he acknowledges that into the balanced flow come changes that do not appear continuously and which change the framework of the economic system. He describes these changes as coming “from within” the system (Schumpeter 1934: 63), rather than
external to it and defines the developments as "spontaneous and discontinuous change in the channels of the flow, disturbance of equilibrium, which forever alters and displaces the equilibrium state previously existing" (Schumpeter 1934: 64). Schumpeter's theory also argues that "innovations in the economic sense do not as a rule take place in such a way that first new wants arise spontaneously in consumers and then the productive apparatus swings round to their pressure" (Schumpeter 1934: 65), rather he argues that consumers are "taught to want new things" (Schumpeter 1934: 65). Further, Schumpeter defines the entrepreneur as the "one who receives profit" (Schumpeter 1934: 76) which supports the idea that the entrepreneur is the one who disturbs the equilibrium, the cyclic flow (in which there is no profit) through innovation and as a result, profit is generated.

Schumpeter also argues that entrepreneurship and innovation are confined to a small number of people in an organisation, but makes a case for a much larger number of employees who have the possibility of acting innovatively, whilst also making reference to phenomena which have latterly been referenced by prospect (Kahneman & Tversky 1979) and agency (Eisenhardt 1989a) theories (see below):

"... everyone is an entrepreneur only when he actually carries out new combinations and loses that character as soon as he has built up his business, when he settles down to running it as other people run their business. This is the rule, of course, and hence it is just as rare for anyone always to remain an entrepreneur throughout the decades of his active life as it is for a businessman never to have a moment in which he is an entrepreneur, to however modest a degree." ... "the carrying out of new combinations is a special function, and the privilege of a type of people who are much less numerous than all those who have the objective possibility of doing it." (Schumpeter 1934: 78, 81).

The idea that many more employees could innovate within organisations is axiomatic to the thesis, the goal of which is to understand how this can occur in relation to the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates which, in reference to earlier arguments, is a process (argued by Schumpeter) to require different
abilities at different stages: “to carry any improvement into effect is a task entirely different from the inventing of it, and a task, moreover, requiring entirely different kinds of aptitudes” (Schumpeter 1934: 88). Further, and specifically in relation to achieving idea implementation, it has also been argued that the process of implementation involves overcoming barriers such as the “reaction of the social environment against one who wishes to do something new” (Schumpeter 1934: 86) and the subsequent resistance to change which “manifests itself first of all in the groups threatened by the innovation, then in the difficulty in finding the necessary cooperation, finally in the difficulty in winning over consumers” (Schumpeter 1934: 87). Finally, Schumpeter proposes that leadership only exists as a result of a need to deal with such issues and that leadership is not required in stable economic environments in equilibrium (Schumpeter 1934: 87).

1.4.3 Subsequent research

It has been argued that organisational innovation can be categorised as: (a) incremental innovation, which is associated with refining knowledge, reinforcing market structures and tends to be found in stable market environments where the emphasis is on precise planning and improving the efficiency of the new product development process; (b) radical innovation, which is concerned with transforming knowledge, transforming market structures and acknowledges that risks must be taken in its pursuit and requires a culture of incubation and support to be successful (Ettlie & Subramaniam 2004; Ettlie & Pavlou 2006; Ettlie & Elsenbach 2007). Moreover, it has also been proposed that innovation can manifest as “radical new ideas that revolutionise ... to much smaller scale innovations” (Axtell et al 2000: 266). Other scholarly contributions also provide the opportunity to aide the definition of Amabile’s (1988) other constituent of innovation, namely creativity, in that it has been suggested a key constituent of innovation is improvisation (Pina e Cunha, Vieira da Cunha & Kamoche 1999), discussed above in
relation to managing resistance to change, with improvisation argued to consist of creativity, intuition and bricolage (Leybourne & Sadler-Smith 2006). Further, it has been argued that creativity is associated with the generation of new ideas with innovation being argued to be associated with the translation of ideas into action (Mumford & Gustafson 1988; Shalley & Gilson 2004). Leading from these definitions which have clarified some of the main terms therein, it seems logical to question why employees act innovatively, but also to investigate the antecedents of innovation in organisations. As with the arguments for corporate entrepreneurship, if this process can be understood and better theorised, it may be possible to leverage this behaviour.

1.5 Antecedents of innovation in organisations

A considerable body of research into the antecedents of innovation within organisations makes reference to a complex interplay of ‘person’ and ‘environment’ and which could have aetiological roots in the work of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1954) and Herzberg’s Hygiene Factors (1959) respectively. Subsequent research might also be claimed as support for this argument in that both personal and contextual factors impact upon attempts to increase creativity in organisations (Oldham & Cummings 1996). Further, other influential studies have proposed that good project management, adequate resources, a culture of collaboration, high expectations, tasks presented heuristically rather than algorithmically and, importantly for latter arguments, employee autonomy, are all important for creativity and innovation (Amabile 1992; Amabile & Sensabaugh 1992). Moreover, further research has produced a rich constellation of factors argued to influence innovation for example, the age, structure and environmental culture of the organisation (Kuratko, Hornsby, Naftziger & Montagno 1993), the learning culture and reward systems and their impact on developing the skills of individual employees (Eesley & Longenecker 2006), the communication openness of the organisation (McAleese &
Hargie 2004) and leadership support and leader behaviour (Peters & Waterman 1982). Employee autonomy and its influence on innovation is another important concept of fundamental concern to this thesis and detailed explanatory arguments will be developed subsequently. The above mentioned variables plus a number of additional factors which have been argued to be antecedents of innovation are now considered in more detail.

1.5.1 Corporate governance

As argued above, corporate governance of public companies potentially creates risk-averse organisations by reducing manager’s discretion in allocating investors’ funds “increasing the probability that managers invest in net present value projects” (Brown & Caylor 2004: 2) perhaps creating ‘denominator’ as opposed to ‘numerator’ management (Hamel & Prahalad 1994) where the emphasis is on profit growth via controlling costs rather than growing sales revenues (Wickens 1999). Thus, there may be grounds for concern for corporate governance as an antecedent to innovation by it encouraging more risk-averse financial control of managers and controlling costs as the primary method of growing profitability, an understandable approach by large institutional shareholders in current times but damaging nonetheless to innovation which requires an element of risk taking, albeit controlled risk taking (Zahra, Neubaum & Huse 2000).

1.5.2 Age of organisation

It has been argued that mature organisations often possess more resources than younger ventures and therefore should be able to better support innovation (Fiol & Lyles 1985; Ford, Voyer & Gould Wilkinson 2000; Kirby 2003). However, it has also been proposed that innovation can become increasingly bureaucratically institutionalised and incremental in older organisations (Dobrev & Barnett 2005). This is based on the premise that younger, often smaller ventures benefit from having a greater percentage of their
employees, versus the total number employed, in direct contact with the market due to the
glue dynamics of the nascent organisation, with more mature, perhaps larger
corporations having a much greater percentage of their total workforce in positions that
are remote from direct market contact, for example internal-company support roles, who
physically get little, if any, direct market exposure (Dobrev & Barnett 2005).

1.5.3 Organisational structure

The structure of an organisation, which is taken to mean the way in which employees of
organisations (whether directors, managers, or subordinates) are organised in terms of
who is subordinate to whom, how many reportees an employee has and to what sub-
grouping the employee belongs, has been argued to directly affect employee innovation
(Mintzberg & Waters 1982; Kanter 1983; Covin & Slevin 1991; Brown & Eisenhardt
1997). Moreover, previous research has also suggested that a decentralised structure and
associated local decision making is more positively related to innovation compared to a
rigid Taylorist centralised control structure (Amabile 1992). Other research however,
argues that a physically dispersed, decentralised structure is a limiting factor to
innovation due to the lack of physical contact between employees (Hansen & Birkinshaw
2007) and with yet further research proposing that physical decentralisation has no
impact on management control of dispersed organisations (Hales & Tamangani 1996) and
thus by implication, does not have any affect on innovation.

1.5.4 Groups

The structure of groups, for example with a purpose of brainstorming ideas, directly
affects innovation in that ‘nominal’ groups, whereby one person is not permitted to
dominate proceedings and less confident individuals are given the opportunity to
overcome their fear of idea evaluation apprehension and make a contribution, are seen to
be more creative than would be otherwise, particularly when lead by a superior displaying transformational behaviour (Jung 2001: 192). It has also been argued that within such groups, although interaction with others should increase the chance for an individual to share ideas to positively assist their creativity, an individual with weak group ties can actually be more creative (Perry-Smith 2006). It is reasoned that groups may exert pressures on members to conform and to adopt ‘cognitive constraint’ (Perry-Smith 2006: 96) which could result in new and novel creations being filtered out by the group due to ‘groupthink’ (Whyte Jr. 1952). It is possible therefore, that individuals with strong group ties need honed interpersonal skills in order to get opportunities to exert their creativity (Birdi, Leach & Magadley 2007). However it may also be that a person with strong group ties has high levels of interpersonal skills in order to have been able to develop those ties in the first place or they may just be following obediently the group norms as part of a sense of belonging (Perry-Smith 2006). Notwithstanding, those group members with weak ties may seek membership solely for the use of group resources to assist their creativity. They may not feel a need to be central to the group and would rather remain on the periphery, perhaps in order to engage in creative behaviours (after Barron & Harrington 1981; Amabile 1992; Unsworth 2001; Janssen 2005; Johnson-Cramer, Parise & Cross 2007).

In other related studies, it has been argued that there are an optimal number of members of a group, below and above which the benefits to group effectiveness are lost (Oh, Chung & Labianca 2004), groups with more relationships with formal leaders of other groups will be more effective than those groups with fewer such ties (Oh et al 2004), and the effective transfer of knowledge and its subsequent use in improving competence depends on the corporate entrepreneur’s social knowledge and their ability to ensure their work-group evaluates, interprets and exploits the knowledge (Zahra et al 1999).
1.5.5 Organisational learning

A considerable body of research argues that organisational learning, essentially a process whereby outcomes of individual learning impacts and benefits the organisation as a whole (March & Olsen 1975; Argyris & Schön 1978) is positively related to employee innovation, including creativity (see: Hurley & Hult 1998; Sundbo 1999; Twomey & Harris 2000; Dess, Ireland, Zahra, Floyd, Janney & Lane 2003; Hayton 2005).

Specifically, it has been argued that corporate entrepreneurs in identifying and exploiting market opportunities “essentially follow a path of self and organisational learning” (Dutta & Crossan 2005: 427) and that:

“learning begins when individuals develop an intuition with respect to a business opportunity of the basis of their prior experience and recognition of patterns as external events unfold. The individual uses these patterns to make sense of what is going on – to interpret an insight or an idea and put it into words ... share it with a group ... develop it into ... a feasible business proposition.” (Dutta & Crossan 2005: 434-435).

It has also been argued that organisational learning is a function of acquisitive learning, whereby existing knowledge external to the organisation is acquired and experimental learning, which is generated internally within the organisation and tends therefore to be organisation-specific (Schumpeter 1934). Experimental learning has been argued to be required for organisational renewal, growth through innovation and the development of new markets (Schumpeter 1934) whilst it has also been suggested that learning outcomes can be incremental, for example value engineering of existing products, or radical frame-breaking innovation (Schumpeter 1934) that creates a clear change from what came before (Zahra et al 1999). Other studies have linked individual learning to risk-taking in organisations in that where employees were not able to gain knowledge and skills to deal with workplace demands, it is argued that this led to an increase in risk management and tighter controls to “avoid costly mistakes being made” (Borgelt & Falk 2007: 129) which
in turn made it more difficult for employees to experiment and acquire new knowledge and skills. Further, and in related research, it has been argued that employee participation in creativity training positively impacts upon idea implementation but “over and above the amount of creativity training received, the degree of management support and the departmental innovation climate strongly influence whether ideas are put into practice” (Birdi 2005: 108; Birdi 2007). Thus, it is argued that organisational learning is essential for risk-taking, experimentation and innovation (Zahra et al 1999), however it is also argued that unless learning challenges base organisational values, long-standing values that may be working against innovation, innovation will not result (Schön 1983; Argyris, Putnam & McLain Smith 1985; Senge 1990; Lakshman 2005).

1.5.6 Rewards

It has been proposed that rewards in creative, innovative organisations should provide esteem recognition as well as financial benefits (Kirby 2003) with researchers arguing that when employees believe they will share the benefits of idea suggestion, they do make more suggestions, yet this belief does not appear to have any effect on whether their ideas are actually implemented (Clegg, Unsworth, Epitropaki & Parker 2002). This finding may support the argument that employees are motivated by factors such as esteem, or it may just be that the levels of financial reward available were not a sufficient incentive to implement ideas within their organisation. Notwithstanding, esteem has been argued to be a powerful motivator for creative people since the implementation of their creativity brings the possibility of industry-wide peer-group recognition (Mumford et al 2002). It has also been argued that project performance amongst research and design engineers is highest when control over performance rewards is held at least jointly by the project manager (together with the senior functional manager), or by the project manager solely (Katz & Allen 1985). These findings could indicate that the engineers in question feared
any non-routine behaviour, for example experimentation with innovative ideas, would be viewed negatively by their manager (see also Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin 1993).

1.5.7 Corporate strategy

It has been proposed that corporate strategy and strategic focus can have a major impact on organisational innovation (Ireland & Hitt 2005) via the setting of research and design budget levels (Hitt, Hoskisson, Johnson & Moesel 1996) and the subsequent toleration of risk-taking and experimentation. However, again the question of causality is raised in that organisations with ‘successful’ strategies have been seen to make more radical product innovations (Guth & Ginsberg 1990: 7-8). Further, companies within the same strategic market segment are often seen to have remarkably similar strategies (Johnson et al 2006) questioning the idea of innovatively-independent organisations. Corporate strategies such as mergers and acquisitions (M&A), downsizing and cost reductions have been argued to influence senior executives to increase financial controls and reduce the amount of time they devote to innovation (Drazin & Schoonhoven 1996). Specifically regarding M&A:

“... firms actively buying or selling businesses, or both, are likely to produce less internal innovation and rely more heavily on external innovation for a variety of reasons, including the structure and implementation of the internal control systems derived from their strategic actions” (Hitt et al 1996: 1110).

It is suggested that within the acquiring company, senior managers do not have the time and resource to both acquire new companies and strategically manage existing ones (Gersick 1994) with the result that existing companies are increasingly short-term financially controlled whilst senior executives look for new acquisition targets. As these newly acquired organisations then come under the control of the mother company, a cycle of tight financial control, reduction in innovative freedom, reduction in experimentation and reducing growth from product and/or market development ensues as
further acquisition targets are sought in turn. Moreover, the reverse-case strategy of company divestment arguably has the impact of a "positive and significant effect on internal innovation" (Hitt et al 1996: 1112). It has also been proposed that the strategy of outsourcing may be harmful to organisational innovation in that creativity and intellectual property may leak from the host organisation to 3rd party suppliers via the transfer of tacit knowledge (Hoecht & Trott 2006). This is a problem difficult to mitigate through definition in legal contracts and which therefore raises the risk of the 3rd party utilising the leaked knowledge to exploit opportunities for themselves (Hoecht & Trott 2006).

Based on the above it is argued that the effect of external environment, internal company cultural context and individual employee actions may manifest at an organisation's corporate strategy in that strategy is externally influenced and is created by organisational actors, usually its leadership (Chandler 1962). It is also argued that the task of strategic leadership is to balance diversity with order, that diversity depends on experimentation and the selection of ideas, and that diversity is required for the constant generation of innovations to renew and evolve the organisation (Burgelman 1983b). Furthermore, it has been proposed that consistently successful organisations are characterised by top management who build, interweave and experiment with both induced strategy which preserves the status quo and continues previous successes, and autonomous strategy which provides the basis for radical innovation and which is likely to emerge at a level where managers are directly in contact with new technological developments, changes in market conditions and have some budgetary discretion (Burgelman 1991). Finally, it has been argued that strategic renewal of organisations comes from organisational learning and that therefore employee training and development are important to encourage individuals to implement their ideas (Crossan, Lane & White 1999).
1.5.8 Antecedents of innovation in organisations - Summary

In summary of the antecedents of innovation and corporate entrepreneurship, the impact of leadership has been identified as being of vital importance in this thesis. More specifically, the impact of leader behaviour on the innovative intentions and practices of employees is of particular interest, together with a number of fundamental concepts that have been introduced in this chapter such as idea implementation, creativity, risk-taking and employee autonomy. A further fundamental precept of the thesis is that of the quality of relationship between leader and subordinate which, it has been argued, will influence the level of autonomy an employee enjoys, or perceives (Graen & Scandura 1987), the result of which will lead subordinates to display greater or lesser levels of innovation (Scott & Bruce 1994). The problem for practitioners with such an eclectic, comprehensive list of antecedents is that, taken as a whole, there might appear to be not a great deal within organisations that does not affect employee innovation, with even the introduction of ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) arguably bringing “a prescribed rigidity that may hinder innovation and creativity” (Trott & Hoecht 2004: 384). Consequently, this thesis will develop arguments in the following chapters in relation to the key factors involved in the realisation of employee innovation as manifested by the implementation of ideas. Firstly however, it is necessary to examine the evidence of the effects of innovation and corporate entrepreneurship within organisations.

1.6 Effect of corporate entrepreneurship and innovation in organisations

It has been argued that organisations with higher levels of corporate entrepreneurship (defined by three factors of innovativeness, proactiveness and the influence of management) are more likely to be successful in terms of financial performance than organisations with lower levels of corporate entrepreneurship (Mintzberg & Waters 1982; Zahra et al 1999; Zahra et al 2000; de Vries & Florent-Treacy 2003). Moreover, the
influence of leadership is argued to be the most significant determinant of success (Burgelman 1983a; Goosen, de Coning & Smit 2002). Further, established arguments that innovation is positively related to organisational performance (for example, Baum & Burack 1969) are supported by research (Damanpour, Walker & Avellaneda 2009) including specific arguments that innovation results in manufacturing process improvements (Akgün, Keskin & Byrne 2009) and that innovation acts as a catalyst to improve organisational profitability (Love, Roper & Du 2009).

Moreover, empirical research has shown that organisational innovation and learning are positively related to organisational performance such as return on assets and sales growth (García-Morales, Llorens-Montes & Verdú-Jover 2006) and corporate entrepreneurship improves company financial performance over time but its early effects may be modest and may even worsen performance initially, suggesting that managers should take a long term perspective when developing corporate entrepreneurship (Zahra & Covin 1995). The theoretical rationale for this is that whilst corporate entrepreneurship may create a successful outcome in one dimension such as the development of innovative new products to grow top line sales, the investment required to develop new products may reduce short-run profitability and so innovation will be deemed to have failed in another dimension (Lumpkin & Dess 1996).

Widening and interweaving with earlier discussions, it has been argued that an organisational learning culture has a direct and positive impact on non-financial performance measures and an indirect and positive impact on financial performance (Skerlavaj Stemberger, Skrinjar & Dimovski 2007). It has also been shown that employees who are encouraged to engage in ‘self-starting’ behaviours and whose operating culture provides a personally non-threatening work environment are more
successful in terms of firm goal achievement and return on assets (Baer & Frese 2003). Further, it has been argued that corporate strategy imposed by the leadership team produces greater organisational performance success versus participative strategy development (Covin, Green & Slevin 2006). Finally, it has been argued that where the mindset of senior management is one of superiority over competition, this alone contributes to performance success whether or not the feeling of superiority is justified through actual comparative performance measures (Stewart & Raman 2007).

However, and as with previous discussions, the suggested causality within the above research can be questioned in that successful companies may allow their employees more freedom to experiment and innovate whereas less successful organisations may permit their employees less freedom to do so and thereby create a downward spiral of control and constriction. A number of other arguments also appear to oppose the above propositions. Empirical research into transformational leader behaviour suggested that whilst it was positively linked to the achievement of business unit goals, there was also a negative relationship between contingent reward leadership and business unit performance (Howell & Avolio 1993). Also, whilst it has been proposed that high quality leader-subordinate relationships positively impact on follower performance (Howell & Hall-Meranda 1999) the same study could not support the specific proposition that transformational leader behaviour positively impacted on follower performance. Furthermore, and in other empirical research, whilst the theorised antecedents of financial performance improvements were observed (such as management support for corporate entrepreneurship and resource availability) actual financial performance improvements themselves were not evident (Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby 1990).
Previous studies that have attempted to demonstrate links between creativity and organisational performance have been criticised as being “sparse and contained to academic settings” (Gong, Huang & Farh 2009: 767). Moreover, attempts to create and implement entrepreneurial cultures (Marcus & Zimmerer 2003, Ford et al 2000) were not able to show a direct link to commercial success and further research was unable to demonstrate any statistically significant relationships between improvisation and satisfactory project outcomes (Leybourne & Sadler-Smith 2006). Finally, a number of studies which recorded the attempts of organisations to implement performance improvement programmes such as Business Process Reengineering, Just-In-Time Production and Total Quality Management rated the effects as modest at best (Leseure, Bauer, Birdi, Neely & Denyer 2004; Ho, Chan & Kidwell 1999; Waterson, Clegg, Bolden, Pepper, Warr & Wall 1999), and research which intended to demonstrate a positive relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and innovative capability did not do so (Chen 2007).

In acknowledging the above shortcomings this thesis aims to respond to these challenges.

1.7 Unit of analysis and research question

This research is concerned with how corporate entrepreneurship can be developed in organisations and specifically how the symbiosis between organisational leaders and their followers results in followers implementing ideas. The dyadic relationship between leader and subordinate, wherever this may exist in the organisational hierarchy, is therefore the basic unit of analysis of this research. This approach is based on the “cascading effect of leadership” (Avolio & Bass 1995: 206) in which the leader behaviour of an organisation’s CEO impacts on his/her direct reports and the direct reports’ leader behaviour then in turn impacts on their subordinates, and so on throughout the organisation. Further, and as
discussed earlier, the effect of leadership on idea implementation is important at all levels of the organisational hierarchy. This research is focused on subordinates’ innovative intentions whether the subordinate is the CEO of a multi-national organisation who reports to the Chairman, or is a shop-floor assistant who is subordinate to their team supervisor.

Also, and as acknowledged above, whilst it is argued that commercial success is coveted by most if not all organisations who wish to make a profit (whether they are trying to survive or gain market leadership), the evidence indicating that corporate entrepreneurship positively contributes to organisational success is mixed. It is these inconclusive results that influence the current research. Intuitively, it is argued that corporate entrepreneurship can be of value and relevance to organisations in their attempt to create new wealth and to create wealth from one’s own actions as opposed to being the passive recipient of good fortune requires new activity, i.e. innovation.

A review and analysis of the extant literature suggests, as noted earlier, that there is a paucity of empirical studies investigating the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship when conceived as the implementation of ideas by subordinates. However, reference is made to a study which appears to be of similar nature to this current investigation. Ling, Simsek, Lubatkin and Veiga (2008) researched the impact of CEO leader behaviour on the immediately reporting top management team. Their study argued that where top management team members described their CEO’s leadership actions as transformational, this resulted in a positive impact on corporate entrepreneurship via the top management team members perceiving that they had responsibility and authority over their own day-to-day operations, top management team members declaring “high” levels of their own risk propensity, and top management team members believing that they were being

However, these findings may be questioned on the basis that the impact on corporate entrepreneurship was measured from the perspective of the top management team members themselves, rather than independently from them. Furthermore, top management team members were encouraged directly by their CEO to participate in the survey, risking bias in the management's ratings of CEO behaviour. Also, since the actual realisation of corporate entrepreneurship is the implementation of ideas (to be argued shortly) this could not have been achieved by the top management team members acting alone and the Ling et al (2008) research is silent on the impact the top management team members had on their own subordinates.

It is partly in response to the above issues but also based on the arguments that idea implementation is the ultimate expression of innovation since "as long as they are not carried into practice, inventions are economically irrelevant" (Schumpeter 1934: 88), and that idea implementation is a process which involves the approval, support and resources of others (Axtell et al 2000) and, crucially, one's leader (Mumford et al 2002), that this thesis now progresses and is focussed on answering the research question:

What is the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates?
Chapter 2 Research design and overview of methods

2.1 Philosophical perspectives

To determine the research design first required an examination of philosophical schools of thought since, depending on one's ontological and epistemological perspectives, deductively testing hypotheses (for example) cannot fully explain a relationship between variables (Cassell et al 2005). Moreover, it has been suggested that the utilisation of the very tools of measurement intended to capture evidence actually contaminates data via an external researcher-derived logic which excludes, or at best distorts what is actually occurring (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe 2002) and even where relative precision in measurement is achieved, deeper meaning and causality may remain ambiguous (Johnson & Duberley 2003). Equally, it is argued that qualitatively, inductively, investigating phenomena in the attempt to discover "deferred, marginalised and hidden meanings in the contextualised data" (Skinner & Edwards 2005: 416) risks providing an incomplete answer due to "the subjective, partial and local nature of the analysis" (Pettigrew 2000: 256).

Scholars recognise two broad assumptions of ontology namely, realist, in that phenomena do exist independently of our knowing it, and subjective, which states that we create reality via our own cognition. Similarly, there are also two assumptions of epistemology namely, subjective, in which reality may be considered a matter of opinion, that we contaminate what we observe, and objective which purports that we see what is actually out there (Johnson & Duberley 2003). The combinations of these ontological and epistemological assumptions accordingly give rise to the classical schools of thought on social science research often presented in literature (Cassell et al 2005). An objective epistemological stance combined with a realist ontological stance produces paradigms such as Positivism whereby phenomena under observation are described via quantitative, deductive methodologies such as the testing of theories expressed as hypotheses and
where an attempt is made to achieve falsification (Popper 1934). Popper argued that a theory should be written so as to provide the opportunity for its predictions to be proved correct or otherwise and to be subject to generalisable, repeatable experimentation. Positivism considers the researcher to be neutral in the research setting and unable to contaminate findings (Cassell et al 2005). Objective epistemology combined with realist ontology also produces the paradigm of Qualitative Positivism or Neo-Empiricism in which falsification is rejected in favour of induction and the attempt is made to understand, to interpret and to discover meaning in the observed contextual phenomena and from which grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) may be developed. This paradigm inherently recognises the possibility of researcher error through incorrect interpretation of the data and therefore the impact of the researcher in the research setting must be carefully scrutinised (Cassell et al 2005). A subjective epistemology and realist ontology gives rise to, amongst other things, the paradigm of Critical Theory (Horkheimer 1972) which purports that the truth is out there but we can’t access it since we contaminate what we observe. Nonetheless it is considered that the very participation in management research can be emancipatory and liberating as participants uncover, discover, recognise and create a consensus view of truth in relation to their current reality and realise that they are able and empowered to change their current reality.

A subjective epistemology and subjective ontology defines the paradigms of Relativism, Constructivism, Constructionism, Social Constructionism and Post Modernism in which there is a distrust towards the very representation of language to describe phenomena since it is believed that we create reality via our own cognition and discourses, and that phenomena are constituted by the methodologies used by the researcher to examine them (Johnson & Duberley 2003; Cassell et al 2005). Therefore it appears crucial for the researcher to be aware of and monitor his/her impact "upon the social settings under
investigation created by the deployment of particular research protocols and associated field roles so as to eradicate methodological lapses" (Johnson & Duberley 2003: 1285). Further, it is argued that perhaps the greatest source of data error emanates from the omission of the researcher "to make unexamined metatheoretical commitments [as to the researcher's epistemological and ontological beliefs], and remain unaware of their origins, [which] amounts to an abdication of intellectual responsibility which results in poor research practices" (Johnson & Duberley 2003: 1280). Given the disparate research philosophies outlined above, a pragmatic conclusion and arguably a major strength of this research was that a mixed methods approach (Jehn & Jonsen 2010) should be utilised. Each method might only claim one interpretation of the results (and only gain one scholarly group's approval and patronage), but together the multiple methods were intended to provide a complementary research strategy which might also mitigate the tension between groups of scholars who argue on the one hand that:

"the world of human practice cannot easily be limited to the confines of academic disciplines or paradigms [which] implies ... greater potential for the researcher ... to engage in ... pragmatic pluralism" (Watson 1997:8),

and on the other that:

"a synthesis between paradigms cannot be achieved ... in other words ... the paradigms are incommensurable" (Jackson & Carter 1991: 109).

In a response to this tension (and the others above), three studies using three contrasting but arguably complementary methods were used to address the research question.

2.2 Overview of research design

Study I was a positivist, deductive, cross-sectional quantitative survey and the research methodology consisted of testing hypotheses between variables by means of multivariate statistical analyses. Study II was a qualitative positivist series of focus group meetings which subjected the results of Study I to further scrutiny that they may be questioned,
corroborated or challenged. Study III was a qualitative positivist, inductive and reflective longitudinal study which also provided an overview throughout the research process via an autoethnographic method. Figure 2.1 illustrates the overview of the research design.

**Figure 2.1 Overview of research design**

As explained in Section 1.7, the dyadic relationship between leader and follower is the basic unit of analysis of this research. Literature suggests that the nature of dyadic relationships within hierarchical organisations can be considered to differ in their complexity, relative to one another, dependant upon the hierarchical position of the dyad in the overall organisational structure (Rousseau 1985, after Miller 1978). Specifically, it has been argued that “in organizations containing multiple groups containing multiple individuals, the nature and attributes of their constituent units differentiate from one another” (Rousseau 1985: 4). It has also been argued that “contexts [in which leadership
is observed] vary and as such they are measurable and must be modeled when attempting to explain a particular aspect of the leadership puzzle” (Liden & Antonakis 2009: 1587). Furthermore, it has been proposed that “scholars must consider context in leadership research, such as by examining the way context influences the variability that may emerge in the constructs under study or by assessing how context can moderate relations between variables” (Liden & Antonakis 2009: 1588). These arguments also supported the conclusion that the research question should not be answered by a quantitative survey alone and thus together with Study III, the attempt was made to better understand under which organisational and environmental conditions the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates may be stronger or weaker.

In terms of mitigating the general limitations of the study design (the following chapters contain details of study-specific limitations/mitigation), Studies I, II and III were temporally dispersed which is a research method often utilised in the attempt to improve data reliability (for example, see Eisenberger Karagonlar, Stinglhamber, Neves, Becker, Gonzalez-Morales & Steiger-Mueller 2010; Liao Liu & Loi 2010). The triangulation methodology (Figure 2.1) where data is obtained from a number of separate studies is also argued to mitigate against potential data contamination since “increased triangulation should improve the ability of researchers to draw conclusions from their studies” (Scandura & Williams 2000: 1250). Inherent in this approach though, and referring to earlier discussions, is the acceptance that each data capture instrument will have its advantages and disadvantages. Specifically it has been argued that “surveys maximize population generalisability but are low on realism of context and precision of measurement” (Scandura & Williams 2000: 1250), that a field study “maximizes realism of context since it is conducted in a field setting but can be low on precision of measurement and control of behavioural variables ... and can be low on generalisability”
(Scandura & Williams 2000: 1251), and that in relation to researcher influence itself “although they [researchers] offer a supposedly accurate interpretation of their observations, they do not question fundamentals, let alone challenge, the way power is embedded within that which they represent” (Hardy & Clegg 1997: 9). Furthermore, it has been suggested that “the researcher is just another subject, subjected to and resistant against the controls embedded in the research process, of which she or he is a part” (Hardy & Clegg 1997: 13). A general issue however, which also relates to the overall research design appears to be that of universality of results. Universality of this research may be challenged by the fact that data have been primarily obtained from a western business culture and whilst it has been argued that definitions of leadership and employee innovation may be relevant cross-culturally (Bass 1996; Knight 1997), some basic philosophies may not translate into other national cultures (after Zahra, Jennings & Kuratko 1999; Keil, Tan, Wei, Saarinen, Tuunainen & Wassenaar 2000; Antoncic 2007). As an example, research conducted within a Confucian culture found a negative link between empowerment and organisational innovation leading to the proposition that organisations within this type of culture that grant autonomy to employees will be “less rather than more innovative” (Jung, Chow & Wu 2003: 539). This finding could have resulted from employees in the Confucian culture feeling uncomfortable and confused with the prospect of having to take risks in isolation of the leader’s guidance.

Whilst acknowledging the above arguments, the details of the methods employed in the studies are reported in the subsequent chapters i.e. Chapter 3, Study I, Survey; Chapter 4, Study II, Focus Groups; Chapter 5, Study III, Autoethnography, summarised below.

2.3 Summary of research design

Table 2.1 contains the summary research design of the three studies.
Table 2.1 Summary of research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
<td>Testing of seven hypotheses proposing relationships between six variables by means of multivariate statistical analyses</td>
<td>To subject the results of Study I to further scrutiny that they may be questioned, corroborated or challenged</td>
<td>To provide a longitudinal, reflective and personal account of phenomena relating to the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Deductive, cross-sectional quantitative survey</td>
<td>Focus group meetings</td>
<td>Autoethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended contribution of research method</strong></td>
<td>Generalisability of results</td>
<td>Realism of Study I findings</td>
<td>Research setting context and researcher impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>Started second</td>
<td>Started third after the completion of Study I</td>
<td>Started first, and continued after the completion of Studies I and II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3 Study I

This chapter commences by describing Study I research methodology and takes the research question (Chapter 1) as its point of departure. Antecedents to idea implementation are investigated and four variables are identified from prior research which, it is argued, mediate the relationship between idea implementation and leader behaviour namely, autonomy, risk propensity, creativity and leader-member exchange. Seven hypotheses linking these variables are developed and tested with the data being analysed via the use of multivariate statistical analyses. Finally, the results are discussed.

3.1 Study I research methodology

3.1.1 Development of hypotheses

As argued in Chapter 1, corporate entrepreneurship depends on innovation which depends on idea implementation. Building on these arguments, the development of hypotheses now follows based on a review of prior research.

3.1.1.1 Idea implementation and autonomy

An influential body of research has argued that an important factor in innovation and therefore idea implementation is employee autonomy (for example Dansereau, Graen & Haga 1975; Graen & Scandura 1987; Amabile 1992; Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen & Rosen 2007; Rindova, Barry & Ketchen Jr. 2009; Schjoedt 2009). Autonomy in relation to the workplace has been defined as the “freedom to conduct tangential work activities in a normative manner in accordance with one’s own discretion” (Engel 1970: 12) or “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (Hackman & Oldham 1975: 162). It has also been argued that autonomy be represented by separate facets of work method, work schedule and work criteria.
autonomy (Breaugh 1985) with the resulting measurement tool for autonomy arguably being relevant cross-culturally (Sadler-Smith, El-Kot & Leat 2003). Moreover, supporting the argument that idea implementation depends on autonomy, scholars have posited that task autonomy is positively related to the implementation of ideas (Frese, Kring, Soose & Zempel 1996), that there is a positive relationship between job autonomy and idea implementation (Parker, Williams & Turner 2006), that autonomy leads to “positive personal and work outcomes” (Hackman & Oldham 1975: 160). Furthermore, it has been argued that relations between the compatibility of persons and organisations on the one hand, and favourable employee attitudes and behaviours such as affective organisational commitment on the other, is partially mediated by the satisfaction of the psychological need for autonomy (Greguras & Diefendorff 2009).

It has also been argued that where employees are allowed and encouraged to develop new ideas, participate in decisions, receive the support of management specifically by being granted autonomy, the more likely it is that the ideas will be implemented (Axtell et al 2000; Unsworth 2001). Moreover, it has been suggested that organisational environments need to be supportive of autonomous employee behaviour for the successful implementation of innovation (Baer & Frese 2003). The above arguments also invite the question of whether the relationship between autonomy and idea implementation is continuously linear or whether there is a discrete level of autonomy above and below which ideas are more or less, respectively, implemented. The above studies infer linearity but, as will be seen in the results of the studies of this thesis, a ‘step-change’ relationship more accurately describes the interrelationship of these, and indeed the other variables.

Considering now a wider perspective of autonomy in order to better understand the construct, it has been argued that low autonomy combined with mid-range job complexity
produces high job satisfaction and psychological well-being but also the highest intentions of employees to find another job (Chung-Yan 2010), and that high autonomy plus low job complexity also produces high job satisfaction and psychological well-being but also is associated positively with employee intentions to find another job (Chung-Yan 2010). Furthermore, it has been argued that there is a curvilinear relationship between organisational bureaucracy and autonomy in that for low and high levels of bureaucracy autonomy is low, whereas autonomy is optimum at a mid-point of bureaucratic structure (Engel 1970). This latter research was carried out in the context of professionally qualified employees yet the empirical results may generally inform subsequent research which reported low levels of innovation in a de-centralised organization (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007). The lack of centralised control may thus have supported employees' feelings of high autonomy but may have also produced an organisation which lacked the supportive structure necessary to assist innovative behaviour (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007). In other research, it has been argued that employees who are granted autonomy to off-set any risks they have taken in generating high-reward organisational performance are no different to external stakeholders such as suppliers and the local community who may also have career and personal interests embedded in the maintenance of the company's operations and who therefore also meet the criteria for being granted a level of autonomy to affect the operation of the organisation, typically through participation rights (Moriarty 2010).

It has also been suggested however, that autonomy may not be welcomed in all situations. For example, in a high-pressure under-resourced environment, employees who were given full control over personnel functions such as recruitment and discipline considered it to be undesirable and even a distraction (Janz, Wetherbe, Davis & Noe 1997). The ability to determine self-working patterns under a scheme of flexible working, whilst
showing an increase in employee task motivation was also found to increase demands on employees due to the flexible working methods (Kauffeld, Jonas & Frey 2004). These findings support the notion that employees can accept that there are aspects of their job they are not be able to control in a corporate context which is influenced by many factors beyond the control of the individual employee (after Manz 1992). By extension, the question is raised whether some employees within organisations - albeit possibly within specialised roles dealing with critical safety, security or welfare situations - should have any role autonomy at all (after Ramaswami 1996). Finally, it has also been argued that some business processes, e.g. Just-In-Time (JIT) manufacturing, systematically introduce an operational rigidity and discipline which reduces the propensity for employees to be autonomous (Mullarkey, Jackson & Parker 1995). However, and conversely, subsequent research has argued that where JIT was introduced together with increased employee autonomy, an increase in production ownership was achieved through employees having time and space to interact with colleagues, broaden their view of the whole production process, learn new skills to affect reduced lead times, lower stock holding and reduce costs (Parker, Wall & Jackson 1997).

Hence it is proposed that idea implementation is positively related to autonomy, or more specifically that a subordinate will implement ideas to a greater rather than a lesser extent when they perceive that they have greater rather than less autonomy (see Figure 3.1).

\[ H1: \quad \text{Idea implementation is positively related to autonomy.} \]

3.1.1.2 Idea implementation and propensity to take risks

It is acknowledged in the literature that although the [corporate] entrepreneur may risk their reputation, “the entrepreneur is never the risk bearer” (Schumpeter 1934: 137) as it
Figure 3.1 Idea implementation is positively related to autonomy.

H1: Idea implementation is positively related to autonomy.
is the one who provides the [corporate] entrepreneur with investment funds who bears the economic risk. However, other important literature has proposed that entrepreneurial organisations do take risks (Miller 1983) and subsequent research has extended this argument by suggesting that an important factor in corporate entrepreneurship, innovation and therefore idea implementation is employee propensity to take risks both in respect of potential harm to the organisation (Hornsby et al 1993) and also to themselves (Baer & Frese 2003) such as in taking interpersonal risk by speaking freely without fear of being rejected or punished (Edmondson 1999). Furthermore, other studies strongly argue that corporate entrepreneurs do take risks (for example Mintzberg & Waters 1982; Kanter 1983, Czernich 2003) but they work to minimise risk (Pinchot 1985) as “successful entrepreneurship is not equivalent to foolhardiness” (Mintzberg & Waters 1982: 495), with other researchers arguing that achievement motivated individuals are moderate rather than big risk takers (McClelland 1961).

Propensity to take risks, or risk propensity, has been defined as “the extent to which a person is willing to knowingly take risks” (Zhang & Arvey 2009: 437 after Simon, Houghton & Aquino 2000). To further aide its definition, research is acknowledged which constructs a model of risk propensity for organisational settings which purports to measure risk propensity on a continuum from ‘risk-averse’ to ‘risk seeking’ via several factors including ‘risk approach’ of the organisation varying from ‘crisis’ to ‘planned’, ‘management style’ of one’s leader varying from ‘micro’ to ‘macro’, ‘risk encouragement’ by one’s leader varying from ‘cautious’ to ‘copious’, ‘risk rewards’ available to the employee varying from ‘non-existent’ to ‘proportionate’, ‘risk ownership’ by the employee varying from ‘forced’ to ‘voluntary’, and with the amalgamation of the

A wider understanding of propensity to take risks, particularly with reference to dyadic relationships (which are of particular interest to this thesis), may be gained by examining research which argues that a dyad consisting of an organisation’s owner and their appointed manager is characterised by a risk-averse manager relative to the owner, based on the manager’s relative inability to diversify their income stream (Eisenhardt 1989a). Eisenhardt argues that the manager has a single income stream (their salary) whilst the owner has a greater ability to spread their investments within other organisations in the attempt to mitigate their risk. Prior research also suggests that more senior employees, measured by their position in the company hierarchy, coupled with their wealth, possible part share ownership of the organisation and their relatively privileged position to identify entrepreneurial opportunities (De Carolis & Saparito 2006) are more risk neutral compared to employees further down the organisational hierarchy who have fewer options to generate alternative income and opportunities. Thus, the extent to which one is risk-averse could increase as one moves downwards through the organisational hierarchy from owner, through CEO, director, manager and to other employees. The above arguments suggest that because employees generally work for only one company, they bear a high risk of employment tenure compared with the owner who is critically positioned within an entrepreneurial social network and this difference in the perception of one’s own employment tenure risk affects employees’ abilities to become entrepreneurial (De Carolis & Saparito 2006). Furthermore, it appears that the owner in their position in the social network provides a crucial service for other members of the network and so the owner’s worth is based on their network position (De Carolis &
The owner then has more options and opportunities to spread their employment tenure risk and, as an integral benefit of their network position, they get a privileged view of other entrepreneurial opportunities that are out of sight of employees further down in the organisational hierarchy (De Carolis & Saparito 2006).

The very concept of risk-averse managers and employees actually seems at odds with the fact that risk-taking does occur in organisations. It has been argued that this risk paradox (Antoncic 2003) may be resolved through reference to the following theories. The theory of planned behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975) suggests that a person may be motivated to behave in accordance with the expected outcomes of their actions, whilst prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky 1979) suggests that an individuals’ risk taking propensity can be manipulated (Colvin 1997). Moreover, agency theory deals with issues of perceptions of autonomy and differences in risk propensity within any dyad, for example leader and subordinate, and suggests that employees can be encouraged to enact risk taking behaviours (Eisenhardt 1989a). Specifically in relation to prospect theory, it has been argued that a person’s attitude to risk-taking could be influenced by manipulating the position from which they consider risk, for example, by influencing their self-efficacy to perform a task or by influencing how they perceive and judge their current assets and thus the impact of any loss or victory (Kahneman & Tversky 1979). Where a stake is offered for gamble and the possible outcome offers a small probability of additional gain, the gamble will not be taken and the stake will be kept intact (Kahneman & Tversky 1979). However, where the gamble is a small probability of small additional gain against a large probability of losing everything including the original stake, the gamble is taken. This suggests that people are prepared to gamble with their stake only if they fear losing it, rather than if they have a chance of incrementally improving it. Moreover, in a
situation of two possible outcomes both of which have an overwhelming probability of failure, the outcome that nonetheless provides the greatest possible reward will be chosen, even when it has the lower of the two success probabilities (Kahneman & Tversky 1979). This result would tend to suggest that in a situation of little pressure such as where the overwhelming likelihood is that everything will be lost regardless of the decision taken, people are motivated to take the higher risk, higher reward option.

Regarding agency theory, which is utilised to describe the relationship in which one party delegates work to another, for example owner and manager (Jensen & Meckling 1976) or by logical extension leader and subordinate, two precepts form the basis of this relationship. Firstly, a positivist view which uses pejorative terms and imagery to describe a leader-member relationship whereby the principal/leader needs to be vigilant against the ever-present threat of the agent/member/subordinate who is acting to deceive (Eisenhardt 1989a). This precept defines the autonomy of the agent as being consequently limited and tightly controlled by the principal and where the contract of employment between principal and agent is outcome based rather than behavioural as this will best accommodate and balance the otherwise self-interested divergent aspirations, with agency costs being incurred due to the difficulty and expense of the principal verifying what the agent is actually doing and whether he/she is acting appropriately (Jensen & Meckling 1976). The second precept describes a relationship between principal and agent which is expectant of a mix of outcomes, behavioural and therefore contextual factors, where the agent is granted a greater degree of autonomy and where the relationship is cognisant and accepting of the difference in perceptions, beliefs, values, organisational goals and risk-taking between principal and agent (Eisenhardt 1989a) and where the contract of employment between principal and agent may be behaviourally based and
rewarding of, for example, high risk/high potential research & development irrespective of its short-term outcome (after Boyatzis 1982). Inherent in this second argument is the acceptance that the principal or leader is not always the corporate entrepreneur and therefore the creation and implementation of innovation is also deemed to apply to the actions of the agent or subordinate.

In other studies, it has been argued that employees may well have entrepreneurial skills but may suppress them due to the more powerful incentives to be risk-averse and to secure their own positions (after Kahneman & Tversky 1979). An entrepreneur may take risks to exploit uncertainty in a given situation, a business manager is a manager of risk and so chooses the optimum outcome from a pre-determined set of available outcomes (Jones & Butler 1992). Whereas the entrepreneur is encouraged by the prospect of earning entrepreneurial profits, business managers are encouraged to adopt the project with the least risk since this represents the greatest chance of them keeping their job. In the early stages of an organisation's life, the founder/entrepreneur and manager/agent may be one and the same and therefore the rewards resulting from taking entrepreneurial risks are delivered to the person who took, and bore, the risk. However, as the organisation grows with the prospect that the founding entrepreneurial and managerial functions separate into two or more discrete persons, the manager increasingly focuses on managing rather than risk taking in order to maintain short-run organisational wealth since the manager is usually rewarded on this basis (Jones & Butler 1992). Progressively over time, the least-risk project options are increasingly chosen by the manager which results in a natural decline in entrepreneurial activity within the organisation (Jones & Butler 1992).
Research has also suggested that propensity to take risks is positively associated with entrepreneurial intentions "aimed at either creating a new venture or creating new values in existing ventures" (Bird 1988: 443). However, other research has also argued that propensity to take risks is not significantly related to entrepreneurial performance, such as firm survival, growth and profitability (Zhao, Seibert & Lumpkin 2010) which may suggest that entrepreneurs take fewer risks once the venture is established, in comparison to taking higher risks to initially establish the venture (Zhao at al 2010). Thus it is interesting to consider variance in risk propensity depending on the stage of organisational life-cycle, which, linked with the previous idea of entrepreneurs starting businesses and perhaps progressively handing day-to-day control to managers, it may also inform the debate as to the different risk perspectives of these organisational players.

However, in similar vein to previous discussions, scholars have argued both that insufficient evidence exists that the risk propensity of entrepreneurs is any different from that of organisational managers (Miner & Raju 2004), but also that the risk propensity of entrepreneurs is indeed greater than managers (Stewart & Roth 2001).

However and notwithstanding the various arguments above, to further understand risk, consideration is given to the view that risk is not just confined to decisions to implement ideas, it is equally associated with decisions not to terminate failing projects (Corbett, Neck & DeTienne 2007). This phenomenon is informed by the concept of escalation of commitment (Staw 1976) which defines the process whereby decision makers stick to a losing course of action and consequently take greater risks as a result of previous unsuccessful decisions perhaps due to the einstellung effect which "is not inadvertent but is a deliberate choice to persist with a strategy as long as problems appear to be part of the same set" (Gersick 1994: 12). Escalation of commitment takes the form of a temporal
sequence which references project factors such as the need to recoup investments already made, psychological factors whereby questionable feedback is initially ignored and capabilities are overestimated, social factors such as the need to save face and adhere to the cultural norm of consistency and structural factors such as political pressure and corporate pride (Drummond 1994). It has also been argued that escalation of commitment will be influenced by the stage of a project's lifecycle as follows. At the start of the project, the need to gather information acts positively in support of escalation of commitment, but towards the perceived end of the project, the desire to complete it also acts positively to support escalation (He & Mittal 2007). There would therefore appear to be a low-point, somewhere in the middle of the project, where the pressures supporting escalation of commitment are at their lowest (He & Mittal 2007) and this phenomenon could explain why many ideas fail to be implemented after an initial rush of activity.

Extending these arguments, it may be that leadership has a role to play in recognising the vulnerability of this mid-point and providing the necessary encouragement to employees and resources to ensure the project does not fail as a result of employees' risk perceptions, particularly when considering arguments that high self-efficacy is positively related to escalation of commitment (Whyte, Saks & Hook 1997). Moreover, whilst self-efficacy could be advantageous when problems in the normal course of a project have to be overcome in order for an idea to be implemented, it may also be undesirable in the case of a highly self-efficacious employee doggedly persisting with a project that should be terminated (Conger 1990). Furthermore, self-efficacy could perhaps be manipulated in the case where an employee is encouraged to persist with business practices which may be judged unethical or even criminal (after Pazzaglia 2010) by a misinformed or malevolent charismatic leader (Bass & Steidlmeier 1999).
It is also appropriate to acknowledge arguments which dispute that escalation of commitment is driven by the need to justify or rationalise the initial decision (Weber & Zuchel 2005). Further, and contradicting the escalation of commitment argument, researchers have argued that greater risks are in fact taken following successful implementations (after Thaler & Johnson 1990) which may be due to people feeling ‘ahead’ and adopting the attitude that they are risking liberated, uncommitted collateral, the potential loss of which doesn’t affect their start position (after Kahneman & Tversky 1979) or it may be due to employees simply having a high propensity to take risks and low risk perception and consequently being more willing to take risks (Keil et al 2000).

In other related studies, it has been argued that in addition to risk propensity and perception, outcome expectancy is a factor in risk taking behaviour (Sitkin & Pablo 1992) in that the effects of risk perception on escalation of commitment are mediated by outcome expectancy (Wong 2005). This leads to the question as to how a person’s outcome expectancy can be influenced in relation to the risks associated with implementing an idea and consideration of the likelihood of those risks occurring (Sitkin & Weingart 1995). An argument therefore follows that, for example, to encourage employees to continue implementing an idea after a first attempt has failed, the employees’ perceptions of what could constitute further possible risks and the likelihood of those risks occurring, must both be assuaged. Finally, in reference to the research question of this thesis, it is argued that leadership could aide mitigation by signalling a willingness to accept the undesirable outcomes should they occur and by providing the necessary resources in the attempt to abrogate risks before they occur.
Hence it is proposed that idea implementation is positively related to propensity to take risks, or more specifically that a subordinate will implement ideas to a greater rather than a lesser extent when they possess greater rather than less risk propensity (see Figure 3.2).

**H2:** *Idea implementation is positively related to propensity to take risks.*

### 3.1.1.3 Idea implementation and creativity

The arguments that creativity is associated with the generation of novel and useful ideas, that creativity is a constituent of innovation, and that innovation is defined as the creativity and implementation of ideas (Amabile 1988) suggests that creativity is an antecedent to idea implementation. Moreover, this inference is supported by empirical research (Birdi, Leach & Magadley 2007). It has also been argued that creativity is associated with the intrinsic motivation to persist with a project when overcoming barriers associated with its evaluation and eventual implementation (Pelz & Andrews 1966; Kasof 1997) again suggesting that creativity is an antecedent of idea implementation. To assist in the wider understanding of creativity other contributions are now considered which argue that organisational creativity is the creation of a useful new product, service, idea, procedure or process by individuals working together in a complex social system, that individual creativity is a function of the complex interaction between experiences, abilities, personality, motivation and environmental factors, and that organisational creativity is a subset of innovation which itself is a subset of organizational change (Woodman et al 1993). From a different perspective, it has been argued that whereas the implementation of ideas is more strongly predicted by group and organisational characteristics such as team leader support, support for innovation, management support, risk taking and the *ad hominem* of organisation internal politics
H1: Idea implementation is positively related to autonomy.
H2: Idea implementation is positively related to propensity to take risks (risk propensity).
(Dudek & Hall 1991; Scott & Bruce 1994), the creation of ideas are related to individual, personal characteristics (Mumford et al 2002; Axtell, Holman & Wall 2006). It has also been suggested that creativity, rather than being represented by a single construct, is better represented as a two dimensional construct (Gilson & Madjar 2010). That is, ‘incremental creativity’ an exploitative activity where ideas originating from practice are solution-driven based on meeting customer needs, and ‘radical creativity’ an explorative activity where ideas generated from abstract theory are problem-driven based on identifying new opportunities away from existing skills and customers and where new knowledge is required (Gilson & Madjar 2010).

A more detailed consideration of an earlier argument that creativity is a sub-set of improvisation provides another opportunity to inform the discussion on creativity. It has been argued that improvisation is the deliberate merging of creativity and execution together with the use of intuitive knowledge and bricolage (Leybourne 2006); the ability and willingness to use the material, cognitive and social resources that are currently at hand (Pina e Cunha et al 1999). For example, improvisation in new product development is argued to require active leadership support to produce an experimental, creative organisational culture with a toleration of failure, low levels of routine procedures and a minimal structure (Pina e Cunha et al 1999). Further, and by definition, if improvisation means to respond in real time it follows that organisational environments should be ready and primed with everything needed to support the real-time temporal merging of creativity and execution in order for ideas to be implemented. In an alternative perspective, it has been argued that improvisation consists of three dimensions namely, novelty (the deviation from existing routines), speed (of the improvisation process) and coherence (both between individual employees' improvisations and whether the
improvisations actually solve problems) (Chelariu, Johnston & Young 2002). It is further argued that learning is central to the process of improvisation and that a three-way trade-off exists between the nature of the learning environment, the novelty of the improvisation and the speed of the improvisation (Chelariu et al 2002). Where the learning environment is defined by intensive and powerful forms of information generation (as typically found in non-hierarchical creative entrepreneurial organisations), this has an effect of producing more novel innovations due to the learning effect and richness of information (Chelariu et al 2002). However, the intensity and richness of the information may mean that it takes longer to create and so results in slower improvisation (Chelariu et al 2002).

This latter model of improvisation appears to argue for a deliberate, seriate and perhaps ponderous process of distinct and discreet development stages to creativity (Miner, Bassoff & Moorman 2001) and appears not to support the idea of a real-time seamless temporal merging of planning and implementation described in the model by Pina e Cunha et al (1999). However, these two models may be related if the organisational environment is primed and made ready as previously argued and supported with a rich learning culture and powerful forms of information generation to produce high novelty improvisation (Chelariu et al 2002). This leads to the following consideration of a possible contradiction relating to the speed of improvisation which may nonetheless aide its understanding. It has been argued that innovations in mature organisations are small and incremental (Dobrev & Barnett 2005) which implies faster improvisation, whereas research cited above has also suggested that faster improvisations occur in new start-up entrepreneurial organisations. Whilst apparently difficult to reconcile, these statements may nonetheless help to inform the speed and novelty of improvisation in that the use of
existing knowledge to improvise may produce faster results but may also produce less novel ideas, whereas acquiring new knowledge and atypically applying it may take longer (after Chelariu et al 2002). The speed of improvisation has also been analogised to the creative phenomena present in jazz music (Hatch 1999) in that the apparent spontaneity of jazz improvisation might be interpreted as learning by doing and learning whilst doing (Schön 1983). Also present within the jazz analogy are useful concepts to organisations such as the leading instrument changing from one performer to the next as a naturally occurring constituent in the creation of music, and also the acceptance, control and use of what at the time of delivery may have been considered a wrong note (Hatch 1999). Furthermore, it has been proposed that jazz musicians posses an ability which "allows them to feel the structure of the tune inside themselves" (Hatch 1999: 80) which is needed for them to be able to depart from more predictable patterns of performance.

Thus, the jazz analogy applied to the organisational setting suggests that employees should feel, experience and engage with the organisational culture at the right tempo, as opposed to being a member of the audience as-it-were, passively observing and accepting without question what the organisational culture delivers. There is also an interesting parallel between the idea of jazz musicians not fully accepting the musical structures they are given and consequently adopting an attitude of finding out what they can get away with, and the notion of corporate entrepreneurs being encouraged to seek forgiveness after they have implemented a risky idea, rather than asking for permission in advance of its implementation (Pinchot 1985). Whilst the jazz analogy is thought provoking, it does little to offer concrete and practical advice as to how actual organisations should be constructed, monitored, motivated, developed or led to produce the equivalent of a creative, flowing, intuitive, interconnected work-group.
A wider understanding of creativity is informed by the argument that intuition is a constituent of improvisation (Pina e Cunha et al 1999). It has been argued that intuition is “a cognitive conclusion based on [the] decision maker’s previous experiences and emotional inputs” (Leybourne & Sadler-Smith 2006: 484), and that “more experienced managers reported greater use of intuition and improvisation than do less experienced managers” (Leybourne & Sadler-Smith 2006: 489). Furthermore, it has been proposed that “expert intuition may be past pattern oriented” (Dutta & Crossan 2005: 436). These arguments, when combined with the view that mature organisations produce less novel innovations (Dobrev & Barnett 2005) provoke questions germane to this thesis, thus: is there a link between experience, maturity of organisation, and a lack of novelty? do experienced managers re-use what they already know, rather than trying new things? is this why mature organisations have been argued to innovate incrementally and with less novelty? Moreover, as researchers could find no support for the hypothesis that intuition is positively related to innovation (Scott & Bruce 1994), does this mean that intuition works against creativity and innovation and that intuition is negatively related to, at least radical innovation?

Furthermore, whilst researchers have argued that intuition is critical for success (Schumpeter 1934) the same study also acknowledges “the very nature of fixed habits of thinking, their energy-saving function, is founded upon the fact that they have become sub-conscious … but precisely because of this they become drag-chains when they have outlived their usefulness” (Schumpeter 1934: 86). This provokes a further question thus: could it be that a culture of experimentation is required in organisations to help and actively encourage people to acquire new perspectives on tackling old problems and overcome “intuition inertia”? (after Jung 2001: 186; Hater & Bass 1988: 696).
Responding to the above questions and linking into previously discussed concepts, it may be that leaders can be encouraged to attend transformational leadership training courses to help improve their innovativeness and to assist them in creating an organisational culture that supports innovation (Jung et al 2003). However, unless those leaders are prepared to "unlearn" (Nystrom & Starbuck 1984), to question their own experience and to learn new ways of doing, they risk simply returning to their workplace with their old ways of thinking still firmly in place, ready to work from the same intuitions that created the need for the transformational leadership training in the first place.

Returning now to the specific argument that idea implementation depends on creativity, research argues that people who have a high degree of energy for idea creation possess personality traits such as 'impulsive', 'restless', 'impatient', 'eager' and 'open to change' (Puccio & Grivas 2009: 253). Whereas people who have a high preference for problem clarification possess personality traits such as 'careful', 'cautious', 'reflective', 'factual', 'calculating', 'matter of fact', 'critical', 'logical' and 'thorough' (Puccio & Grivas 2009: 253) implying that the creation and clarification of ideas are not carried out by the same person (which is in support of an argument made in Section 1.4.1.1 above). Indeed, Puccio & Grivas (2009) make a plea that "future studies need to examine whether there are specific personality traits associated with the thinking needed to develop a rough idea into a workable solution ... and to move a solution or change into action" (Puccio & Grivas 2009: 253), a request which this thesis intends to inform by recording the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by their subordinates.

Finally, it has been argued that "the generation of creative ideas does not automatically lead to the selection of creative ideas" and that "creative idea selection benefits most
from specific selection criteria” (Rietzschel, Nijstad & Stroebe 2010: 65). Rietzschel et al (2010: 65) also argue that “people appear to have a strong preference for ideas they believe can and should be adopted, and ... seem to believe that this is incompatible with the selection of original ideas” and that “an idea that is not very original, but very familiar, may be judged more favourably than an original but unfamiliar idea”. Moreover, Rietzschel et al (2010: 66) argue that “a stronger focus on originality does not necessarily lead to the selection of less feasible ideas”, that “unless attention is paid to the selection process and the implicit or explicit criteria people use, innovation is likely to suffer” and that “big improvements and innovative solutions will only come about when people take original ideas seriously, and are willing to take the risk to develop these further”. That is, Rietzschel et al (2010) support a number of the arguments made in Chapter 1 relating to the process of idea implementation and they recommend that the question of how to practically realise their propositions “seems a worthwhile avenue for further research” (Rietzschel et al 2010: 66) which this thesis intends to address.

Hence it is proposed that idea implementation is positively related to creativity, or more specifically that a subordinate will implement ideas to a greater rather than a lesser extent when they are creative to a greater rather than a lesser extent (see Figure 3.3).

\[ H3: \text{ Idea implementation is positively related to creativity. } \]

3.1.1.4 Autonomy and leader-member exchange (LMX)

It has been argued that the nature of the dyadic relationship between leader and follower, described by Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Dansereau, Graen & Haga 1975) will determine the level of autonomy enjoyed by the follower, or
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subordinate. Two models of LMX have been defined thus: one in which loyalty, support and autonomy are shared, and the other in which the leader-member relationship relies primarily on contracted role expectations with autonomy being tightly controlled (Dansereau et al 1975). It has also been argued that employees within a higher quality LMX relationship will be given greater role autonomy (Graen & Scandura 1987) based on a perceived 'mutuality' of shared contributions to the relationship, displayed loyalties and mutual affection (Dienesch & Liden 1986). Employees with such autonomy and leader support may also show greater levels of innovation such as creativity and idea implementation as a result of their free thinking, exchange of information and freedom to experiment (Scott & Bruce 1994, Basu & Green 1997).

Further, it has been proposed that where employees perceive positive support from their supervisor this is positively related to the employee's perception of their own influence in the workplace which in turn is positively related to the employee's own innovative behaviour (Janssen 2005). Janssen (2005) also argues that employees feel their supervisors are the main influencers in the workplace who have the power to grant or deny them the support necessary for the further development, protection and application of their ideas. Other research has also argued that task autonomy moderates the LMX-job performance relationship in that LMX-job performance will be stronger in conditions of high task autonomy versus low task autonomy (Ozer 2008). Furthermore, Ozer (2008) argues that locus of control (LOC, Rotter 1966) whereby people believe that events are determined by forces either within themselves (internal LOC) or external to themselves (external LOC) also moderates LMX-job performance in that LMX-job performance will be stronger in conditions of internal LOC versus external LOC (Ozer 2008).
A wider understanding of LMX may be gained by considering arguments that whilst moderate levels of conflict between leaders and followers on ideas and opinions relating to a particular task can lead to better decision making and higher team performance (Jehn 1995), low quality LMX is linked with more leader-subordinate conflicts (Paglis & Green 2002) with higher quality LMX producing fewer conflicts (Landry & Vandenberghe 2009). These research findings suggest there is an optimum, probably low level of conflict between subordinate and leader which produces the most effective subordinate performance based on the employees' perception of their autonomy to question their leader's directives (Jehn 1995; Paglis & Green 2002; Landry & Vandenberghe 2009).

The avoidance of conflict, however, has also been argued to mediate the relationship between LMX and subordinate performance (Moss, Sanchez, Brumbaugh & Borkowski 2009) in that subordinates who know they have performed poorly may engage in proactive behaviours to avoid interacting with their leader in a way that could lead to negative feedback being received. Further, feedback avoidance behavior may also have a cumulative effect in that perceptions of low quality LMX on the part of the subordinate may result in the subordinates' active feedback avoidance behaviour at times of their poor performance which may result in poorer quality LMX which in turn may make it less likely that the subordinate will seek feedback from their leader (Moss et al 2009).

In other research it has been argued that a subordinates' judgement of their LMX quality compared to those of other dyads is based on their (the subordinate's) expectancies and preferences such as their need for leadership assistance and their dependence on the leader for their day-to-day functioning (Schyns, Kroon & Moors 2008). Moreover, it has been argued that comparisons by subordinates of their LMX quality with those of other work-group colleagues impacts the perception of their own LMX in a cyclic feedback
loop and provides them with a judgement as to where they are in the standing of LMX distribution amongst members of their work-group (Vidyarthi et al 2010). Furthermore, it has been proposed that a subordinate will judge LMX based on what they believe is their leader’s opinion of the attitudinal similarities, or not, between themselves (Phillips & Bedeian 1994). The subordinates’ judgement of LMX will also result from their leader’s organisational embodiment “the extent to which employees identify their supervisor with the organization” (Eisenberger, Karagonlar, Stinglhamber, Neves, Becker, Gonzalez-Morales & Steiger-Mueller 2010: 1085) which is positively related to subordinates’ affective organisational commitment⁴ “an emotional attachment that fosters performance and lessens absenteeism and employee turnover (Eisenberger et al 2010: 1085). The above arguments also suggest that the nature of leader behaviour will affect the subordinate’s perception of LMX (see below).

Informed by role theory (Katz & Kahn 1966), it has been argued that leaders who have higher quality relationships with their bosses and who are influential in their peer networks are perceived by subordinates as having greater status in the organisation, the result of which is higher quality LMX from the subordinate’s perspective (Venkataramani, Green & Schleicher 2010). Leader status is argued to affect LMX due to subordinates believing that influential leaders can grant greater autonomy, can better support the subordinates’ innovation activities, can use their position to solve the subordinates’ problems, can defend the subordinate to higher authorities and can better publicise subordinate achievements to higher authorities (Venkataramani et al 2010). Being associated with high-status leaders may also enhance the subordinates’ own status within the organisation (after Cialdini & De Nicholas 1989). Linking to the discussions of

⁴ A construct that extends the definition of organizational commitment from “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian 1974: 604).
Groups in Section 1.5.4, subordinates who are more detached from their own peer work-group with its associated support network may have a greater need of their leader’s support, be more sensitive to the status of their leader and seek to develop higher quality relationships (Venkataramani et al. 2010). Finally, research has also proposed that ‘growth need strength’, the strength of a subordinate’s need for “the opportunity for personal growth and development in my job” (Hackman and Lawler 1971: 274) is a follower characteristic that influences follower-rated LMX (Graen, Novak & Sommerkamp 1982; Graen, Scandura & Graen 1986).

The above research predominately considers LMX from the perspective of the subordinate and this naturally leads to question whether the arguments would differ if LMX were considered from the perspective of the leader. It has been argued that discrepancies found between supervisor and subordinate rated LMX raises the question whether LMX is more than one construct (Zhou & Schriesheim 2009). Zhou & Schriesheim (2009) suggest that there are “inherent psychometric problems” (Zhou & Schriesheim 2009: 921) in LMX scales “such as measurement inequivalences for supervisors versus subordinates” (Zhou & Schriesheim 2009: 923), “with supervisors more likely to judge LMX on task-related exchanges and subordinates more likely to judge LMX on socially related exchanges” (Zhou & Schriesheim 2009: 925). Moreover, it is suggested that LMX measures should include comparisons of relationship qualities between different dyads, plus entire work-group LMX intra-comparisons (Zhou & Schriesheim 2009). Furthermore, it has been proposed that “substantially more leadership research still emphasizes the effect of leader behavior on followers than of follower influences on leaders” and “a complete understanding of leader behavior is only possible when taking follower characteristics and behaviors into consideration” (Liden &
Antonakis 2009: 1598). This thesis contributes to this debate by considering the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by their subordinates. Finally, it has been proposed that leaders perceive value in their relationships with subordinates, such as commitment, admiration and positive word-of-mouth, as well as perceiving potential benefits from subordinates’ citizenship behaviours and performance “which may impact on the leader’s reputation and perhaps remuneration” (Wilson, Sin & Conlon 2010: 362). It is also suggested that the leader’s perception of these values and potential benefits “determines LMX quality from the leader’s perspective” (Wilson et al 2010: 369).

Hence it is proposed that autonomy is positively related to leader-member exchange, or more specifically that a subordinate will perceive they have greater rather than less autonomy when they perceive the quality of LMX to be higher rather than lower (see Figure 3.4).

\[ H4: \text{ Autonomy is positively related to leader-member exchange (LMX). } \]

3.1.1.5 Propensity to take risks and LMX
Research suggests that the nature of the relationship between leader and subordinates affects whether subordinates take risks and act innovatively (Swain 2007). In a setting of high personal risk and work related stress it has been argued that with high quality LMX “the immediate supervisor may provide access to many resources and relieve some situational constraints” (Rousseau, Chiocchio, Boudrias, Aubé & Morin 2008: 1758) which may encourage employees to take risks based on a perception of “psychological safety” (Kahn 1990: 711). Conversely, in a setting of high personal risk and work related
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stress, low quality LMX produces employee perceptions of fear and subsequent risk-averse behaviour (Rousseau et al 2008). To better understand risk-taking behaviour particularly in the context of this thesis, previous research is mobilised which suggests a paradox in the relationship between organisational leaders and their subordinates in the situation where leaders issue directives for their subordinates to simultaneously manage risks and act innovatively (Borgelt & Falk 2007). For example, such situations can involve risk to profitability perhaps via damage to an organisation’s reputation which could be severe and permanent (Whysall 1998; Resnick 2004; Laforet & Saunders 2005; Dowling 2006). Intuitively, contradicting directives to both mitigate risk and innovate might cause uncertainty in the mind of the subordinate as to whether they should take a risk or not, a process labelled in this thesis as ‘traversing the innovation risk gap’.

The concept of an innovation risk gap is framed by Senge (1990) and Johnson et al (2006) who propose a creative tension gap between a person’s vision and their current reality and a triggering point for innovation, respectively. The size of the gap and the associated tension, it is argued, may make the vision seem unrealistic or fanciful, but the gap is itself a source of energy to help realise the vision since, if there were no gap, there would be no impetus to move towards the vision (Senge 1990). Indeed, the gap “is the source of creative energy” (Senge 1990: 150) with an analogy offered of a rubber band stretched out between two posts of ‘vision’ and ‘reality’ (Senge 1990). Creative tension exists on the basis that there is a physical gap between the two posts, however without the right level of leader support the creative tension leads to emotional tension for the employee that is borne out of not realising the vision (Senge 1990). It is further argued that the emotional, anxious tension is released by allowing the ‘rubber band’ to pull the ‘vision’ post towards the ‘reality’ post and so abandon the vision, thus:
"In organisations, goals erode because of low tolerance for emotional tension. Nobody wants to be the messenger with bad news. The easiest path is to just pretend there is no bad news, or better yet, "declare victory" – to redefine the bad news as not so bad by lowering the standard against which it is judged (Senge 1990: 153).

Moreover, Argyris & Schön (1978) also propose a gap between an organisation's actual and aspirational performance which acts as a catalyst for activity in that once a gap is identified, an organisation acts to close it. In a similar vein to the creative tension gap (Senge 1990), the tension caused by the performance gap leads to the creation of a learning organisation (Senge 1990) in which, as discussed previously, basic organisational values and beliefs are challenged with a view to permanently changing them (Argyris et al 1985).

Hence it is proposed that propensity to take risks is positively related to the nature of the subordinate’s relationship with their leader defined by leader-member exchange (LMX), or more specifically that a subordinate will have higher rather than lower propensity to take risks when they perceive the quality of LMX to be higher rather than lower (see Figure 3.5).

\[ H_5: \text{Propensity to take risks is positively related to LMX.} \]

### 3.1.1.6 Creativity and LMX

Supervisors who are supportive and show concerns for employees’ feelings enhance employee creativity, whilst supervisors who closely monitor employee behaviour, make decisions without employee involvement and generally pressure employees to think or behave in certain ways, diminish employee creativity (Oldham & Cummings 1996).
Figure 3.5 Propensity to take risks (risk propensity) is positively related to LMX
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Researchers have also found that the nature of the leader-follower relationship is positively related to the follower's creativity (Tierney, Farmer & Graen 1999; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev 2009). Moreover, it has been argued that the presence of high organisational support including from one's leader results in optimum individual creativity (Shalley, Gilson & Blum 2009). In other research, it has been argued that the relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity only becomes significant when it is moderated by the employees' perception of identification with their leader (Wang & Rode 2010) and that the direct relationship between leader behaviour and creativity is not significant (see below).

A wider perspective on LMX and creativity is provided by research which argues that for employees whose roles require higher levels of creativity, individuals' feelings of energy mediate the relationship between LMX and creative work involvement (Atwater & Carmeli 2009). The same study argues that LMX may have a more positive direct effect in encouraging employees to be creative in roles that appear more routine, mundane and seemingly less demanding of creativity (Atwater & Carmeli 2009). It has also been argued that the relationship between LMX and creativity is mediated by self-efficacy (Liao, Liu & Loi 2010). However, and at risk of creating a cyclic argument, Liao et al (2010) also argue that high quality LMX can lead to a heightening of supervisors' expectations of subordinate performance which can generate the self-fulfilling prophesy, or Pygmalion effect (Rosenthal & Jacobson 1968), in which subordinate performance may actually be enhanced (Eden 1990). Notwithstanding, it is also proper to acknowledge other research which was unable to confirm the Pygmalion effect (Eden, Geller, Gewirtz, Gordon-Terner, Inbar, Liberman, Pass, Salomon-Segev & Shalit 2000). Furthermore, in consideration of mediating phenomena on creativity, it has been argued that self-efficacy
mediates the relationship between leader behaviour and employee creativity (Gong, Huang & Farh 2009) and so together with the arguments above linking LMX with self-efficacy, it is hereby proposed that leader behaviour impacts LMX which affects employee creativity (see below). Whilst the above studies suggest that creativity is dependant on LMX, consideration is also given to research which argues that of the four-dimensional model of LMX (Dienesch & Liden 1986), only the ‘loyalty’ dimension is positively related to innovation (Lee 2008: 681), with loyalty being defined as “the expression of public support for the goals and the personal character of the other member of the LMX dyad” (Dienesch & Liden 1986: 625). Subsequent research has also argued that “high quality LMX does not help innovativeness” (Lee 2008: 681) and these latter findings give impetus to the current thesis.

Hence it is proposed that creativity is positively related to the nature of the subordinate’s relationship with their leader defined by leader-member exchange (LMX), or more specifically that a subordinate will be creative to a greater rather than a lesser extent when they perceive the quality of LMX to be higher rather than lower (see Figure 3.6).

**H6:** Creativity is positively related to LMX.

### 3.1.1.7 LMX and transformational leader behaviour

Researchers have found that leader behaviour determines LMX quality (Graen & Haga 1975) with further studies examining leader behaviour as an antecedent to LMX showing strong correlation between transformational leader behaviour (TLB) (Burns 1978) as an entire construct and LMX (Howell & Hall-Meranda 1999). Other research has also shown
Figure 3.6 Creativity is positively related to LMX
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strong correlation between specific leader behaviours and LMX (Yukl, O'Donnell & Taber 2009) with some leader behaviours argued to be transformational such as supporting and leading by example and some argued to be relations-oriented such as recognising, consulting and delegating (Yukl et al 2009). Further support for the posit that TLB is positively related to LMX is provided by Chung-Kai Li & Chia-Hung Hung (2009) who argue that TLB is positively related to co-worker relationships, defined as "relationships in which the individuals involved have no formal authority over one another, where the relationship is derived from mutual liking, similarity of attitudes, or personal choice and initiative" (Chung-Kai Li & Chia-Hung Hung: 1132). The same study also finds that LMX has a stronger positive relationship with task performance than does co-worker relationships, that LMX has a weaker positive relationship with individual-targeted citizenship behaviour such as discretionary role behaviour (Piccolo & Colquitt 2006) than does co-worker relationships, and that LMX has a weaker positive relationship with organisational-targeted citizenship behaviour than does co-worker relationships (Chung-Kai Li & Chia-Hung Hung 2009). Whilst acknowledging the contribution of the above studies in the definition of the relationship between TLB and LMX, to assist in the wider understanding of this construct, other perspectives are now considered.

The categorisations of the types of leader behaviours may logically extend to the number of personalities of individuals particularly if one is motivated to respond to the proliferation of leadership theories tracing back to at least the writings of Socrates in c.400 BC (for example, see Kahn 2004). However, over several more recent decades, a substantial and consistent leadership research school has nonetheless argued for three main groupings of globally applicable (Tubbs & Schultz 2006) organisational leader
behaviours. ‘Transactional’ leadership is argued to be based either on contingent rewards from contracted performance or management-by-exception where mistakes trigger management intervention, ‘Laissez-Faire’ is an almost total absence of leader control and guidance, and ‘Transformational’ is where the leader elicits subordinate performance that exceeds expectations (for example see Lewin, Lippitt & White 1939; Bass 1985, 1990 & 1999; Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman 1997; Bass, Jung, Avolio & Berson 2003).

In relation to the organisational setting, it has also been argued that leader behaviour may not necessarily be permanently confined to one of the above categories and may need to change with situational dynamics such as differences in subordinates’ personal characteristics (Chang, Bordia & Duck 2003). Further, and building on trait activation theory which argues that personality traits require trait relevant situations in order that they are expressed (after Murray 1938; Tett & Guterman 2000; Tett & Burnett 2003) and therefore that personality may predict job performance (de Hoogh, den Hartog & Koopman 2005), it has been argued that the relationship between subordinate personality and transformational leadership is moderated by the subordinates’ perceived dynamism of the work environment (de Hoogh et al 2005). Specifically, the relationships between subordinate personality with charismatic and transactional leadership may differ depending on the situational context, and that transformational leadership could be more prevalent in dynamic environments with transactional leadership being more prevalent in stable environments (de Hoogh et al 2005).

In relation to specific leader behaviours in specific contexts, in dynamic, turbulent environments, agreeableness and conscientiousness by the leader may send entirely the wrong signals to subordinates who seek strong directional leadership to get them through the turbulence, not somebody who agrees with everybody, who seems too cautious and
appears unsure of their own vision (de Hoogh et al 2005). Further, research has also presented a concept of leader behaviour being dependant on the stage of development of the leader-subordinate relationship (Scandura & Pellegrini 2008). It is argued that the leader will enact transactional behaviour at the start of the relationship and this behaviour will change based on the progressive realisation that, amongst other things, the leader and subordinate can trust each other (Scandura & Pellegrini 2008). This may in turn elicit further changes in leader behaviour (Caldwell 2003) which may change subordinates’ perceptions of the work environment (Dess & Picken 2000). However, the issue of perceived work environment brings into question the organisational situational context since, for example, what one employee perceives as dynamic and expansive may be another’s stability and conservatism (Sturdivant, Ginter & Sawyer 1985) from which it follows that perhaps transformational leader behaviour has an important role to play in influencing a subordinates’ perception of dynamism during the complex process of idea generation and implementation i.e. successful innovation (Woodman et al 1993).

By contrast, other research provides a challenge to the inference that entrepreneurial leadership behaviour always is, and always has to be, transformational (Schumpeter 1934). It has been argued that entrepreneurial leadership in fact resembles an autocratic, transactional behavioural style which is characterised by “a certain narrowness which seizes the immediate chance and nothing else” [italics in original] (Schumpeter 1934: 89). Moreover, that the personality of the leader is not important since he leads “not by convincing people of the desirability of carrying out his plan or by creating confidence in his leading ... but by buying them or their services, and then using them as he sees fit” (Schumpeter 1934: 89). Schumpeter’s model of an entrepreneur seeking capital for his idea and then single-mindedly executing the plan, manipulating people into carrying out
his will, seems at odds with latter thinking on TLB. It raises the question as to how the
different perspectives on TLB witnessed in contemporary studies came to be. It also
offers a challenge to the longevity and perhaps the universality of current TLB theories. It
may be that Schumpeter’s model has more relevance to new business start-up situations
rather than to corporate entrepreneurship within existing organisations. However, this
then inevitably brings into question the generalisability of some of the basic tenets of
entrepreneurialism such as risk taking and innovative behaviour and might imply
contextual mediating factors of the kind suggested by this thesis. The generalisability of
TLB has indeed been questioned with researchers suggesting that it may be best suited to
professional employees who are well educated, tasked with radical innovation projects
and perceived as needing guidance to fulfill their potential (after Keller 1992), as opposed
to employees whose tasks are perceived to be more incrementally innovative and where
the leader can adopt a more transactional leadership style dealing with task allocation and
coordination (Hater & Bass 1988).

Be that as it may, this thesis is designed in part to answer such questions and a
consideration of the antecedents to TLB can provide a greater understanding of the LMX-
TLB relationship. It has been argued that TLB emanates from the leader’s emotional
intelligence (Barbuto & Burbach 2006) defined as the leader’s ability to influence,
motivate, stimulate, mentor and empathise with subordinates, and to regulate their own
mood whilst also possessing high interpersonal skills, internal motivation and self
awareness (Piccolo & Colquitt 2006). However, it has also been argued that leaders’
mood regulation may be negatively related to TLB in that “leaders less likely to manage
their moods are more likely to be perceived as authentic and effective by their
colleagues” (Barbuto & Burbach 2006: 59) and may therefore counter the view that
leaders should regulate their displayed emotions (see below). Furthermore, it has been argued that leaders who are high in extraversion and with emotion recognition ability, a combination argued to significantly and positively influence TLB, will be perceived as transformational versus those leaders who are high in extraversion and low in emotion recognition, a combination that could be perceived as insensitive to employees’ needs (Rubin, Munz & Bommer 2005). Researchers have also posited that “emotion recognition could represent an important point of divergence for understanding and predicting transformational leadership behaviour as opposed to other forms of leader behavior” (Rubin et al 2005: 854). Finally, from studies which may raise the question of causality, it has been argued that the effects of transformational leadership will be contingent on the organisational environment with those environments more open to change, experimentation and risk-taking being more receptive to transformational leadership (Bass 1985; Howell & Avolio 1993).

Considering now the effects of TLB, it has been argued that TLB is positively related to the success of projects in organisations (Prabhakar 2005), to corporate entrepreneurship (Visser, de Coning & Smit 2005), employee innovation (Axtell et al 2000), risk propensity (Tarabishy, Solomon, Fernald & Sashkin 2005), employee learning (Lakshman 2005), proactiveness of decision making (Collins 2001) and change (Bommer, Rich & Rubin 2005). Indeed, CEO’s who personally drive their organisations and take risks themselves have produced higher levels of profit success than those similarly structured organisations whose CEO’s simply act as a veto to subordinate manager’s plans; managers who discard entrepreneurial opportunities on the basis that they are not prepared to take risks under those circumstances (Eisenmann and Bower 2000). Personal direct leader involvement in the attainment of success and the
development of an organisational culture which supports innovation, change and respect for the individual has also been argued to be transformational (Rubin et al 2005). Moreover, and considering leader behaviour from disparate research, it has been argued that humour moderates the effect of leadership style on individual performance (Avolio, Howell & Sosik 1999) with other studies on the group effect of humour suggesting that it "establishes the group's boundaries, the identity of the group members and the processes through which the group makes sense of and performs its labor" (Lynch 2010: 127).

Whilst acknowledging the above arguments relating to positive and perhaps welcome effects of leader behaviour on subordinate performance, it is also proper to recognise arguments which suggest less positive, less welcome outcomes. Starting with a consideration of the effect of TLB on LMX, it has been argued that employee stress may increase in conditions of low and also high quality LMX as follows. Where the leader-subordinate relationship is of poor quality and the leader does not emotionally support or communicate with the employee, nor provide them with a clearly defined role, employee stress can be high (Harris & Kacmar 2006). As the leader-subordinate relationship improves, employee stress falls but then rises again at very high levels of relationship quality which may be due to the employee feeling obliged to carry out discretionary role behaviours in return for being in receipt of leader emotional support and better communication (Harris & Kacmar 2006). In very high quality LMX relationships, the subordinate may feel intimidated and exploited (Turnipseed & Wilson 2009) and unable to handle the pressure being exerted on them to perform beyond expectations (Basu & Green 1997) which may lead to subordinates suppressing their true emotions (Glasø & Einarsen 2008) and which, linking with earlier arguments, may therefore challenge the ethicality and morality of TLB.
At this stage, it is also apposite to acknowledge research which has considered the ethicality and morality of leadership together with emotion recognition of self and others and has argued for a metamorphosisation of TLB into authentic leader behaviour (Bass & Steidlmeier 1999, Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans & May 2004) (see below). Ethical leadership is characterised by the leader’s “character and integrity; ethical awareness and consideration of the effect of the leader’s decisions on others; motivating and encouraging employees to be self-sufficient; and setting ethical standards” (Resick, Hanges, Dickson & Mitchelson 2006: 346-349) with other research also arguing that corporate ethical values are positively related to creativity (Valentine, Godkin, Fleischman & Kidwell 2011). Moral leadership is evidenced by the decisions leaders make (Kumar et al 2005) and particularly the effect of those decisions on their subordinates and the wider community (Fisscher, Frenkel, Lurie & Nijhof 2005) and whether the leader has considered the effects of their decision on the whole system within which they are operating (Senge 1990) or whether the leader is seen to be only concerned for themselves.

Authentic leader behaviour has been defined as leadership with confidence, optimism and hope, with a moral and ethical perspective, self-regulation, self-control and equal opportunities (Avolio & Gardner 2005). It has been argued that authentic leadership will ensue “when organisational leaders know and act on their true values, beliefs and strengths, while helping others to do the same” (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing & Peterson 2008: 91) with further research arguing that authentic leadership will result in higher levels of employees’ well-being with the consequent positive effects to creativity, coping with adversity, motivation and performance (Amabile & Conti 1995; Ryan &

5 Expectancy Theory (Vroom 1964) underpins the argument of a linkage between (a) an employees’ feelings of well-being which emanate from expectations of favourable outcomes of their personal performance; and (b) the motivation of the employee to act and realise the actual performance.
Deci 2001; Erez & Isen 2002; Fredrickson & Joiner 2002). Authentic leadership might also be informed by hypotheses normally associated with theology since it is argued the attributes of serenity, courage, wisdom, vision, trust, integrity, ethics, personal beliefs and moral courage are relevant to leaders of both disciplines (Harle 2005). Theology makes reference to metanoia (Senge 1990), or conversion, which involves attitudinal changes, whilst authentic or transformational leadership also has to encourage and achieve attitudinal changes within organisations. Thus it may be that whereas a priest may guide and comfort individuals through processes such as denial, anger, guilt or depression, the business leader may also have to coach employees through similar reactions within the organisational environment (Harle 2005).

It has been argued that subordinates will recognise inauthentic leadership when leaders’ values do not match their attempted transformational behaviours (Fu, Tsui, Liu & Li 2010). Moreover, empirical studies have argued that the effect on subordinates of a leader’s apparent self-transcendent values (which purport to be associated with the good of the organisation) dissipates over time, whereas the effect on subordinates of a leader’s self-enhancement values (in which the leader is considered only to be interested in their own advancement and well-being) persists over time. Consequently it has been argued that “perhaps followers take for granted authentic transformational leadership because it is how leaders should be, whereas the effect of inauthentic transformational leadership persisted” (Fu et al 2010: 248). Further, the same study suggested that “the positive effect of ... transformational behaviours ... will be compromised when followers notice that leaders’ behaviors are inconsistent with the values they expect leaders to hold, and they respond negatively with lower commitment and higher intention to leave” (Fu et al 2010: 249).
Hence, and returning to the central theme of this section, namely the relationship between transformational leader behaviour and its impact on the relationship between leader and subordinate; it is proposed that LMX is positively related to the transformational behaviour of one’s leader, or more specifically that a subordinate will perceive the quality of LMX to be higher rather than lower when the behaviour of their leader is more rather than less transformational (see Figure 3.7).

**H7:** LMX is positively related to transformational leader behaviour.

### 3.1.1.8 Study I research model

The above arguments suggest that positive relationships exist between transformational leader behaviour, mediated through LMX, through subordinate perceptions of autonomy, subordinates’ propensity to take risks and subordinates’ creativity to change the nature (after Baron & Kenny 1986) of subordinates’ idea implementation. The Study I research model is thus presented in Figure 3.7.

### 3.1.2 Research setting and procedure

The research setting for Study I was ‘EngCo PLC’, a major Anglo-American cultured assembly of strategically independent companies that form a publicly quoted Group on the London Stock Exchange (FTSE). In 2005 the new CEO of EngCo commenced a strategy to grow the organisation and in 2007, the Group was reclassified in terms of its FTSE investment classification, a market-based driver argued to be an influence on innovation (Hornsby et al 1993). Late 2007 also saw the start of the global economic recession (Roubini 2009) and this study was conducted during the height of that recession. Permission to conduct this research was given by a member of the
H1: Idea implementation is positively related to autonomy.
H2: Idea implementation is positively related to propensity to take risks (risk propensity).
H3: Idea implementation is positively related to creativity.
H4: Autonomy is positively related to leader-member exchange (LMX).
H5: Propensity to take risks (risk propensity) is positively related to LMX.
H6: Creativity is positively related to LMX.
H7: LMX is positively related to transformational leader behaviour.
The executive board of EngCo. The survey sample size was 879 across 25 companies, 14 of which had a UK HQ and 11 were headquartered in the USA. Considerations as to how the sample was selected and also to the issue of selection bias are given below. 311 complete usable responses were received, representing a response rate of 35%. Of the total respondents: 80.8% had an immediate supervisor who was a Director or Senior Manager; 67.6% had an immediate supervisor who had been in their position for less than five years; 83.2% had worked for their immediate supervisor for five years or less; 66.9% had a role tenure of five years or less; 47.9% had a company tenure of five years or less; 53.3% described their own position as either Employee or Junior Manager; 53.4% did not consider themselves to be a member of senior management; 74.6% worked in a company which was between 11 and 50 years old; 61.1% worked in a company employing 100 persons or less; 59.2% were degree or professionally qualified; 63.3% were aged 40 or older; 74.3% were male.

The survey, in English, comprised a total of 67 questions: 54 Likert-scaled items and 13 demographic questions (see Appendix 1). It was presented as an online questionnaire and invitations to complete the survey (Appendix 2) were sent from October to December 2009 to all persons with a live email address within the 25 companies as described above. Each survey invitee received a request to take part plus a reminder request within five working days. A three-phase administration of the survey (the researcher’s organisation, thence all UK organisations and finally all USA organisations) was used to allow for permission to be sought (see below) and for the next phase of invitations and reminders to be created by the researcher who was also undertaking full-time employment in the subject organisation. Prior to the first phase, pilot tests were carried out in relation to the design efficacy of the online instrument to which minor layout changes were
subsequently made. Before the 879 survey invitations were sent, the Managing Director/President of each organisation was contacted and asked if he/she would permit to the survey being undertaken in their company. Of 17 companies headquartered in the UK, 16 of them were contacted in this regard and 14 gave their permission. One UK Managing Director failed to respond to repeated email requests and one Managing Director refused permission for the survey, citing large redundancies taking place at the company. One UK company was not contacted at all as their Managing Director had just been dismissed. Of 12 companies headquartered in the USA, all were contacted and 11 gave their permission. The 12th USA company responded to the permission request in a way that threatened respondent anonymity and confidentiality and the researcher therefore decided not to proceed with this company. A further nine organisations within the Group of companies were not contacted at all as they were headquartered in countries where the first language was not English.

In relation to the issue of selection bias whereby “otherwise acceptable applicants” (Cahan & Gamliel 2001: 109) in the sampling frame are rejected, acknowledgement is given to the fact that the survey invitations were sent via email. The reason for the survey invitations via email as opposed to traditional letter was that the email contained a hyperlink directly to the online survey in the attempt to maximise the response rate. As an estimate, the 879 invitation emails were sent to over 50% of the total number of employees (1728) in the 25 companies and the number of usable, completed responses received (311) represented approximately 18% of the total number of employees of the 25 surveyed companies, whilst also representing a survey response rate of 35% which matches the average rate achieved in organisational science research from 1995 to 2008.

\[6 \text{ From secondary published and primary research data, the average number of employees per surveyed company was 69} \]
where the subjects are more senior employees (Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert & Choragwicka 2010). Finally, with $n = 311$, this would appear to satisfy the minimum sample size criteria for hypothesis testing, both in terms of an absolute figure and also regarding the number of usable completed responses per independent variable (51.83:1) in order to permit credible statistical inference (Weiss 1997). With specific reference to the intended data analysis of Study I: (a) $n = 311$ provides a “good” sample size for the estimation of correlation coefficients, Principal Components Analysis and Factor Analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996: 613); (b) >51 responses per hypothesis variable exceeds the 15:1 minimum ratio recommended to minimise problems with multivariate normality deviations within Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson 1992); (c) $n = 311$ is within the range of suggested sample sizes to provide “valid and stable results” (Hair et al 1992: 661) of the SEM maximum likelihood estimation procedure.

Common method variance (Campbell & Fiske 1959) is a potential source of bias attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs which the measures represent and this can introduce measurement bias (Meade, Watson & Kroustalis 2007) and therefore measurement error (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff 2003). However, the problem of common method variance was weighed against what is argued to be another crucially important factor to data credibility, respondent anonymity (Podsakoff et al 2003; Wiles, Crow, Heath & Charles 2008). Common method variance due to self-reports (Podsakoff & Organ 1986) may have been obviated by adopting a methodology of pair-matching leader and their associated subordinate’s responses, however, a form of coding of the questionnaires would then have been necessary in order that the relationships between the variables in question could be measured from each
perspective of the dyadic relationship. Coding would have risked introducing response bias (e.g. social desirability) where subordinates answered questions in relation to what they thought their leader would want them to say, fearing that the code on their questionnaire may be traced back to them as an individual. Therefore, to obviate the potential for such bias, one questionnaire was created which covered the concepts of transformational leader behaviour, leader-member exchange, subordinates’ perception of autonomy, propensity to take risks, creativity and idea implementation and procedural remedies relating to the questionnaire were utilised to obviate method bias. Such remedies included varying the response formats to questions and the use of open-ended questions. An attempt was also made to reduce evaluation apprehension in which respondents may edit their answers, by clearly stating that there were no right or wrong answers and questions should be answered as honestly as possible (Podsakoff et al 2003).

A post-measurement technique was also used in the attempt to identify the existence and magnitude of any common method bias by isolating the covariance between variables due to artifactual reasons. The Harman Single Factor Test is one such potential test (Podsakoff & Organ 1986) in which exploratory factor analysis is used to determine whether a single factor could account for the majority of the covariance in the observed variables. Whilst the single factor test has been labelled “an uncomplicated yet accommodating technique ... [which] is easy to implement” (Malhotra, Patil & Kim 2007: 27), it is correct to also acknowledge research which argues that such a test is not “a useful remedy to deal with the problem [of common method bias]” since it is an “insensitive test” and any common method bias could equally be due to a lack of adequately discriminated constructs (Podsakoff et al 2003: 889). Further, it has also been argued that the greater the number of variables, the greater the chance of more than one
factor being found which explains the majority of covariance (Podsakoff & Organ 1986).

Whilst recognising the above limitations of Harman’s test, it was nonetheless utilised based on the following rationale. Firstly, it was but one of several procedures which were utilised within a multi-procedure methodology within the overall research programme to mitigate bias, as indicated above, but also inherent in a three-study research design which intentionally utilised multiple data-collection methods (Malhotra et al 2007) in the attempt to reduce potential data bias. Secondly, the Harman Single Factor Test does retain the endorsement of contemporary scholars as part of a methodological framework to identify data anomalies (Jarvis & Petty 1996; Drewes 2009) and is used within recently published management research (e.g. Sahin & Erkal 2010).

Another potential source of error was from confounding variables, a problem which was highlighted in the Hawthorne Studies 1927-32 (Mayo 1933) and indeed which was referenced by the researcher of this study (see Study III diary note dated 31st October 2009) in which the presence of an extraneous variable could confound apparent observed correlations between predictor and criterion variables. Unless suspected confounding variables were known and their effects measured (McCandless, Gustafson & Levy 2007), confounding effects may need to be mitigated via research design (Hanley & Dendukuri 2009). Confounding effects could be mitigated by restricting the study population via cohort selection and/or stratification since increased sample homogeneity may give a greater chance that any unknown confounding variables were matched both to the predictor and criterion variables. However the disadvantage of this method was the inevitable small sample size and the concomitant limitations.

3.1.3 Research materials

The variables were measured utilising the following scales, summarised in Table 3.1.
### Table 3.1 Variable map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Implementation</td>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>During the last year, to what extent have you attempted to get support from others for your ideas</td>
<td>0.94 (Holman et al 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Idea Promotion&quot; dimension (Holman et al 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>During the last year, to what extent have you had your ideas implemented</td>
<td>0.96 (Holman et al 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Implementation&quot; dimension (Holman et al 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td><strong>Work autonomy</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done (the method to use)</td>
<td>0.76 (Breaugh 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Work Method&quot; dimension (Breaugh 1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79 (Sadler Smith, El-Kot &amp; Leat 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work autonomy</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have control over the scheduling of my work</td>
<td>0.76 (Breaugh 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Work Schedule&quot; dimension (Breaugh 1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68 (Sadler Smith et al 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work autonomy</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My job allows me to modify the normal way we are evaluated so that I can emphasize some aspects of my job and play down others</td>
<td>0.76 (Breaugh 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Work Criteria&quot; dimension (Breaugh 1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71 (Sadler Smith et al 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Propensity</td>
<td><strong>Risk Propensity</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Safety first (scale of 'totally disagree' to totally agree')</td>
<td>0.77 (Meertens et al 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Meertens &amp; Lion 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>During the last year, to what extent have you thought of new ideas</td>
<td>0.90 (Holman et al 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Creativity&quot; dimension (Holman et al 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td><strong>LMX-7</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you usually feel that you know where you stand and do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?</td>
<td>0.84 (Scandura &amp; Graen 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Graen &amp; Cashman 1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB</td>
<td><strong>Transformational Leadership Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>My leader has provided me with new ways of looking at things which used to be a puzzle for me</td>
<td>0.80 (Podsakoff, MacKenzie &amp; Bommer 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Idea implementation: The links between idea implementation and autonomy, propensity to take risks and creativity respectively, were of interest to this investigation. Idea implementation was measured utilising the scales developed by Holman, Totterdell, Axtell, Stride, Port, Svensson & Zibarras (2008), providing a five-point Likert-scale response format of the style: ‘Not at all’; ‘To a little extent’; ‘To some extent’; ‘To a great extent’; ‘To a very great extent’. In previous research, these scales have been shown to have an internal consistency of 0.94 minimum (Holman et al 2008) which exceeds the accepted threshold of 0.70 for Cronbach alpha (see Nunnally 1978).

2. Autonomy: In addition to (1) above, since it was the link between autonomy and LMX which was of interest to this investigation, the measure of autonomy was intended to be a subordinate perspective resulting from influence ‘upstream’ of themselves. Autonomy was measured utilising the scales developed by Breaugh (1985) providing a five-point Likert-scale response format. In previous research, these scales have been shown to exceed the accepted threshold for Cronbach alpha with only one scale being marginally below this value (0.68 for the ‘Work Schedule’ dimension) (Sadler-Smith et al 2003).

It is proper at this point to also recognise research which argues: “although several autonomy scales have been used in prior management research, few are appropriate for assessing EO [Entrepreneurial Orientation]-related autonomy” (Lumpkin, Cogliser & Schneider 2009: 48) since “autonomy from an EO perspective refers primarily to strategic autonomy ... [which enables] ... a team (or individual) to not only solve problems, but to actually define the problem and the goals that will be met in order to solve that problem (Lumpkin et al 2009: 50). It is consequently argued by Lumpkin et al (2009) that existing autonomy scales including that of Breaugh (1985), measure structural autonomy dealing
with local problem solving issues, rather than strategic autonomy (Lumpkin et al 2009).

Whilst acknowledging the above research, this thesis argues that due to the cascading effect of leadership previously discussed, the matter of implementing ideas for the subordinate in each dyadic relationship is indeed a local problem-solving issue, the collective effect of which throughout the organisation delivers the strategic direction of the organisation.

3. **Propensity to take risks:** In addition to (1) above, the link between propensity to take risks and LMX was of interest to this research. Propensity to take risks was measured utilising the scale developed by Meertens & Lion (2008), providing a nine-point Likert-scale response format of ‘totally agree’ to ‘totally disagree’. In previous research, the scale has been shown to have an internal consistency of 0.77 (Meertens & Lion 2008).

It is again proper at this point to acknowledge the view that existing risk propensity scales are arguably somewhat “compartmentalised in nature, and their applications are confined to specific aspects of risk decisions” and therefore are “less applicable to business decisions where decision-making agents tend to encounter various facets of risk and need to draw considerations across different perspectives” (Kuo-Ting & Chanchai 2010: 91). This phenomenon may be relevant to this study in that the researcher did receive a query from a survey recipient who questioned in what context the risk items should be answered. However and whilst acknowledging the above argument, this thesis was nevertheless premised on the need to measure propensity to take risks and the selection of a peer-reviewed scale with high internal consistency made a best-practice attempt to mitigate the potential problem of scale applicability.
4. Creativity: In addition to (1) above, the link between creativity and LMX was of interest to this investigation. Creativity was measured utilising the scale developed by Holman et al (2008) and Zibarras, Port and Holman (2005), providing a five-point Likert-scale response format. In previous research, this scale has been shown to have an internal consistency of 0.90 (Holman et al 2008).

5. Leader-member exchange (LMX): The effect of LMX from the subordinates’ perspective was of specific interest to this research, however, arguments that uni-dimensional measures of LMX fail to capture the full extent of the leader-subordinate relationship (Greguras and Ford 2006) are nonetheless recognised and this is one reason for Studies II and III in this thesis. Notwithstanding, LMX was measured utilising the scale developed by Graen & Haga (1975), providing a four-point Likert-scale response format. In previous research, this scale has been shown to have an internal consistency of 0.84 (Scandura & Graen 1984).

6. Transformational leader behaviour (TLB): Since it is the effect of TLB on subordinate behaviour that was of interest to this research, TLB was measured from the perspective of the subordinate member of any and all dyads, irrespective of their seniority in the hierarchical organisation. The recipients of the questionnaire were therefore looking 'upstream' of themselves and assessing their own leader's transformational behaviour. TLB was measured utilising the transformational leadership scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990) providing a five-point Likert-scale response format. The Podsakoff et al (1990) scale is a well-validated measure of transformational leadership behaviour with an internal consistency of 0.80 (Podsakoff & Organ 1986).
3.2 Study I results and analysis

3.2.1 Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, correlations, PCA

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and inter-correlations for the Study I measures are shown in Tables 3.2 (scales and sub-scales) and 3.3 (scales). Disregarding correlations which may have resulted from 'artifactual covariance' (Podsakoff & Organ 1986: 533), i.e. those that are not significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed), the resulting correlations show support for hypotheses: H1, autonomy and idea implementation \( (r = 0.24, p<0.01) \); H2, propensity to take risks and idea implementation \( (r = -0.34, p<0.01) \); H3, creativity and idea implementation \( (r = 0.77, p<0.01) \); H4, LMX and autonomy \( (r = 0.38, p<0.01) \); H6, LMX and creativity \( (r = 0.16, p<0.01) \); and H7, TLB and LMX \( (r = 0.75, p<0.01) \). The correlation between LMX and propensity to take risks (Hypothesis 5) was non-significant.

The study variables were also examined via an item-level Principal Components Analysis (PCA) in order to discover "which variables in the set form coherent subsets that are relatively independent of one another" (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996: 607) and which may "reflect underlying processes that have created the correlations among variables" (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996: 607). The data met the thresholds for sampling adequacy, KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) was 0.93 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant \( (p<0.001) \) indicating that these data were suitable for PCA. The scales were also checked for distribution normality and met the recommended thresholds for skewness \( (\leq 2) \) and kurtosis \( (\leq 7) \) (Ryser, Campbell & Miller 2010). For the item-level PCA, the scree plot (Figure 3.8) demonstrated ten principal components with eigenvalues >1, accounting for 71.30% of the variance which were extracted and rotated to simple structure. Of these ten principal components, nine exhibited high score component loadings for a particular
Tables 3.2 and 3.3: Means, reliabilities (bold across diagonal) and inter-correlations \((n = 311)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] TLB1 articulating a vision</td>
<td>4.70 (1.42)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] TLB2 providing an appropriate model</td>
<td>4.71 (1.49)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] TLB3 fostering the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>4.83 (1.47)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] TLB4 high performance expectations</td>
<td>5.22 (1.19)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] TLB5 individualised support</td>
<td>4.80 (1.41)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] TLB6 intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>4.20 (1.40)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] LMX</td>
<td>2.93 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] Autonomy1 work method</td>
<td>4.13 (0.88)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Autonomy2 work schedule</td>
<td>4.04 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10] Autonomy3 work criteria</td>
<td>3.25 (0.89)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[11] Risk propensity</td>
<td>5.61 (1.35)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12] Creativity</td>
<td>3.72 (0.69)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13] Idea implementation1 idea promotion</td>
<td>3.50 (0.84)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14] Idea implementation2 idea implementation</td>
<td>3.06 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .05; \)** \(p < .01; \) two-tailed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>[1]</th>
<th>[2]</th>
<th>[3]</th>
<th>[4]</th>
<th>[5]</th>
<th>[6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] TLB</td>
<td>4.75 (1.18)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] LMX</td>
<td>2.93 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Autonomy</td>
<td>3.94 (0.78)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Risk propensity</td>
<td>5.61 (1.35)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Creativity</td>
<td>3.72 (0.69)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Idea implementation</td>
<td>3.28 (0.80)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .05; \)** \(p < .01; \) two-tailed
individual item; each item had one of its ten component loadings > 0.45; and those items which loaded onto two factors produced factor loadings which were > 0.10 difference, thus all items were retained for the computation of scale scores (Nunnally 1978). Thus a single factor did not account for the majority of covariance in the observed variables (Harman Single Factor Test) supporting the claim that method bias due to artifactual reasons was not present in the data set.

Figure 3.8 Item Level PCA Scree Plot

3.2.2 Extended data validation

3.2.2.1 Analytic strategy

Further analysis of the Study I research model was conducted utilising Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Bollen 1989) as implemented in AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle
A two-step approach to SEM was adopted, namely: (a) construct validity via CFA and (b) comparison of structural models, since this approach arguably "allows an assessment of whether any structural model would give acceptable fit" (Anderson & Gerbing 1988: 422). In terms of fit of data to the model, it has been argued that several fit indices should be used since no one measure gives an optimum result versus any other (Medsker, Williams & Holahan 1994) with it being also argued that "typically, using three to four fit indices provides adequate evidence of model fit" (Hair et al 1992: 672). Consequently, a number of fit indices commonly used in literature were used: (a) Chi-square divided by degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df$) with a recommended value <3.00; (b) Comparative Fit Index (CFI) recommended value >0.90; (c) Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) recommended value >0.90; (d) Incremental Fit Index (IFI) recommended value >0.90; (e) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) recommended value ≤0.08 but ideally <0.05 (Kline 1998).

### 3.2.2.2 Construct validity

Construct validity, i.e. "the extent to which a set of measured items actually reflects the theoretical latent construct those items are designed to measure" (Hair et al 1992: 708) was assessed primarily via convergent validity and discriminant validity (Hair et al 1992). Regarding convergent validity, where "indicators of a specific construct should converge or share a high proportion of variance in common" (Hair et al 1992: 709), this was assessed via factor loadings in that of fifty-four standardised coefficients between items and the fourteen factors of six hypothesised variables (as per Tables 3.2 and 3.3) in the research model: (a) forty-two coefficients were above the "ideal" (Hair et al 1992: 709) threshold of 0.70; (b) nine were between the recommended 0.50 threshold (Hair et al 1992) and 0.70; (c) three were below 0.50 and these were in the propensity to take risks.
scale; (d) all fifty-four indicator-construct relationships were statistically significant, forty-eight to $p<0.01$ and six in the propensity to take risks scale to $p<0.05$. These results suggest convergent validity of the measures.

### 3.2.2.3 Discriminant validity via CFA (measurement model)

Regarding discriminant validity, “the extent to which a construct is truly distinct from other constructs” (Hair et al 1992: 710), Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) were conducted accordingly. The results suggested that the measurement model, constituted of the fourteen factors of Table 3.2, produced the best fit of data in terms of discriminant validity and parsimony compared to alternative models constituted of a lesser number of factors. The 14-factor measurement model was compared to two alternative models with results thus: (a) the measurement model: $\chi^2/df = 1.70$ ($p<0.001$); $\text{CFI} = 0.93$; $\text{TLI} = 0.92$; $\text{IFI} = 0.93$; $\text{RMSEA} = 0.04$, yielded a better fit than a 13-factor model formed by combining LMX and TLB (individualised support) into one factor: $\chi^2/df = 1.90$ ($p<0.001$); $\text{CFI} = 0.91$; $\text{TLI} = 0.90$; $\text{IFI} = 0.91$; $\text{RMSEA} = 0.05$, with a reduction in chi-square of 286.86 ($\Delta \text{df} = 13$, $p<0.001$); (b) the 14-factor measurement model yielded a better fit than an 11-factor model formed by combining LMX and TLB (individualised support) into one factor plus creating a single factor by combining Creativity, Idea Implementation (idea promotion) and Idea Implementation (idea implementation): $\chi^2/df = 2.26$ ($p<0.001$); $\text{CFI} = 0.87$; $\text{TLI} = 0.86$; $\text{IFI} = 0.87$; $\text{RMSEA} = 0.06$, with a reduction in chi-square of 803.46 ($\Delta \text{df} = 36$, $p<0.001$). These results suggest: (a) discriminant validity of the measures; (b) the 14-factor measurement model provides the most parsimonious fit of data and should therefore be accepted.
3.2.3 SEM

3.2.3.1 Hypothesised research model

Maximum likelihood estimation SEM was utilised to test the 14-factor hypothesised research model, illustrated in Figure 3.9, since this is the most common and well understood estimation method that "iteratively improves parameter estimates to minimize a specified fit function" (Hair et al 1992: 632). Further, model fit was evaluated via the significance of standardised path estimates (Bollen 1989).

![Figure 3.9 Hypothesised research model
(Factors as per Table 3.2)](image)

Multicollinearity between the direct predictors of Idea Implementation was assessed via multiple regression which produced acceptable tolerance results at ≥0.85, \( p < 0.05 \) minimum. The SEM analysis indicated a good fit of data: \( \chi^2/df = 1.97 \) (\( p < 0.001 \)); CFI = 0.90; TLI = 0.90 (in fact marginally below the 0.9 recommended threshold); IFI = 0.90; RMSEA = 0.05. The probability significances also lent support to hypotheses: (a) H1 from Autonomy3 ‘work criteria’ factor to Idea Implementation2 ‘idea implementation’
factor; (b) H3 from Creativity to both factors of Idea Implementation; (c) H4 from LMX to all three factors of Autonomy; (d) H6 from LMX to Creativity; (e) H7, from TLB factors ‘high performance expectations’ (TLB4) and ‘individualised support’ (TLB5) to LMX. However, hypotheses H2 and H5 were reported as non-significances (see Figure 3.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3.10 Hypothesised research model SEM significances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<em><strong>) ( p &lt; .001 ); (</strong>) ( p &lt; .01 ); (</em>) ( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the research model provided acceptable fit statistics (Kline 1998) and produced statistically significant standardised regression weights in support of Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7.
3.3 Study I discussion

The above analysis offers support for the positive relation between TLB and LMX; LMX and autonomy; LMX and creativity; autonomy and idea implementation; creativity and idea implementation. Further, support for the interrelationship between propensity to take risks and idea implementation was evident from the correlation matrix (see Tables 3.2 and 3.3). However, no support was found for a statistically significant relationship between LMX and propensity to take risks as suggested by previous researchers (e.g. Swain 2007) who argued that propensity to take risks was essentially a behavioural phenomenon which could be manipulated, for example, by the right kind of leader relationship; hence the hypothesis linking LMX with propensity to take risks. In the attempt to understand why this linkage was not supported in the results, consideration is given to the question over the scale applicability for propensity to take risks as highlighted in Section 3.1.3. It may be that further research is required to test the applicability of propensity to take risks scales in corporate entrepreneurship contexts.

A second possible reason for the lack of support for the proposed relationship between these variables may be found in the notion of two distinct models for propensity to take risks. Firstly, as a behavioural tendency, proffered above, affected “not only by one’s risk preference but also by the judgement of whether it is worth taking risks” and suggesting that risk propensity can “differ by a decision context and be modified based on experience and knowledge about the situation” (Cho & Lee 2006: 114). Secondly, as a personality trait “thus implying that it is stable over time and across circumstances” (Cho & Lee 2006: 114) and also that it is not influenced via the relationship with one’s leader, with subsequent research also proposing that propensity to take risks may result from deep-rooted personally traits (Zhang & Arvey 2009). Further research would therefore
seem to be required to examine the antecedents of propensity to take risks in greater detail to better inform the understanding of its effect on idea implementation by subordinates.

Inspection of the correlation matrix in Table 3.2 also indicates a number of other statistically significant relationships \( (p<0.01) \) in addition to those hypothesised, namely: (a) TLB and autonomy; (b) TLB and idea implementation; (c) LMX and idea implementation; (d) autonomy and creativity and (e) propensity to take risks and creativity. In an attempt to understand why these may have occurred, consideration is given to research which argues that leader behaviour and the nature of the relationship between leader and subordinate, whereby the leader encourages the subordinate to adopt “high expectations, self observation and self goal-setting” (Parker et al 2006: 640), is positively linked to autonomy, and through autonomy, to idea implementation (Parker et al 2006). Furthermore, influence-based leader behaviour such as the granting of autonomy is argued to be positively related to the generation, testing and implementation of ideas (Krause 2004). Consideration is also given to research into empowerment which is a more widely-embracing construct than autonomy but which nonetheless may inform the correlations between leader behaviour and autonomy and idea implementation.

Empowerment is argued to incorporate a number of similar concepts to autonomy as follows: ‘Self-determination’, which reflects “autonomy over the initiation and continuation of work behaviour and processes” (Spreitzer 1996: 484); ‘Impact’, “the degree to which a person can influence outcomes at work” (Thomas & Velthouse 1990: 677); The concept of employees sharing power with their leader in the execution of a particular task (Conger & Kanungo 1988). Empowerment is also argued to incorporate
the cognition of ‘Competence’ (Spreitzer 1995: 1443) which may inform the construct of task autonomy via self-efficacy as follows. Firstly, the effect of job autonomy on idea implementation is mediated by role breadth self-efficacy (Parker et al 2006). Secondly, autonomy positively relates to self-efficacy (Axtell & Parker 2003). Thirdly, self-efficacy predicts employee innovation (Axtell et al 2000). Empowerment is also argued to incorporate the notion of ‘Meaning’ (Spreitzer 1996: 484), i.e. whether tasks are commensurable with employee’s values and beliefs, and links to leader behaviour since leader behaviour can create a sense of meaning for employees “through the use of a strong vision and by energizing and aligning employees to the task at hand” (Spreitzer, Kizilos & Nason 1997: 683).

Other researchers also provide insights which help explain the correlations between leader behaviour and autonomy and idea implementation. It has been suggested that ‘empowering leader behaviour’ defined as “the process of implementing conditions that enable sharing power with an employee by providing greater decision-making autonomy, delineating the significance of the employee’s job, expressing confidence in the employee’s capabilities, and removing hindrances to performance” (Zhang & Bartol 2010: 109), is positively related to ‘employee psychological empowerment’, a process of heightening feelings of self-efficacy (Conger & Kanungo 1988). It has been proposed that psychological empowerment is positively related both to intrinsic motivation, “the extent to which an individual is focused on learning and mastering task skills” (Utman 1997: 170), and to “creative process engagement” defined as “employee involvement or engagement in creativity-relevant cognitive processes” (Zhang & Bartol 2010: 112).

---

7 a complex construct comprising: (a) performance accomplishments, or personal mastery experiences; (b) vicarious experience, seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences; (c) verbal persuasion, suggestion from others that one can cope successfully with what has overwhelmed them in the past; (d) emotional arousal, judgement of one’s anxiety and vulnerability to stress through one’s state of physiological arousal (Bandura 1973, 1977, 1982; Gist & Mitchell 1992; Eden & Aviram 1993)
Moreover, it has been argued that intrinsic motivation is positively related to creative process engagement which is positively related to employee creativity (Zhang & Bartol 2010). In summary, the above findings illustrate linkages between leader behaviour and employee feelings of empowerment and autonomy which result in employees acting innovatively, an articulation of arguments which appears to be supported by research proposing that the effect of (transformational) leader behaviour on organisational commitment is mediated by empowerment (Ismail, Mohamed, Sulaiman, Mohamad & Yusuf 2011). It is recommended that further research investigates the direct relationships between TLB, autonomy and idea implementation in order to further inform the phenomenon of idea implementation by subordinates.

Regarding the other statistically significant relationships of Table 3.2, consideration is given to research which argues that autonomy and creativity are closely related (Amabile 1992). Creativity may be extinguished in an atmosphere "fraught with evaluation pressures and restriction of choice" but conversely can exist in an atmosphere with minimal extrinsic constraint and where the employee is "as much as possible ... simply left alone" (Amabile 1992: 16-17). Other research has also argued that a common core of personality traits found in people deemed to be creative include the need for autonomy, independence of judgement, intuition, attraction to complexity, high energy, self confidence and a firm sense of oneself as "creative" (Barron & Harrington 1981: 453). Further, empirical studies have also proposed that employees are more creative when they perceive they have more control over how to accomplish given tasks (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby and Herron 1996; Zhou 1998; Jung and Sosik 2002). In related research, it has been argued that benevolent leadership, where the leader shows paternalistic concern for employees but expects a degree of unquestioning obedience in return, may
inhibit employees from questioning the status quo and thereby inhibit subordinate employee creativity (Wang & Cheng 2010). Wang & Cheng (2010) subsequently argue that to overcome this potential problem, high job autonomy and strong creative role identity will encourage subordinates both obey and defer to their leader, but in so doing they will respond to high job autonomy and fulfil their creative role identity. Finally, it has also been argued that the personal characteristics considered essential for creativity are a capacity and attraction for taking risks, internal intrinsic motivation and the relevant cognitive skills (Amabile 1992) and thus it is recommended that further research investigates the direct relationships between autonomy, propensity to take risks and creativity in order to further inform the concept of idea implementation by subordinates.

To conclude, Study I was designed to address the research question via the testing of seven hypotheses developed from literature. Data analyses supported the hypothesized relationships between idea implementation and autonomy, idea implementation and propensity to take risks, idea implementation and creativity, autonomy and LMX, creativity and LMX, LMX and TLB. However, analyses did not support the hypothesised relationship between propensity to take risks and LMX. Finally, and as described in Chapter 2 (research design), it is acknowledged that in consideration of the disparate research philosophies cited, a mixed methods approach (Jehn & Jonsen 2010) of contrasting but complementary research methods should be used to address the research question. Thus it was so designed that Study I (quantitative) results obtained via a survey comprising pre-defined and closed questions would be subjected to further scrutiny by an alternative method (producing qualitative data) of open-ended questions directed at a series of focus groups whose purpose was to question, corroborate or challenge Study I results (Cassell et al 2005).
Chapter 4 Study II

4.1 Study II research methodology

Study II addressed the research question as to ‘the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates’ by subjecting Study I results to further scrutiny in order that they be questioned, corroborated or challenged (Curran & Downing 1989).

4.1.1 Research setting and procedure

The research setting for Study II was EngCo, the same research subject Group as for Study I (and III). Permission to conduct this research was given by a member of the executive board of EngCo. The research methodology for Study II took the form of focus groups led by the researcher in open and free discussion of the results of Study I which were presented to the focus group at the start of each meeting. Focus group meetings were chosen as the method for Study II because they provided a complementary yet contrasting (compared to Study I) method of data collection via the use of open-ended questions (and which produced qualitative data) to further analyse the quantitative results of Study I (Chapter 2 contains a discussion as to why multiple research methods was considered necessary to address the research question).

Within the focus group meetings, the researcher acted as initiator, facilitator and moderator and care was taken to mitigate potential biases such as the researcher projecting their own opinions or missing non-verbal clues from focus group participants (Easterby-Smith et al 2002). Six focus group meetings (after Oh et al 2004) involving of a total of 29 employees were conducted in five separate companies belonging to EngCo (see Appendix 3). The meetings took place during the global economic recession of the late 2000s (Roubini 2009) and EngCo had recently undertaken a number of redundancy
programmes in several of their companies. However, within the five-company-sub-group conducting the focus group meetings, one had recorded a six-year consecutive run of profit growth, two had been short-listed for the annual EngCo innovation award (a third was to be short-listed within 10 months of the focus group meeting) and one had survived the prior two-year economic downturn with profits largely unaffected in contrast to its two sister companies whose profits had fallen up to 50% in the same period.

The companies hosting the focus group meetings were selected on the basis that they had taken part in Study I and that they were in the UK which allowed for all focus group meetings to be conducted within a total time-span of one week from meeting one to meeting six. To obviate against the possibility of data contamination via confounding variables interfering with how the separate focus groups assessed the Study I results (such as changes in external economic conditions or changes to the EngCo internal organisational environment), it was important that all focus groups were able to consider the data at approximately the same time (Hanley & Dendukuri 2009). Requests and reminders were sent to all UK based Managing Directors of Study I and four companies agreed to host focus group meetings which, together with the company of which the researcher is Managing Director, provided five companies to host the meetings. Whilst the original intention was to hold each of the six focus group meetings in different companies, the fact that four companies responded positively (including after also having received a reminder request) it was not considered sensible to ask the companies for a third time and so a decision was made to hold a second focus group meeting in the researcher's company which then consequently hosted the first and last meetings of the programme. To mitigate the risk of focus group members "simply resorting to telling the researcher what they think [he/ʃ she wants to know" (Easterby-Smith et al 2002: 90), four
of the five companies in which focus group meetings were held were beyond the managerial control or influence of the researcher. Instructions were provided to each focus group host company Managing Director requesting that the focus group be representative of their company in terms of job level, gender, cultural diversity and also keeping the number of focus group members to six, with four or five being optimum (Oh et al 2004). It was intentional that each focus group be formed of members of the same subsidiary company since it has been argued that focus groups should be formed of members who have a self-declared interest or expert knowledge of the particular subject of interest (Wiles et al 2008). Furthermore, focus groups whose members share the same interest and social values on a particular subject perform significantly better than an externally nominated, random-membership incongruous group (Eggins, O’Brien, Reynolds, Haslam & Crocker 2008).

It was explained to the Managing Directors of the focus group host companies that the researcher would start the meeting by making a short presentation of survey results followed by an open-ended discussion by the group which would last for no more than one hour. This methodology was chosen to allow the participants to discuss their opinions freely, instead of perhaps having their thoughts curtailed and directed via semi-structured one-to-one interviews (Eggins et al 2008). The length of time of meeting was declared in advance of the meeting since it has been argued that to avoid the pitfalls that can be encountered in qualitative research such as interviews being disrupted, researchers should “be certain when setting up the interview to state the length of time the interview will take” (Easton, McComish & Greenberg 2000: 705). Further, in terms of the open exchange of opinions, the researcher intended (if needed) to carefully probe participants utilising questions to elicit significant or memorable incidents (Flanagan 1954) and to ask
questions in an open-ended format so as not to lead discussions or suggest outcomes (Easterby-Smith et al 2002). Once the respective Managing Directors had selected members of their company to form the focus groups, Guidance Notes were sent to each potential focus group member in advance of the meeting. The Guidance Notes are contained in Figure 4.1. The request was also made that the focus group meetings take place in a neutral, convivial and relaxed setting within the subject company’s premises (Ingley & Van der Walt 2008) such as the canteen, and care was taken to present myself as a researcher from my sponsoring university, rather than a Managing Director within EngCo (after Easterby-Smith et al 2002). The assurance of confidentiality was also stressed and supported by the requirement of each participant to complete a consent form, witnessed by their colleagues, which gave permission for the meeting to proceed and to be recorded with the assurance that the researcher was operating under the University of Surrey’s Code of Ethics, independent of EngCo. Each participant was also offered a copy of the transcript of the recording and invited to comment on any aspect of the transcript or the methodology at any stage before, during or after the focus group meeting. Finally, the accounts of the meetings were transcribed and analysed (see below) with the written transcriptions being produced by the researcher since it has been argued that to avoid errors being introduced by incorrect transcription, perhaps by a 3rd party, “ideally the researcher should also be the interviewer and transcriber” (Easton et al 2000: 707).

4.1.2 Research materials

Study I results were presented to the focus groups in the form of two data sheets, the contents of which were obtained primarily from the Study I matrix of inter-correlations of variables cited in the hypotheses (see Chapter 3). However, the contents were also influenced by the wording of Study I scale items but also the answers to question No. 67
Thank you for agreeing to be a member of the focus group which is to meet at your company in April 2010. The following guidance notes have been created in order to assist with your participation in the group. Should you have any questions at any time, please do not hesitate to contact me. My private email is researcher@surrey.ac.uk and all correspondence is treated in the strictest confidence.

**Purpose of meeting:**
From November 2009 to January 2010, 25 separate [group] companies took part in a survey to try and find out whether [group] companies are entrepreneurial and if so, why. As a result, over 22,000 separate pieces of data were produced. The purpose of the focus group meeting is to discuss the results of this survey.

**Format of meeting:**
The meeting is scheduled to last no more than 1 hour. At the start of the meeting I will make a short presentation of the main survey results and then open these to discussion by the focus group for the remainder of the time. My role is not to lead the meeting, but to present the results for discussion by the group. As the discussions will be an opportunity for opinions to be freely expressed, no opinion will be considered right or wrong.

**Ideal structure of the focus group:**
Ideally, the focus group will contain no more than 6 members (not including me). It will also ideally contain an equal number of male and female members and a spread of employees from junior and senior positions within the company. Ideally, it should also represent the cultural diversity of the company.

**Desired result of meeting:**
The desired result of the meeting will be the free exchange of opinions by all members of the focus group on the results presented.

**Anonymity:**
The survey was deliberately designed to provide complete anonymity to the companies and individuals who took part, thereby protecting their identities and freedom of expression. Similarly, as several different companies are hosting a focus group meeting, care will be taken to ensure that my written results of these meetings do not contain any information which could identify either the company or the individual focus group members. A copy of the written results will also be available to each focus group member and it will be possible to raise any concerns with me at any time on the private email address above.

Many thanks once again and I look forward to seeing you in April 2010.
of the Study I survey which asked “are you happy in your company?” (Appendix 1). The first of these data sheets, Figure 4.2, illustrates linkages from TLB, through LMX, to autonomy, creativity and risk propensity which results in subordinates implementing their ideas. This first data sheet is referred to as the ‘implementing ideas’ model in the sections below. The second data sheet, Figure 4.3, illustrates similar structural linkages between the variables but with the result that subordinates do not implement their ideas. This second data sheet is referred to as the ‘not implementing ideas’ model in the sections below. It is these two data sheets which were presented to the focus groups for discussion in order that the inferred postulations could be corroborated or otherwise. The results of the discussions are contained in the following sections.

4.2 Study II results and analysis

The purpose of Study II was to subject the results of Study I to further scrutiny. As demonstrated in Chapter 3, Study I supported the hypothesized relationships between idea implementation and autonomy, idea implementation and propensity to take risks, idea implementation and creativity, autonomy and LMX, creativity and LMX, LMX and TLB. However, no support was found for the hypothesised relationship between propensity to take risks and LMX. The following excerpts of the focus group meeting discussions are organised under category headings which reflect the main results of Study I. Those results which received unconditional support contain fewer excerpts than those which elicited greater discussion. There is also a category reflecting the considered accuracy, or otherwise, of the ‘implementing ideas’ and ‘not implementing ideas’ models. A final category of excerpts contains references to a number of antecedents to organisational innovation and idea implementation which fall under headings other than

---

8 It was considered that further analysis of this particular question lay beyond the direct relevance of this current thesis. However, the researcher intends to address this issue at a later date.
"How does the behaviour of my immediate supervisor affect me implementing my ideas?"

What is your opinion on what your colleagues have said?

“When my immediate supervisor:

1. leads by ‘doing’ rather than simply by ‘telling’
2. provides a good model of behaviour for me to follow
3. leads by example
4. develops a good team spirit
5. and shows respect for my thoughts and needs

then I feel happy that:

1. I know where I stand with him/her
2. he/she understands me and my problems
3. he/she recognises my potential and supports my development
4. we have confidence in each other
5. we would help each other through our problems

and that makes me feel that I’m allowed to decide:

3. how to do my job
4. what methods to use in doing my job
5. what procedures to follow
6. when to schedule activities
7. and I feel I have some control over what I’m supposed to accomplish

and it also makes me think of:

4. a greater number of ideas on how to improve things around here
5. greater willingness to take a risk to make these ideas happen

which all results in:

6. me implementing my ideas.”
Figure 4.3 ‘Not implementing ideas’ model

“How does the behaviour of my immediate supervisor affect me implementing my ideas?”

What is your opinion on what your colleagues have said?

“When my immediate supervisor:

- is under pressure to control, save money and make profits
- is only concerned with carrying out their bosses instructions
- rarely communicates with me nor says 'thank you' occasionally
- is inconsistent, doesn't listen to me and doesn't respect me or my ideas
- acts without integrity and even bullies, belittles or insults me

then I feel unhappy:

- that he/she doesn't know, understand or care about me
- that we do not share the same values or aspirations
- that I will never be given a chance to change his/her opinion of me
- that he/she does not respect my judgement and we distrust each other
- that I never know where I am with him/her

and that makes me feel that I'm allowed to decide:

- only petty, administrative, bureaucratic things; nothing of substance
- little that will help the company grow or help me make progress
- nothing that costs any money as we pay 'lip-service' to innovation
- nothing unless I get permission from my immediate supervisor
- very little about changing work methods, procedures and goals

and it also makes me think of:

- keeping quiet and just keeping my job in these tough times

and I also feel a:

- fear for my job if my ideas don't work

which all results in:

- me not implementing my ideas.”
those defined by the Study I results (but which the literature review of Chapter 1 suggests inform the research question of this thesis). This final category also contains the results of an open-ended question, the purpose of which was to elicit candid opinions from group members as to the most important issue to idea implementation as far as they were concerned. Demographic information relating to the Study II research subjects such as their job role and gender is contained in the appendices but identities of individuals have been withheld for purposes of anonymity (Blenkinsopp 2007). Finally, the notation in the excerpts which references focus group members takes the form C63 (e.g.) which indicates focus group meeting at Company 6, and member 3; and passages within the excerpts which are underlined indicate particular relevance to the category heading.

4.2.1 Idea implementation and autonomy

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between idea implementation and autonomy. By way of illustration, the following excerpt supports the argument of a relationship between autonomy and employee action (Dansereau et al 1975, Schjoedt 2009) in activities argued to be antecedents of idea implementation (Amabile 1988) such as the freedom to communicate (McAleese & Hargie 2004) and the freedom to experiment (Daniel et al 2004).

C63: I've always had a great freedom to express myself from that point of view. If you take, my career with [C1], I came here as a Production Engineer, and then, found I had a, I don't wanna call it a talent for design, or whatever, and was allowed to experiment with that [by] the Managing Director and obviously my line manager the Operations Director.

The following excerpt also supports the argument that a lack of task autonomy (from one's supervisor) discourages employee action (Hackman and Oldham 1976).
It’s as though, when we’re chasing orders downstairs, and speak to some of the guys and they’re saying ‘I’m not allowed to do that’ and ‘it’s only my supervisor who will answer’.

Furthermore, the following excerpt supports the argument of a positive association between the construct of empowerment (as espoused below), of which autonomy is a critical component (Spreitzer 1996), and the implementation of ideas (Parker et al 2006).

It’s about being giving trust, empowerment and when you experience those then I certainly think you go through that process and you are more likely to, implement your ideas. Personally, I do experience that.

4.2.2 Idea implementation and propensity to take risks

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between idea implementation and propensity to take risks. By way of illustration, the following excerpts support the argument of a relationship between propensity to take risks and idea implementation in that task outcome expectancy, an integral element of the process of idea implementation (Dailey & Mumford 2006) (and in the following excerpts, task outcome expectancy is the prospect of completing the task in a faster time) is a factor in the propensity to take risks (Sitkin & Pablo 1992).

I think we all take risk. We all take risk in our work. ‘Cause you’ve got to try something to find out if it’s gonna happen. Then you take the risk of trying it a different way. It’s like, if you’ve got a job and you’re setting up a job, you’ve got to take risk in it, ‘if I do it this way, it might be quicker’.

Obviously, first thing would be to, if say a customer comes on the phone, they want quickly something, then, you would take notes, and, do it the quickest way possible. Supposing [they] want something out today, so you just try and make that, take that risk and do it the quickest way possible.

However, the following excerpts also suggest that foolhardy risk-taking is likely to be avoided (as proposed by Mintzberg & Waters 1982) via task preparation in the form of an
assessment of whether the risk will succeed or fail (Kahneman & Tversky 1979), which will impact the employee's self-efficacy to enact the risk (Gist & Mitchell 1992).

C14: I actually, I don’t completely disagree, but risk wise I find if we get a job that’s like, a big rush, I find more often than not we don’t, rather than sort of like move to another supplier to try, that you might be able to get it quicker, which would probably taking a risk, we tend not to take the risk, because, we could be too big a risk.

C13: Yeah, you have to think that way as well, because you promise a customer something, but I think first you have to do your homework before you can go and promise something out and take that risk.

4.2.3 Idea implementation and creativity

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between idea implementation and creativity. By way of illustration, the following excerpt supports empirical evidence which found a positive association between idea implementation and creativity (Birdi et al 2007) and also illustrates idea implementation as a process which involves persons other than those who generated the idea (Dailey & Mumford 2006).

C63: I spend a lot of my time putting other people’s ideas, making other people’s ideas work. Someone wants a design for something, I’m doing the, maybe the creative part of that and bringing those ideas to fruition, rather than, my own personal thoughts.

4.2.4 Autonomy and LMX

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between autonomy and LMX. By way of illustration, whilst the following excerpt questions the linkage between TLB and LMX, it lends support to the argument that good quality LMX (defined in the wording of Section 2 of ‘implementing ideas’ model) results in ideas being implemented via the granting of autonomy (Scott & Bruce 1994; Basu & Green 1997). In the excerpt below, autonomy is represented by the proxies of ‘more room for
manoeuvre’ (autonomy work method) and ‘more time’ (autonomy work schedule) (Breaugh 1985).

C21: I certainly believe number 2 [referring to ‘implementing ideas’ model] is true, that if I’m happy, whatever reason, if I’m happy, I’ll do better, I’ll implement more of my ideas if I get encouragement. But whether it’s number 1 ['implementing ideas’ model] leading to number 2, or in giving me more money or giving me more room to manoeuvre or giving me more time, I’m not sure.

4.2.5 Creativity and LMX

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between creativity and LMX. By way of illustration, the following excerpts support the arguments that when the leader-subordinate relationship is described as good, ideas increase, but when the relationship is poor, ideas decrease (Tierney et al 1999; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev 2009). The excerpts also suggest that within leader-subordinate relationships in which a degree of informality is shared, the subordinate feels more able to discuss their ideas, perhaps due to a feeling ‘psychological safety’ (Kahn 1990). The following excerpts describe the situation where the relationship is good and ideas increase.

RE: Is there a link between your relationship with your supervisor and the number of ideas you’re having?

C14: I suppose if you have like a better relationship with someone and you sort of, just have general chit chat with them, and, I dunno, yeah, just I suppose general chit chat, and ideas almost probably come about from that

C64: Oh absolutely, yes! I think you have more ideas because (a) the dialogue and (b) their probing. Y’know, if you try one idea, and it fails, you don’t tend to think about it.

C11: Yeah, it’s not too serious, like you can say I’ve thought of this and then they might think ‘ok, that’s a good idea’, rather than thinking ‘oh, you know, I’ve got this idea, like what do you think’ and it’s quite serious.
However, the following excerpt suggests that if the informality between leader and subordinate is too great, creativity may be affected adversely.

*C14: But then I guess like some people might feel too comfortable that they wouldn't, they just become too relaxed, they think 'ah, kind of like a friend as well as, you know, my supervisor, so maybe I won't do this, maybe I won't do that, they'll get away with things, a bit easier. I suppose it ends up almost not being a supervisor and a worker or someone below you, it's more of a, like two friends going out for a drink or something.*

This phenomenon is framed by research which argues that at high levels of LMX, creativity may be adversely affected due to the subordinate feeling stressed (Harris & Kacmar 2006), intimidated (Turnipseed & Wilson 2009) and unable to handle the pressure to perform beyond expectations (Basu & Green 1997). Informality may therefore be another factor to assess when considering the degradation of creativity versus differing LMX qualities.

The following excerpts describe the situation where the leader-subordinate relationship is poor and ideas decrease; an association previously suggested by Oldham & Cummings (1996).

*RE: Under that situation ['not implementing ideas' model], would you have fewer ideas or still have lots of ideas?*

*C11: I think you will think of less ideas, you don't really care, you won't be thinking about making things better, you'll just be thinking about what you've got to do there and then and that's it, and go, forget about work.*

*C33: In some ways you do have less ideas because you're not thinking of any. Any you do think of you dismiss because you know it won't be of interest.*

*C31: I think there are probably ideas, still, there are probably fewer ideas 'cause you're less open to look 'cause you're not enjoying yourself for want of a better term. You just keep your head down just keep doing it, so you're not thinking of ideas and those that you do have you just think 'well there's no point in me doing anything with them, they're not gonna go anywhere', so you lose out, twice.*
They'll end up not bothering to think of them because they don't think anyone will listen. They'll just act defeated and stop thinking of things.

However, and contrary to the arguments progressed by Tierney et al (1999) and others (above), the following excerpt argues that there is no link between LMX and idea generation. Notwithstanding, the excerpt does support research which argues that the relationship with one's leader is a crucial factor in whether the subordinate progresses with idea implementation (Lassen et al 2009).

Personally, is there a link between [LMX and] the number of ideas?, no. But there is a link between, 'am I likely to go forward with it and try it or just forget about it and stay as we are'. So, in terms of the number of ideas generated, no, but in 'am I actually going to try and push it and see if we can go forward?' the answer is yes.

Furthermore, the following excerpts suggest that even in the situation where leader behaviour is not transformational and the leader-subordinate relationship appears poor, employees still generate ideas but suppress them. These findings are also contrary to research which suggests that non-transformational leadership is negatively related to the generation of ideas (Oke et al 2009) but they do again support the findings that leader support is crucial during idea implementation (Lassen et al 2009) and poor leader behaviour will have a detrimental effect on the implementation of subordinates' ideas (Zhou & George 2003). In challenging the relationship between LMX and creativity, the following excerpts offer support to the argument that successful innovation is less about idea generation and more about the support for implementing them (Frese et al 1999).

I think you're still gonna have the same amount of ideas. Whether they actually get implemented or you have the feeling of even going to find out whether they get implemented, might reduce. So you're still going to have the ideas, it's whether you're gonna carry them through. You know, if you feel your boss is not receptive, then you may not try to even implement it.
C14: I think you’d have more ideas, sort of eat up inside you, when you wanna say something but you don’t feel you can say something.

C12: The 1st case ['implementing ideas' model] you could go with it to your supervisor and give your point of view, what you want, some changes, and he’ll carry on through it. If it went with this one ['not implementing ideas' model] you wouldn’t bother.

RE: You wouldn’t bother, but you’d still have the ideas?

C12: Yes.

Ideas being suppressed due to poor LMX may also be affected indirectly in that a subordinate witnessing a poor relationship between their peer and leader can result in the subordinate not progressing with their own ideas, as indicated in the following excerpt.

C11: It might make other people think that they can’t say their ideas, even if they got on with that person [leader]. If you’re friends with someone else and they say ‘so-and-so has just had a right go at me’, then that person might think ‘maybe I can’t say something’. It would just affect everyone.

Illustrating another relationship between LMX and creativity, the following excerpts support research which argues that the nature of the relationship between leader and subordinate will directly affect subordinate organisational commitment and performance (DeConinck 2011). Also, employees who believe they have their leader’s support may display organisational citizenship behaviours (Bateman & Organ 1983) in which discretionary, non-contracted role behaviours are enacted by the subordinate to benefit the organization (Piccolo & Colquitt 2006). It has been suggested that subordinates may enact these behaviours due to perceiving their role tasks differently as a result of receiving “informational cues” from their leaders (Griffin 1981: 180) but also due to their heightened feelings of emotional attachment to the organisation (McCann, Langford & Rawlings 2006). Further, it has been proposed that subordinates may exert extra efforts to generate creative solutions due to their heightened levels of intrinsic motivation resulting
from the alignment of values between the leader and subordinate (Gardner & Avolio 1998) which can result from the leader articulating organisational long-term goals and visions (Jung 2001) and which the subordinate interprets as an ‘irresistible’ opportunity to satisfy their ambitions, needs and goals (Conger 1989: 92).

C13: Even if it’s out of my capability like, you know, I would try and sort of focus on other things and whereas I think when you are not respected or anything, this is the way I’m looking at things, you just get on with your job and that’s about it, you know. You say why am I bothering.

C14: I think it’s almost a bit like, if someone shows that you’re like appreciated, you’re obviously more willing to do more. I’m not saying you wouldn’t be willing to do it anyway but ... you’d rather go out of your way for someone who does actually appreciate you

Furthermore, poor quality LMX can create disengagement from the organisation where generated ideas are not shared (DeConinck 2011), as illustrated by the following excerpts.

C62: I feel that we’re held back, [from] putting the ideas into action. Held back as in people don’t listen. Management don’t listen. It comes to a stage where nothing gets actioned so why should I say something? You never get a chance to express yourself. When you do try and express yourself, you get fobbed off so you live to learn with it. You keep your mouth shut.

C24: Well you’d be de-motivated wouldn’t you? If your boss had some of these qualities ['not implementing ideas' model], there’d be no incentive to ask him anything. You’d tend to probably keep your head down. Because that’s just de-motivating, you’re not gonna want to speak up.

RE: What happens to ideas in this situation?

C44: They just stay as their own ideas and no more. They don’t ever see the light of day, even if they were good. They’re [colleagues] either too afraid to say anything at all or whatever they say isn’t listened to anyway, it’s disregarded, so they don’t grow.

C43: I say, they don’t share them.

C45: They don’t develop them.
Moreover, discussions in the focus groups on the effects of poor LMX on creativity generated the following excerpts which suggest that in such situations subordinates feel that they are not trusted, that they feel a lack of self-worth and that they adopt a negative persona themselves, which has a subsequent effect of their ideas being further discounted. Researchers have argued that feelings of a lack of trust can produce withdrawal behaviours in employees (Kiefer 2005) and subsequent negative emotions such as the unwillingness to contribute in the organisation (Beer et al 2005).

**RE: How do you think people are feeling in that situation?**

C54: That they're not trusted.

C32: I’m thinking of previous experiences where your boss is not open to ideas, it can make you question your own self confidence. If you’re relatively self confident anyway, then it can cause an attitude of ‘sod that, I shall take my good ideas somewhere else’. It could cause you to think ‘I’m not hired by a receptive boss, my ideas aren’t listened to, I shall polish up my c.v. and see if I can find someone where they’re more open to the ideas’. But it could, if you’re not so self confident, just knock your confidence to change, and go somewhere else. I’ve had both of those in the past.

C44: Downtrodden, completely un-relevant, invaluable.

C42: They don’t care about this, job, they just want to come to work, finish it as soon as possible, they don’t care about quality and they can’t tell [anyone] about the problems, even if they find any problems they think there is no worth to tell my supervisor, he doesn’t care about us.

C55: Or their persona becomes negative so when they do put, what could be perceived as a positive, thought, forward, they’re coming across as negative because that’s the nature of the person. In other words they’re a ‘moaner’! You know, and if they’re always moaning, whenever they’re saying something, even if it might be a good idea, your first impression is automatically ‘oh Christ’ [and] do they get the full hearing?

### 4.2.6 LMX and TLB

The focus group meetings offered support for the hypothesised relationship between LMX and TLB. By way of illustration, the following excerpts provide evidence of leader behaviour which has been defined as transformational (such as showing empathy,
providing individualised support and treating employees with respect, Rubin et al 2005), producing high quality LMX.

C12: I have to agree with number 2 ['implementing ideas’ model]. My supervisor, he is good, he listens to what we have to say, and he helps us out and we help him. If there’s problems you go to him and he’ll help, he’ll sort it out, there and then. You know that’s one thing about downstairs, I try and do the work, I do, if I can do more, I do more.

C13: I'd say if the supervisor shows respect and thoughts for your needs then I think that's a guidance for us to follow, on whatever you need to do, a little bit of respect goes a long way, that's what I go by.

The following excerpts support arguments that the quality of the relationship between leader and subordinate must also take the leader’s perception of the relationship into consideration (Liden & Antonakis 2009). Furthermore, the overt display by the leader of behaviour which shows that they value the relationship with their subordinate is a factor in whether or not the subordinate exercises organisational citizenship behaviours (Wilson et al 2010).

C21: My problem is that it is a bit too ‘me’ centred ... ‘my boss, I’m happier’, what about understanding my boss, when he’s under pressure, obviously, that is when he needs more support from me ... why is it that I, my performance goes down then? ... so, that is the problem I’ve got with that. I expect a bit more understanding from myself a bit ...

C25: ... it needs to be a 2-way process ...

C21: No, no I expect myself to understand my boss a bit better because if he’s behaving like I ['implementing ideas’ model], that is the time when he’s not under pressure, he’s had it good and so on. Where he’s under pressure, for whatever reason, that is where he needs more support.

The excerpts in Section 4.2.8.2 (below) referring to the bullying of subordinates by leaders provide evidence of leader behaviour which is the antithesis of transformational (Burns 1978). The members of focus group meeting [C1] (during which the issue of bullying was raised) were asked how they felt when witnessing such behaviour.
RE: How do you feel when you witness bullying?

C13: Uncomfortable.

C12: Just like you wanna walk out. You’re not meant to be in a company to be shouted at. It makes people feel like they’re on the floor, something crawling, like they’re nothing really.

C14: It makes me feel uncomfortable. I don’t like it.

Furthermore, discussions by the focus group as to the effects of such leader behaviour suggested that subordinates in that situation react by keeping their own counsel and by producing avoidance behaviour to limit their interaction with their leader - a phenomenon observed in previous research (Moss et al 2009).

RE: How does the person who’s being bullied feel?

C11: I guess they’ll just think ‘why should I carry on doing anything else for that person or help in any way?’

C14: You don’t wanna go out of your way.

C13: They would do the work, whatever they have been asked, but no more.

C12: They’d try not to go to the person that just shouted at them, they’ll just think ‘oh I’ll go and see my mate next to me, he’ll tell me.

C14: It stops you wanting to go to that person again if they’re not friendly.

4.2.7 Propensity to take risks and LMX

Whilst no statistically significant support for the relationship between propensity to take risks and LMX was found in Study I, the following excerpts do nonetheless suggest that leaders may have an important role to play in encouraging subordinates to take risks i.e. in overcoming the differences in perception of risk between themselves (Eisenhardt 1989a).
C14: I think sometimes the supervisors are same as everyone else, stuck in their ways and don’t want you to take risks.

C11: [The managers] might feel like, ‘oh you’ve made the mistake, now I’ve got to deal with it, rather than, ‘well, that was your choice, it didn’t go right so maybe next time we’ll do it a different way’. You’re always scared like, you’ve done the wrong thing.

C44: You’re not going to take a risk if you don’t feel that you’re confidently supported are you?, You’re just gonna, sit and do what you’re told to do and, y’know, ‘mushroom’ almost. If you feel supported and confident about what you’re doing, then you’re more likely to take decisions.

C46: If you’ve done it before, you’ve taken that risk and you’ve been supported through it, although it might not have worked out to be absolutely the right thing to do but you felt that you’ve been supported right the way through it, you’ll do it again, or you’re more likely to do it again. But if you’ve been left out hanging to dry and you’re the scapegoat now, you’re in serious trouble, then you’re not gonna do it again are you?

Furthermore, the following excerpts support the argument that poor leader-subordinate relationships adversely affect subordinate intentions to take a risk (Swain 2007) and experiment (Gilmore & Gilson 2007). The excerpts below suggest this is based on the fear of repercussions and reprisals from the leader.

RE: In the ‘not implementing ideas’ model, do people feel able to take risks?

C31: No, you don’t take any risks you just keep your head down, unless you’re 99% sure of a benefit. You don’t rock the boat, it’s not worth it. Where you’ve taken risk, do you think you’ll be blamed or not? I think if you talk it through and you agree to take a risk, and it fails, if somebody then comes back and blames ‘you were wrong’, you actually go back onto the negatives. Whereas, if somebody says ‘ok we took the risk and we knew it may or may not work, it didn’t work, fair enough, let’s try again’, you know, ‘it was there, it was a 50/50 gamble, that one didn’t work out, but it’s not gonna stop us doing anything else’. If the finger pointing starts, that stops you from doing anything next time.

C32: You fear that if you take a risk and it doesn’t come off, as some risky things obviously won’t come off, you’re gonna, get blame, get into trouble. So, you bottle it up and don’t take the risk. You don’t experiment with ideas so you don’t get the feedback of ones that succeed and don’t, so the next idea isn’t gonna be any better. You basically stop coming up with ideas or if you come up with any you keep them, but you don’t get the experience of trying them out. So, it’s not whether the risk succeeds or
not, it's the reaction, of the supervisor whether it succeeds or not. It's the reaction that will determine, whether you continue to come up with ideas. So, up to that point, if the supervisor's been with you, you take the risk, it doesn't work, if you get praise for taking a risk and we also learn something, you're gonna do more.

C45: They wouldn't take any risks would they?

C41: They'd be vulnerable. You're not going to rock the boat to push yourself.

Linking into previous discussions on autonomy, the following excerpt suggests that where an employee perceives that they do not possess autonomy over their work criteria such as how to perform tasks (Breaugh 1985), this may influence the relationship between LMX and propensity to take risks, as observed by Amabile (1992).

C62: There's no such thing as 'you can have your views'. You've been told 'go that way' and that is it! If you try and oppose that, the fear of repercussions would put you off. Repercussion means making your life harder. Everything that you do may get blocked and make you feel belittle.

4.2.8 Accuracy of Study II data sheets

4.2.8.1 'Implementing ideas' model (Figure 4.2)

The following excerpts are arranged into three sub-groups. Firstly, those which indicate agreement with the 'implementing ideas' model. Secondly, those which indicate agreement with the model but also with the suggestion that its accuracy is dependent upon cited contingencies. Thirdly, those excerpts which suggest the model is not accurate. The following excerpts indicate agreement.

C22: These behaviours [referring to 'implementing ideas' model], I would agree when you experience these behaviours that encourages that sort of behaviour

C32: I guess it seems to be a model for getting ideas implemented, in business, it's almost telling you 'this is how to do it', for it to succeed, that's one
way I could look at that and you interpret that or use it. If you do that, that, that this research has, concluded, ideas will get implemented.

C44: That’s what happens in our department, I don’t think it’s across the board.

C64: I think, I’m very lucky, because I’ve worked in lots of different environments from across a whole, range of different things that I’ve done, and I, you know, some of them have been exactly like this [‘implementing ideas’ model].

The following excerpts indicate agreement with the ‘implementing ideas’ model but contingent upon the behaviour of the leader (as argued in this thesis) and also upon the nature of the company ownership which Agency Theory states will determine how owner and manager reconcile their different perceptions of the opportunities and risks to the business (Eisenhardt 1989a).

C13: Yeah. I mean, not all of it is, well, I suppose it is, in like, it just depends on, I think, your supervisor or your, also on how you actually are close to him or how comfortable you are with him.

C55: I think it’s what a person would want to be but not necessarily what they are. I think everybody would have a certain proportion of that [referring to ‘implementing ideas’ model] especially within [C5] actually. If you were in another business, as a different business model, y’know, a ‘mum and pap’ firm, are they going to be meeting all these requirements? No, I don’t think they would.

The following excerpts suggest that the ‘implementing ideas’ model was not perceived as accurate by the members of the focus group.

C24: I mean, it sounds great doesn’t it? It’s all very utopian, y’know that sounds like an ideal scenario, it doesn’t quite sound like the real world.

C61: It seems like these answers here [‘implementing ideas’ model] are proper answers. This is not true in the real world by a long way.

The above number of excerpts in each sub-group is also indicative of the overall number of comments made by focus group members when asked whether they believed the
'implementing ideas' model was accurate. The largest number of comments indicated 'yes' it was accurate, with the remaining comments split roughly equally between those which indicated ‘yes’ but with contingencies and ‘no’ it was not accurate.

4.2.8.2 ‘Not implementing ideas’ model (Figure 4.3)

The following excerpts are arranged into three sub-groups. Firstly, those which indicate agreement with the ‘not implementing ideas’ model. Secondly, those which indicate agreement with the model but also with the suggestion that its accuracy is dependent upon cited contingencies. Thirdly, those excerpts which suggest the model is not accurate. The following excerpts indicate agreement.

C13: Number 1 ['not implementing ideas' model], 'is under pressure to control, save money and make profits', happens to all of us. In this day and age we all have to do that don't we? And number 4, a lot of times I do keep quiet and just keep my job, I do that a lot.

C21: That is not at all an unfamiliar situation. You know, people trying to keep their job, trying to keep a low key 'cause the times are hard or the pressure is too much and so on, that's understandable. One other thing is, people take pressure differently.

C31: I think ['not implementing ideas' model] is, exceedingly accurate, the negative one, I think that's very well written. The first one ['implementing ideas' model], I was just looking, I was trying to work out what is what that, wasn't quite right, and I think it's the, feedback on risk and with that in, I think that's, pretty accurate as well now.

C55: Looking at point 1 ['not implementing ideas' model], when you look at the superior of the Board [referring to C52's immediate supervisor], I could put that person under every category in Section 1. I would put [C52's immediate supervisor] under every one of those categories to be perfectly honest! I don't think there's actually one I'd even question.

C64: This just exactly describes the process that I've just [explained], getting the meeting to this point and then, the termination of the meeting was exactly what happened here ['not implementing ideas' model].

C61: ‘Thank you occasionally’ ['not implementing ideas' model], that's what I said earlier wasn't it. This is 90% what happens downstairs. That one's very accurate, very accurate.
One focus group meeting also suggested that the behavioural template in the ‘not implementing ideas’ model also applied to working with colleagues (as opposed to their leaders) and so the model may also inform a concept similar in nature to LMX but relating to member-member exchange (MMX) (Vidyarthi et al 2010).

_C34:_ That sums up what it’s like working with my colleague, not my immediate supervisor, I must add that. That is just, isn’t it, just down to a ’T’.

The following excerpts indicate agreement with the ‘not implementing ideas’ model but contingent upon organisational contexts such as the stage within a financial year. The excerpt also suggests that leader behaviour will need to consequently change to match the situation at hand - a concept informed by Oke et al (2009) who argue that leader behaviour may need to change at different stages of the innovation process.

_C44:_ I’m not sure that there’s someone like that. I think there are times, as a supervisor, you possibly need to be between the two of those things [referring to the two models]. There are times when being the good guy just isn’t enough, but being that bad ['not implementing ideas' model] is equally, unrealistic but somewhere in the middle where you do need to control, and still be supportive, take those decisions, be a bit tough sometimes. Sometimes you need to be that person.

_C46:_ We know that in our business, you start cribbing your way through March [end of financial year] and nobody really has an entrepreneurial thought. We’re all ‘we’ve gotta do this’ regardless of what’s going on, ‘this is what we’ve got to achieve’. So yes, there are times during a financial year when probably people do feel like this ['not implementing ideas' model], but I would say that for the most part, people feel very empowered to at least voice their opinions, their concerns, their aspirations for the future and what they feel that [C4] can do for them and what they could do for [C4]. So, I think that is, quite right [but] certainly not all the time.

Furthermore, and temporarily considering the accuracy of both models together, the above excerpts suggest that both the ‘implementing’ and ‘non implementing’ models may represent accurately behavioural experiences in the same organisation but at different moments in time; a suggestion which is supported by the following excerpts.
C21: My feeling is that you’re giving us two extreme cases here which polarises the process. Realistically, the reality’s somewhere in the middle, but I genuinely believe the actual result is polarised, it’s almost like being balanced on a knife edge. A little good management can make a company very innovative and ideas start flowing, the slightest movement the other side can shut the valve completely, it’s a digital on-and-off type of thing. In a good company, the bit of bad management, off very quickly, and then turning it on takes quite a while.

C44: They’re extreme. We have both models running through this business.

C43: Yeah, I think they are they are extreme, but I think it represents most behaviours. I think it represents how you would feel, in the given circumstance, so I think [they’re] fair.

C63: I would think a mix of the two [models] and, you’ve got [C1]. But I’m not sure about the percentage between the two. There’s true and false in both, yeah, well, not false but, maybe different to people in different positions.

Returning now to the accuracy of the ‘not implementing ideas’ model, the following excerpt questions the accuracy of the model, specifically in relation to the detail in Section 1 which refers to the leader bullying their subordinates.

C12: No, I couldn’t believe it’s happened anywhere. I don’t think I could work in a place where this is going on. I think it’s all wrong. You shouldn’t be able to bully people, tell them what to do or not give your points of view.

However, upon further discussion by the focus group of the issue of bullying by leaders (plus see above in Section 4.2.6), the proclamation by C12 that the model was inaccurate was challenged.

C14: I don’t agree with it or it’s my full experience, I have seen bits of it around, not on a daily basis but I can believe it happens in places.

C13: It does happen, a lot of bullying does happen in a lot of companies. Not in my experience, I haven’t experienced it but it does happen.

C14: I don’t feel like I get bullied myself but saying something like ‘bully’ as well depends on someone’s, what they think that bullying is.
The above number of excerpts in each sub-group is also indicative of the overall number of comments made by focus group members when asked whether they believed the ‘not implementing ideas’ model was accurate. The majority of comments indicated ‘yes’ it was accurate, the overwhelming majority of remaining comments indicated ‘yes’ but with contingencies and a very small residue indicated ‘no’ it was not accurate.

4.2.9 Additional antecedents to organisational innovation

During the focus group discussions, a number of antecedents to organisational innovation and idea implementation were cited which fall under headings other than those defined by the Study I results (but which inform the research question of this thesis, see Chapter 1). These results are recorded in the following sections. Also, focus group members were asked to state what was the most important issue to idea implementation as far as they were concerned and these results are recorded in the final section below.

4.2.9.1 Personal factors

The following excerpt suggests that acting innovatively is a matter of inner drive and personal perception (Hornsby et al 1993) and personal judgement and control of the situation at hand (Kahn 1990).

C21: Generally not being satisfied with the status quo and some of us are never satisfied no matter how good they are, we get better and then we think can we tune it even better. Really, I always think is, I think the process of generating ideas is you do something and you then you immediately start thinking ‘can I do it better?’

C22: ... yeah, you’ve also got inner drive that makes you want to do something, it doesn’t necessarily matter what your supervisor ... thinks, or rather that they create for you, if you, have a drive and you want to do something.
you just do it anyway. [It's] your own desire to improve things, so I think ... this is putting a lot of emphasis on your supervisor to generate the right environment, whereas you can generate that yourself in many instances.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationship between personal factors and organisational innovation.

4.2.9.2 Peer pressure

The following excerpts support research which argues that peer pressure can adversely affect organisational innovation whereby members within an organisational group suppress ideas if they do not conform to group norms (Perry-Smith 2006).

C13: You always have a few [ideas] which, like, like we talk that on a daily basis ‘oh this, it would be better if we do it like this’, it always comes up, we never sit down and discuss it, you know, like, you know, chatting wise, like I’m always talking to [my internal sales colleague] ‘it would be better if we do it this way’, but ... I’ll be honest and I’ll say we talk about it, but do we do anything about it? No, we don’t.

RE: Why do you think that is?

C12: It’s like putting your ideas to people, it doesn’t seem to go anywhere. Y’know, saying ‘well, if you change this bit’, then he’ll say, he’ll have a go and say ‘no, no, no’, other people having a go at you for saying it, you know, so if you say something about something you’ve got somebody coming behind saying ‘what you have to do that for’.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationship between peer pressure and organisational innovation.

4.2.9.3 Role and task definition

Specifically regarding influences on creativity, the following excerpts support research which argues that innovative behaviour is a function of role (Ettlie & Subramaniam 2004).
and task definition (Scott & Bruce 1994) in that undefined tasks generate innovative solutions.

C25: Well again I think it depends on which area of the company you’re in, I mean if you’re in contact with the customer, it could be customer feedback. If you’re on the production floor it could be something you see. You’re doing a specific job in a certain way, and you can see it being done better, so it’s very dependant on where you are within the company.

C23: I think in general, the research and development department, it’s the sort of challenges calling that sort of result in the ideas, so if your design brief is a design before you’re allowed to be flexible, and, sort of push the boundaries of ... where your ideas are.

C46: I think that if you want to have a complete, open thinking and more of an entrepreneurial, sort of ... route forward, then it’s quite nice that ... that, ‘well this is what I want to achieve, I’ve got absolutely no idea how we’re gonna get there, but ... this is what I want, us to look like when this task is complete’, and with no constraints of the way the business has been, operating or ... that ‘you can’t do that because’ ... let’s just forget about all of that and say ‘well, that’s what we want to achieve, what do we need to do to get there?’.

However, this latter excerpt was made in response to the suggestion that a lack of leader expert task knowledge will lead to the subordinate feeling disrespect for their leader in that they (the leader) is considered to be unreasonable in asking the subordinate to succeed in a task that they (the leader) cannot (see below). Linking with previous discussions, this may illustrate the difference between entrepreneurial leaders who, as is typical with entrepreneurs, enjoy expert knowledge in their chosen field (De Carolis & Saparito 2006), versus a business manager who leads their subordinates in a transactional style (Burns 1978) and primarily as a bureaucratic controller of their tasks (Jones & Butler 1992).

C44: I think if you work for someone that doesn’t understand the task and is just telling you to do it, then, you feel a lack of respect
Discussions in the focus group meetings also suggested that role and task definition was related to propensity to take risks with some roles and tasks providing greater opportunities for risk-taking than others.

*C13*: I think [risk-taking applies] more downstairs than to us. Our job’s different.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationships between role and task definition, and organisational innovation.

### 4.2.9.4 Purpose and structure of organisation

The following excerpts support research which argues that the purpose and structure of the organisation, particularly when there is a need to cross boundaries of departments which are lead by separate leaders, can also influence innovation (Mintzberg & Waters 1982).

*C26*: For me it could be a departmental goal largely. If the department has any strategy that drives you to work towards [the] departmental goal, it could be monthly goal or six months, or anything like that. So you work towards achieving that goal no matter where you boss stands really.

*C44*: I think this depends, on whether it’s internally a good, internally, idea improvement within your own department, in which case if you have that support and coaching and stuff, it’s probably an accurate model. If it involves, other departments to become involved then there could be all kinds of barriers that are not mentioned there [referring to ‘implementing ideas’ model].

*C14*: I think, yeah possibly, a lot of people do have ideas but there’s also, like in this particular company, there’s also a lot of people that have been here a very long time, that are stuck in their ways, like ‘this is my job, I don’t wanna do this job. I don’t wanna sit on this bench and do this for 10 minutes because I wanna do this’. It’s like split departments as well and people obviously are supervised under different people, unless they’re told by their particular supervisor to do that, they prefer not to.
Furthermore, and linking into above excerpts on autonomy, inflexible, rigid organisational structures can also adversely affect innovation by limiting perceptions of autonomy (Amabile 1992), an argument which is supported by the following excerpt.

*C44:* Within this model ['implementing ideas' model], if I was in the department that was implementing the idea, yes probably. But if you're in a different department, you may not have the same support structure, in that case you may not feel any power to communicate your issues or your ideas.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationships between the purpose and structure of organisations, and organisational innovation.

### 4.2.9.5 Internal organisational culture

Previous research has argued that the internal organisational culture will affect innovation (Kuratko et al 1993; Eesley & Longenecker 2006), specifically when employees feel there is no support structure from colleagues and to assist them (Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007). The following excerpt supports this research by linking a lack of togetherness and support, a 'family' feeling, with apathy and inaction.

*C12:* Because it's not a family. They're not close I think, that's what it is. Nobody wants to get in there and sort it, because, if things were sorted out rightly and things were put in order, the process of everything would run smooth. But at the moment it's, doesn't seem to be doing that. I know what's the problem, I see it downstairs, all the stuff that's around and nobody seems to want to do anything about it.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationship between internal organisational culture and organisational innovation.
4.2.9.6 Open and free communications

The following excerpts suggest that open and free communications are antecedents of innovation (Miller 1983).

C25: Yeah, I think it's the fact that you've, well, certainly for me I feel you can go and talk to anybody within the company and you can bounce ideas off them no matter whether it's [C21] or [colleague] or someone in the R&D department, and then by talking with that person that obviously generates more ideas, y'know they might have different ideas and that springs, sparks something within you, so, I think because it is an open culture and you, certainly I feel that you can go and, I mean I've been here a long time but, I feel I can go and talk to anybody within the company.

C24: Yeah, that's very true actually [C25] 'cause [C21] is very approachable. You can always go and knock on his door and he would always listen, and you're right [C25] that applies to everybody really. So you wouldn't be in fear of thinking 'oh I can't ask, I've got a problem'. Go and ask him!

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationship between open and free communications, and organisational innovation.

4.2.9.7 External market

The following excerpts support research which argues that external market-based drivers influence organisational innovation (Terreberry 1968, Lawless & Anderson 1996).

C24: We don't work in isolation do we and it depends we have different jobs around here, bit of a mixture, but for what I do, I'm greatly influenced on the customer ... chasing me, so it's, I'm probably more customer focused than I am thinking about my boss if you see what I mean.

C21: ... and that is really an important point, for a lot of people, it's the response which they get from outside, they talk to the customer and they get a, they service something they makes a customer happy or they answer a question which they have had and that is what drives them, and that is when they come up with the idea

C26: Set by the industry, set by the company strategy I suppose.
However, and as argued in Chapter 3, the nature of the external market may also determine that the licence to be innovative is curtailed for the very good reason of ensuring on-going compliance with strict legislative requirements (Ramaswami 1996), as highlighted in the following excerpt.

C52: I think you’ve got to take into consideration the nature of the business that you work in, and the individual specific job role. Imagine an employee, who has to, whose primary care, is to follow legislative, for instance, health and safety rules. The scope to be entrepreneurial, within that environment, is probably very limited and also, the scope for a manager to encourage deviation could be potentially fatal.

Thus the focus group meetings offered support for the relationship between the external market and organisational innovation.

4.2.9.8 Preeminent antecedent of idea implementation

Finally, the focus group meetings culminated in an open-ended question as to what was the preeminent antecedent of idea implementation as far as the focus group members themselves were concerned. The following excerpts support the main argument of this thesis that, from a subordinate’s perspective, it is primarily leader behaviour which ultimately decides on whether an employee progresses from having an idea, to seeking help from colleagues, to its eventual implementation.

RE: What's the most important issue for you in terms of whether you carry forward an idea or not and implement it?

C11: Some people may have an idea but don’t know how to go about it. Maybe they need a bit more advice, how can this grow. So you need to be confident in your idea then your supervisor needs to be there and listen. You need that relationship where you’re comfortable to put that forward.

C14: To have the feeling that you’re actually being listened to by your supervisor or whoever you’re telling your idea to.

C12: The supervisor [if] he’s willing to listen to you and help you through it.
In summary, the above excerpts suggest that the most important issue to idea implementation (to the focus group members concerned) is being listened to by their leaders. Displaying empathy to one's subordinates has been defined as a constituent of TLB which emanates from the leader's emotional intelligence (Barbuto & Burbach 2006). Furthermore, the provision of support and encouragement to one's subordinates is also argued to indicate TLB (Podsakoff et al 1990) and is cited in the following excerpts as being most important issue to idea implementation.

C13: More support than anything else from the supervisor. If you're implementing any ideas, if you have that support then obviously you go further, or you take the risk and you do it yourself.

C22: It's the support of the supervisor.

C43: Getting the backing, if I implement this, from my manager.

C24: Encouragement from your boss. It's just basic human nature. We all respond to a bit of encouragement. If you get slapped down, you feel flat don't you? So, you've only got somebody to say thank you for something. It could be your boss, could be a customer, it could be anything really but that bit of encouragement is good. It builds you up and you want to aspire to other things.

C53: It would be the encouragement to do it; above, and below, from the team.

C54: Encouragement, underpinned by open minded but active leadership.

Trust between a leader and their subordinate has also been argued to be an important element in their relationship in that leader behaviour will develop into a transformational style based on a growing level of trust with the subordinate (Scandura & Pellegrini 2008).

The excerpts below suggest that trust between leader, subordinates and peers is the most important issue to idea implementation.
C21: For me it’s the trust from my boss. If I’ve got an idea and he tells me ‘get on with it’ rather than ‘oh, what about this, what about that’, if he questions it too much and analyses too much, I think he will kill it for me.

C34: If you haven’t got confidence in your boss then you’re in the wrong job. You’ve got to get on with your boss. I may not agree with everything my immediate boss does or the opinions she may have but she does support me. Whether it be from a personal aspect, she’s been very good with me. She’s very easy to talk to. If you haven’t got that trust in the people you work with it doesn’t bode for a very good working relationship.

In the following excerpts, it is also interesting to record the apparent fear of the potential reactions from one’s leader and colleagues which prevents ideas from being presented since it has been argued that idea generation networks that are constituted by same-sex and same-seniority personnel may suppress novel, creative ideas due to friendship/peer linkages amongst the network members and that therefore the status of the supervisor in idea generation networks is critical in allowing new ideas to be aired (Ohly et al 2010).

C31: The reaction of the boss particularly if the result is negative. If you fear you’re going to be hit for a failed attempt, you’re not gonna take on anything unless you have confidence that your boss is going to back you.

C64: How far it would leave me exposed to attack by my senior supervisors.

C63: A fear of not being able to complete something that I tried to implement. That would stop me implementing an idea because of thinking ‘am I going to be able to complete this to my satisfaction and everybody else’s?’ Also, the perception of your colleagues on how you’ve performed. If you said ‘I’m going to go and build this and it’s going to be in that corner, and it’s gonna be done by 2011, and you don’t finish it, and it’s not done, then it’s a monument to your failure isn’t it? Your immediate superior would see that you were someone who maybe couldn’t be trusted with a major task.

C46: It would be whether my direct reports would support the idea as well. If they are in some way confused about what the idea might be and the impact that it could possible have on them and they feel that it would be a negative impact on them, then I wouldn’t get their buy-in to be able to implement it. From an upward chain, if it’s a sensible and good business idea, then I’m sure it would be supported by my bosses. But there could be a different impact on the people that report to me and certainly, the success of its implementation depends on their impression of it.
From a leader's perspective (several of the focus group members were also leaders of their own teams) the above excerpts support arguments that it is the leader's own abilities to influence their subordinates, build trust and overcome resistance to change (Kiefer 2005) and be able to overcome their subordinates' negative emotions about the idea (Beer et al 2005) which are also critical to successful idea implementation. These concepts are also referenced throughout this thesis based on the principal of the cascading effect of leadership (Avolio & Bass 1995).

Finally, focus group members suggested that the most important issues in determining whether or not ideas are carried forward to implementation are the nature of the decisions being made and whether or not the subordinate feels the decisions are for the overall good of the business. This phenomenon may be informed by research which argues that an organisation's strategic focus can have a major impact on innovation (Ireland & Hitt 2005) particularly if subordinates feel that the idea is for the overall good of the business and essential to the organisation, as indicated below.

C51: It would depend on the actual decision, what it was concerning. For some things my bosses would be the biggest influence, otherwise if I thought it was an essential decision then I would probably do it and deal with it later.

C45: It depends on what the idea is. If it's a way of changing the way I run my section, then I would want the buy-in of all the people that are working for me. But if it's a procedure change, then I would have to get the backing of my immediate superior I suppose, or I may need to get help from an engineer. It depends what the idea is and where it's going really.

C52: For me, it's for the overall, good of the business. My, primary concern is that, we all prosper together and we all move forward together, and it's governed by the opportunities that could be realised.
4.3 Study II discussion

The above analyses offer support for the 'implementing ideas' and 'not implementing ideas' models and also lend support to the hypothesised relationships from Study I between idea implementation and autonomy, idea implementation and propensity to take risks, idea implementation and creativity, autonomy and LMX, creativity and LMX, and LMX and TLB. Whilst no relationship between propensity to take risks and LMX was found in Study I, the above analysis does nonetheless suggest that leaders play an important role in encouraging subordinates to take risks. The reason for this apparent difference in results may lie in the arguments highlighted in Section 3.1.3 in that research has questioned the applicability of the scale used in Study I to measure propensity to take risks within a corporate entrepreneurship context (Kuo-Ting & Chanchai 2010). Further research would therefore seem to be required to further understand the apparent difference between the Study I and II results.

Regarding the results as of the overall validity of the two models, it is interesting to observe that the 'not implementing ideas' model appeared to be more readily accepted as accurate (both unconditional and via contingency) than did the 'implementing ideas' model. This is especially interesting when considering that the two models were in fact identical in terms of the hypothesised associations between variables with the only difference being the particular behaviours and subsequent effects within each model sub-category which resulted in the implementation of ideas, or not. The higher acceptance to accuracy of the 'not implementing ideas' model, which many of the focus group members referred to as the 'bad', 'negative' or 'scary' model, may be informed by a phenomenon which researchers have argued pervades people's perceptions whereby, in a situation where an event can be described between a choice of good or bad news, the
good news is discounted in favour of the bad news which is more readily accepted (Oliver & Winer 1987; Kopalle & Lehmann 1995). Further research would therefore seem to be required to better understand this phenomenon in a corporate entrepreneurship setting.

The above analyses also produce an interesting suggestion that perhaps both the ‘implementing’ and ‘non implementing’ models accurately represent behavioural experiences in the same organisation but at different moments in time, and that therefore neither model describes the permanent state of relationship between the leader and their subordinate. As argued above, the idea of leader behaviour changing to suit the organisational context is supported by previous research (Oke et al 2009). It is therefore possible that both the ‘implementing ideas’ and ‘not implementing ideas’ models are found in all companies but with there being a predominance of one model or the other prevailing in entrepreneurial or non-entrepreneurial organisations respectively. To clarify, even in so-called entrepreneurial companies, the ‘not implementing ideas’ model may exist from time to time but perhaps it exists in a minority of situations compared to the ‘implementing ideas’ model. Thus, it is not suggested that there is any permanency to the ‘implementing ideas’ or ‘not implementing ideas’ relationships as it seems logical that a temporary ‘implementing ideas’ relationship will result in a person implementing their ideas, only for that subordinate behaviour to cease as soon as this enabling relationship style and behaviour stops. Furthermore, it is interesting to consider whether these two behavioural models represent the complete ‘whole’ of the data set relating to the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates. It raises the question of whether there is indeed a binary, digital cultural experience for the subordinate in that leader/subordinate relationships are always one or either of the
'implementing ideas' and 'not implementing ideas' models, or whether there is a 3rd behavioural state in the middle of these two; a state of 'quiescence'? In sum, it may therefore be that these two models co-exist in a dynamic and further research is needed to investigate this potential relationship.

To consider this issue from other perspectives, from the performance context within the six focus group meeting companies, it seems that some companies in EngCo were experiencing a more innovative culture/environment than others yet all companies are members of the same PLC Group and have the same CEO. Further still, the above analysis suggests that employees within the same company experience a difference in innovative culture compared to their peers in other parts of the same company, and yet they all have the same Managing Director. Interweaving with arguments in previous chapters, a number of other questions are now raised. Does an employee who experiences an entrepreneurial culture, do so depending on the nature of their relationship with their immediate supervisor? What proportion of the subordinate's feelings are based on their perceptions of their individual LMX quality versus the impact of the overall culture of the team, unit, section or company they work within? A subordinate who experiences the switching between a 'non' to an 'implementing' relationship with their leader (as described above) might well immediately be encouraged to start to generating ideas, but in terms of implementing them, does their belief that the change in their leader's behaviour is authentic take longer to manifest and so delay the necessary feelings of autonomy and risk-taking that, this thesis argues, are necessary for ideas to be implemented? Is there a curvilinear relationship inferred in this last question in that in the first few times the subordinate experiences the switch to the 'implementing' behaviour, it takes some time for the subordinate to be truly convinced of their leader's authentic
support, but the longer the subordinate works with their leader, and the more times the leader toggles back into their 'non implementing' behavioural style, does the subordinate take longer and longer to be convinced of their leader’s support? These questions may be informed by research into socialised charismatic leadership in which it is argued that the leader-subordinate relationship is less dependent on physical contact and direct reporting to the leader and more dependent on the leader’s message and specifically whether the subordinate considers that “the charismatic relationship provides them [the subordinate] with a means for expressing their important values” (Howell & Shamir 2005: 100). It would appear that further research is required to answer these questions.

Finally, and considering the research design and administration of the focus group meetings, it was found that four persons in a focus group was the optimum number in that within the groups containing five and six members, the group-dynamic was too complex and it allowed for one or two members to remain somewhat in the background of discussions and to contribute less during the meeting than the others. It could also be that the duration of the meetings (1 hour) allowed some members to contribute less and future studies may wish to experiment with longer duration discussions.

In summary, Study II addressed the research question by subjecting the results of Study I to further scrutiny in order that they be questioned, corroborated or challenged. The subsequent analysis shows support for Study I results and both the ‘implementing ideas’ and ‘not implementing ideas’ behavioural models. However a number of subsequent questions above have also been developed and are recommended for future research (plus see Figure 6.2 in Chapter 6 Conclusions which summarises the main findings and overall theoretical contribution of this research).
Chapter 5 Study III

5.1 Study III research methodology

Study III addressed the research question as to 'the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates' by documenting the researcher's personal experience of the effect of their own leader's behaviour on the researcher's intentions or otherwise to implement ideas. Study III was designed as a longitudinal, autoethnographic chronicle which also provided a self-reflective overview of the researcher's personal journey throughout the process of this study. Consequently, this account simultaneously provides a "thick description" (Geertz 1973:3) of the research setting context and also records the researcher's interactions in and on that setting (Parry 2008). Previous research has argued that leader behaviour should be examined from its multiple perspectives namely, as an individual behaviour, as behaviour which impacts upon a group of people, and as behaviour which impacts upon an organisation as a whole (Avolio & Bass 1995). Consequently, it was decided to examine leader behaviour in vivo which gave rise to the longitudinal autoethnographic research methodology employed in Study III (after Morgan & Smircich 1980).

5.1.1 Ethnography

Autoethnography is informed by ethnography which is historically informed by anthropology. Since the environmental setting of this thesis is the workplace, the anthropological study of organisations is of particular relevance. Organisational anthropology utilising what some scholars have latterly termed ethnographic research methodologies, has a long and distinguished history (Durkheim 1893/1997; Mathewson 1931; Roethlisberger & Dickson 1939; Warner & Low 1947; Thernstrom 1964; Blumberg 1968). Moreover, the value of situationally-embedded research to the
understanding of the contextual environments of organisations is well-established (for example, Lewin 1947, Weber 1947). Progressing from these foundational studies, contemporary scholars have assisted with the definition of ethnography by arguing that ethnographic research is concerned with the link between culture and behaviour and how cultural processes develop and change over time (Forsythe 1998; Hall 1999; Byrne 2001; Fischer 2002). It has also been argued that ethnography "is a process of empathetically entering the psychic space of other human beings and, to the extent possible, translating the actions of those subjects by way of seeing the world from their point of view" (Churchill Jr., 2005: 5). Moreover, it has been proposed that "ethnography typically involves researchers spending extended periods of time (sometimes a year or longer) in one or more settings ... observing what goes on, talking to members of the setting, collecting documents and, on occasion, interviewing" in order to make sense of people's actions in context (Murphy & Dingwall 2007: 2224). Furthermore, workplace ethnography has been described as "a study, using observation or other ethnographic techniques, of a particular group of workers and their relations of conflict and cooperation with managers. Such a study in interested in how work gets done, and not in the purely social relationships that may happen to occur in the workplace" (Edwards & Bélanger 2008: 292). In support of this last study, ethnography has also been described as a way of writing about and analysing social life and describing "how things work" (Watson 2011: 214).

Other researchers have suggested that "Ethnography is first and foremost a social practice concerned with the study and representation of culture ... it is an interpretative craft, focused more on 'how' and 'why' than on 'how much' or 'how many' (Van Maanen
2011: 219), supporting the definition of ethnography as a qualitative methodology.

Furthermore, Rosen (1991) proposes that:

"Ethnography is a method for both data collection and analysis, each irrevocably mated to the other. It is based upon achieving a conscious and systematic interpretation of the culture system operating for those the ethnographer observes to those who may eventually take in the ethnographer's end product" Rosen (1991: 1).

In terms of considerations as to the value or worth of an ethnographic account, an excellent ethnography (Baba 2009) is proposed as one which is:

"both institutionally and problem oriented ... [and] places a historically grounded work community within the context of a situated social and geographic place ... taking a broadly historical and institutional approach to its subject matter" (Baba 2009: 45)

It also directly deals with the key issues facing anthropology, such as "globalization, technological transformation, morality and ethics of persons working in business" (Baba 2009: 45). The longitudinal nature and research setting (see below) of Study III respond positively to these quality requirements, it having been conducted over a six-year period and within an international business organisation.

Ethnographic data may also be utilised to create grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) since it has been argued that "grounded theory and ethnography ... [are] ... highly compatible, as ethnographic studies can provide ... useful data for grounded theory analysis (Pettigrew 2000: 258). Furthermore, Pettigrew (2000) suggests that "a useful way of conceptualising the relationship between ethnography and grounded theory is that grounded theory can formalize and extend the limited theoretical component of ethnography" (Pettigrew 2000: 258). Consequently, Study III was embarked upon with the additional requirement that the data should be collected and recorded to provide
future opportunity to generate grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967; Eisenhardt 1989b) via reference to “appropriate extant theories and literature that have relevance to the emerging, data grounded concepts” (Goulding 2005: 296). The collection and recording of data was thus enacted in such a way as to facilitate future analysis for grounded theory development, utilising the methods described by Butterfield, Trevino and Ball (1996) and Isabella (1990) (see below). It should be noted, however, that the scope of Study III in the present thesis did not extend to the development of grounded theory since its purpose was to address a research question derived from existing theories.

Ethnography and autoethnography are not without their critics however, with some scholars arguing that they are inferior compared to other qualitative methodologies such as participant observation which “allows researchers to observe what people do, while all the other empirical [research] methods are limited to reporting what people say about what they do” (Gans 1999: 540). Criticism of ethnography and autoethnography also emanates from Gans (1999) who claims that autoethnography “is basically autobiography written by sociologists” (Gans 1999: 542) and that “even if it is well meant and well done, this kind of ethnography has nothing to do with analysing what people do with and to each other in their groups and networks, or how institutions and communities function and malfunction” (Gans 1999: 542). Furthermore, Gans attacks ethnographers by suggesting that “at times, it is difficult not to suspect that some ethnographers are avoiding the hard work that fieldwork entails ... a few are simply engaged in ego trips, whether or not they know it” (1999: 542). Gans (1999) also levels a disparaging attack on ethnography and autoethnography by suggesting that it has nothing to do with social science but is “more concerned with autoethnographers understanding themselves” rather than the social setting (Gans 1999: 543-4). Considering further challenges to ethnography
and therefore also to autoethnography, it has been suggested that since "ethnographic research is emic in design" (i.e. attempts to describe occurrences as they are experienced by the subject) there is an acknowledged lack of objectivity in most ethnographic research (Pettigrew 2000: 256). Ethical considerations also appear to pose challenges to ethnography in relation to the nature of disclosure of the researcher's role and purpose. Specifically, it has been argued that the ethnographer should make it explicit that he/she is in fact a researcher to those being studied, that the participants know about the research and in which activities the researcher will and will not participate, and that the orientation of the researcher is known, along with how involved they are in the situation under study (Goulding 2005). Study III responded to these challenges by the overt nature of the twin roles of manager and researcher in the study setting. No attempt was made by the researcher to disguise their role, either as researcher or manager, with regular opportunities being afforded to (and taken by) the researcher to remind his leaders, peers and subordinates of the nature of the longitudinal research he was undertaking.

Specifically regarding the longitudinal nature of Study III, researchers have also suggested that such studies may pose ethical problems in terms of the extent of the initial informed consent to conduct the research (Murphy & Dingwall 2007). Progressively over time, the relationship between researcher and subjects may develop into friendship and the subjects "may divulge information to the researcher which is not intended to be written into the research findings" (Murphy & Dingwall 2007: 2226). Consequently, consideration of the researcher's position in the study setting is also befitting in that publication of information considered to be inappropriate or inaccurate may lead to serious ethical, legal, career or personal threats directed at the researcher. Thus, there is a potential dilemma for ethnographers in terms of what data are published:
"Is the purpose of ethnography merely to provide an accurate, if partial, picture of the field ... or should ethnography be utilized as an instrument to expose illegal, exploitative and corrupt practices? If the latter, how and through what means might this be achieved? Do we have a duty to ensure that we leave the workplace in the state in which we found it? Or should we seek to bring about change and improvement, irrespective of whether or not this distorts the field during the research process itself or later through publication?" (Brannan, Pearson & Worthington 2007: 400).

It therefore appears that the nature of the ethnographer's role within the research setting is critical to the accuracy of data collection, data interpretation, publication and their personal well-being and that of other participants. In another consideration as to the ethnographer's role, it has been suggested that they should be aware of, and carefully manage, the balance between being an observer in the setting and being a participant in the activities under research (Castellano 2007). Whilst “the power of ethnography stems from the researcher's close observation of and participation in a particular social setting” (Castellano 2007: 704), it is also proposed that “ethnographers ... are commonly confronted with dilemmas involving physical risk, highly sensitive data, marginalized clientele, and the exploitative use of power and domination by institutional gatekeepers” (Castellano 2007: 705). To assist with the ethnographer's considerations as to their role in the research setting, Castellano (2007) has created four strategies which arguably help the (auto) ethnographer position themselves within the research setting depending on whether they will become more or less embedded in the setting in their dual roles as researcher and member/participant of the group (Castellano 2007: 707) (Figure 5.1).

The four strategies suggested actions for the researcher of this thesis, for example, when anchored in the role of researcher, undisguised data collection such as for Studies I and II was demonstrably enacted. Conversely, the researcher was able to anchor themselves as a member of EngCo by participating in evening social gatherings with peers and
subordinates and so was able to gain acceptance as a member of their respective social and cultural groupings (see Figure 5.1).

**Figure 5.1 Castellano’s (2007) Four-Strategies Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Member/Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anchoring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Distancing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying research protocols to collect data and protect informants’ rights</td>
<td>Deepening participation in member activities to gain acceptance into member culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiding or downplaying research tasks and activities, e.g. via feigning disinterest in a phenomenon</td>
<td>Withdrawing from participant activities to avoid over rapport with members e.g. via declaring oneself as a non-expert to carry out a particular activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Autoethnography

Autoethnography has been described as the cultural study of “one’s own people” (Rosen 1991: 4, after Hayano 1979) with organisational ethnographers being researchers who “largely study organizations peopled by individuals like themselves” (Rosen 1991: 4). It has been suggested that the goal of autoethnography is to “produce an essay that sheds light on some aspect of humanity as reflected in the everyday life of the consumer in general and the author in particular” (Holbrook 2005: 45). Furthermore, autoethnography is more likely to “unearth and illuminate the tacit and subaltern aspects of organization ... due to its insightful, first-person, aesthetically written and culturally rich reading of organisational life” (Boyle & Parry 2007: 186-7) particularly where extant literature is “weaved into the narrative” (Boyle & Parry 2007: 188) but also where it is combined
with other research methodologies (O’Byrne 2007). Study III acceded to these descriptions of autoethnography by the recording of the researcher’s personal diary notes and by Study III being but one of three studies utilising different and complementary methodologies (see Chapter 2). As defined by the term ‘auto’ however, autoethnography is also about the ‘self’ of the ethnographer in that “autoethnography concentrates on the study of personal and biographical documents which, intentionally or unintentionally, offer information about the structure, dynamics and function of the consciousness of the author, especially in relation to that cultural context” (Vickers 2007: 224). Narratives about oneself “can be thought of as being distributed among the individual and the whole group of others with whom they interact” (Vickers 2007: 225) but are nonetheless “profoundly situational, contingent on the changing fabric of a person’s entire social experiences, as well as their interactions with others and the organisation” Vickers 2007: 225). The arguments by Vickers (2007) also suggest that the autoethnographer should be aware of the impact they themselves have on the research setting particularly as, by its nature “autoethnography is a reflexive and emotive personal narrative” (Parry 2008: 127) and that “the intensely reflexive nature of autoethnography as an autobiographical form of research, allows the researcher to intimately connect the person with the organization through a peeling back of multiple layers of consciousness, thoughts, feelings and beliefs” (Parry 2008: 128). The emotional aspect of the narrative is also argued to be important in that “the emotional impact of the narrative helps to impart knowledge to the reader” (Parry 2008: 129) and as demonstrated by the researcher’s diary notes (see below).

In related arguments, researchers have placed autoethnographies on a philosophical continuum from individuals studying their own life and experiences “in the attempt to
understand larger social or cultural phenomena” (Butz & Besio 2009: 1665, after Denzin, 1989), through to a ‘mid-point’ of researchers being embedded into the group about which he/she is researching (Butz & Besio 2009), to the research subjects themselves being the authors of their own self-study (Butz & Besio 2009). Study III resides towards the latter end of this continuum with the researcher being a full-time permanent member of the research subject EngCo.

In other considerations of autoethnography, a leading contemporary scholar in the discipline defines ‘analytic autoethnography’ (Anderson 2006) as where the autoethnographer is “a permanent member of the group under study, most often having acquired familiarity with the group by, for example, occupational participation, and having joined the group prior to deciding to conduct research on the group” (Anderson 2006: 379). However, and echoing considerations made by Castellano (2007) above, Anderson (2006) suggest that the researcher is not just a member of the group, but “they are also a social scientist with a requirement to observe and record group activity … [and] … the tension and role conflict on the researcher of having to perform as a group member and as a social scientist can be manifest (Anderson 2006: 380). Furthermore and in terms of data analysis, it is argued that researchers “must recognise the distinction between their own actions as members of the group and the actions of the group” (Anderson 2006: 381). Analytic autoethnography (Anderson 2006) is also defined by an acceptance by the autoethnographer that they are not only representing the processes of the group they are observing, “but are themselves affected by those processes” (Anderson 2006: 383). The diary notes which follow clearly indicate this process in action in relation to now the researcher is affected by the actions of EngCo.
In terms of the capture and analysis of autoethnographic data, Anderson (personal communication) suggests that autoethnographic fieldnotes or other appropriate autoethnographic data is kept and analysed as per other ethnographic data (see below). The narrative from Anderson (2006) is also congruent with views of other leading autoethnographers. Ellis (personal communication) suggests that autoethnography utilises narrative analysis or what she terms “thinking with a story” instead of about a story. Thus the interweaving of existing theories within the autoethnographic narrative would seem very important for the acceptance of data, certainly as considered by contemporary leading scholars of this methodology.

In further consideration of arguments concerning the acceptance of data from autoethnography, its theoretical and empirical value, practical generalisability and ethical considerations relating to data capture, it has been suggested that “autoethnographic research is principally of interest where one’s own troubles also happen to correspond to wider issues” (Blenkinsopp 2007: 255, original emphasis). This suggestion may be informed by Mills (1958) who proposed the term ‘sociological imagination’ as the capacity to recognise and understand the relationship between large-scale social forces acting within and by society as a whole, and the actions of individuals as discrete components of that society. It also speaks of the issue of the generalisation of research data from the individual experience to relevance for wider populations. It has further been suggested that whilst autoethnography may not be able to claim objective or scientific accuracy, “its validity lies more in it being an honest and accurate description of how [the autoethnographer] experienced the situation” (Blenkinsopp 2007: 255). It is suggested, perhaps controversially for some scholars, that it is less important whether the actions recorded actually took place as described “but crucially important that the account
honestly reflects [the autoethnographer's] perception and analysis of the situation at the time” (Blenkinsopp 2007: 255). In terms of data reliability, in a similar vein to ethnography, autoethnographies have to overcome the epistemological accusation that the account is not accurate. It is therefore suggested that autoethnographers take care when writing and post-editing to “distinguish between their perceptions then and now” and not to mislead or confuse the reader with “caveats and nuances” in the writing (Blenkinsopp 2007: 256). Autoethnography must also attempt to preserve anonymity and confidentiality of research subjects “by deliberately altering names and other details” (Blenkinsopp 2007: 256), advice that was heeded for Study III.

Further, and as with ethnography per se, autoethnography has its critics and challengers. It has been proposed that autoethnography has inherent data-based problems such as the ability to generalise beyond the interpretation of a single researcher’s perspective (Boyle & Parry 2007). Autoethnography has also been labeled “the least successful” of the new qualitative research methodologies since “there is no reason for the autoethnographers to think that they are bigger, smarter, nicer or better observers than anyone else” other than their “class-based smugness” (Dennis 2005: 475-6). Criticism of autoethnographers as authors is also forthcoming in that researchers “especially those who come from positions of privilege, had better bring considerable talent in writing to the table, or else their autoethnographies may lack sociological merit, or literary merit, or both” (Dennis 2005: 476). Thus, and acknowledging the above critiques of autoethnography, Study III progressed as part of a complimentary research strategy and incorporated the methodology cited above in the attempt to maximise data reliability and acceptability amongst scholars from disparate research paradigms (and as previously extensively argued in Section 2.1).
5.1.3 Research setting and procedure

The research setting for Study III was EngCo, i.e. the same setting as for Studies I and II. Permission to conduct this research was given by a member of the executive board of EngCo. The researcher’s position within the EngCo hierarchy is contained in Figure 5.2, a position which also permitted the researcher to directly observe 50 other leadership-subordinate dyads within the Group.

Figure 5.2 Study III perspectives

Primary data from directly experienced and observed relationships was recorded in the form of personal diary notes which were chronologically stored and which subsequently
allowed for a logical review of data as if reading a novel. Secondary data was also collected, being available in the form of publicly available documents. Primary diary note data was collected only if it offered the possibility to inform the research question, i.e., it was able to inform the general case of the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates. In the early stages of the autoethnography, data was collected on the basis that it might at some stage inform the research question, but as the study progressed and Studies I and II were conducted, a tighter focus of experiences and phenomena were collected as it became clearer as to what themes and contextual information would most likely inform the research question.

The personal diary notes were transcribed, coded and content analysed (Miles & Huberman 1984) utilising the methods described by Butterfield et al (1996) and Isabella (1990) since these are established tools for analysing qualitative data (Pettigrew 2000). Furthermore, it was recognised that contamination may occur during data analysis via:

"the transformational process by which field data is captured by the investigator and reassembled for the reader ... [since] ... the unavoidable reshaping of that data in the subjective territory of the ethnographer's mind must be examined as either a weakness for its skewing of data or a strength for the interpretive light it sheds on the data" (Churchill Jr., 2005: 4).

Researchers have argued that to avoid such contamination, "the participant observer may ask the subject to review the ethnographic account and provide a more truthful rendering of events" (Churchill Jr., 2005: 6). Furthermore, it has been proposed that in order for the ethnographer to provide a balanced interpretation of what is seen and heard (Partington 2000), a dual account of proceedings should be recorded: one a narrative of events and the other an analysis with reference to a theoretical framework (Laffan 1997). Although the need to obviate against data contamination was recognised, the researcher also felt the
need to balance this requirement against another consideration relating to the accuracy of collected data. Whilst the researcher was a full-time employee of EngCo and permission had been granted for the research to be conducted, the researcher nonetheless felt a degree of unease about sharing their personal experiences with others in the Group. As will be demonstrated by the content of the diary notes, the researcher sensed personal risk associated with sharing the diary notes in that the researcher might be rejected, ostracised or punished (a phenomenon recognised in previous research, Edmondson 1999) or at very least, pressure might be applied to the researcher to alter their depiction of events.

5.2 Study III results and analysis

5.2.1 Results - selected diary notes

The purpose of Study III was to inform the research question by primarily documenting the researcher's personal experience of the effect of their own leader's behaviour on the researcher's intentions or otherwise to implement ideas, together with recording relevant data from observed relationships which informed the research question. The results of Study III were realised in the form of the researcher's personal diary notes which were selected for inclusion specifically on the above basis with the majority of notes dealing with the researcher's relationship with their leader. As will be seen below, practically all the diary notes are presented in chronological order to satisfy the Study III purpose of providing a longitudinal perspective of the researcher's journey throughout the process of this study. Demographic information relating to the research subjects is contained in Appendix 4 with identities of individuals disguised for purposes of anonymity (Blenkinsopp 2007). A defining element of an autoethnography is in the display of the researcher's personal emotions (Parry 2008) and the reader is thus advised that some of the language used in the diary notes is emotive and may cause offence.
al 1996: 1483) into "preliminary categories ... to organize the data ... [by] common issues and concerns ... similar specific facts ... similar observations ... identical recollections of the past" (Isabella 1990: 13). The thought-units were coded into "as many categories of analysis as possible" (Glaser & Strauss 1967: 105) with the categories being continually modified with "old ones eliminated; new ones created to account for newly acquired evidence" (Isabella 1990: 13) and the goal was to "minimise differences between thought-units within a category; but to maximise the differences between thought-units of different categories" (Butterfield et al 1996: 1483). During the process of placing thought-units into specific categories, they were constantly compared "with previous incidents coded in the same category" (Glaser & Strauss 1967: 106) and regular pauses were introduced into the process to facilitate reflection as to the coding of a thought unit into a particular category (Glaser & Strauss 1967).

The coding of thought-units into categories has been called "the most inductive phase of the analysis" (Butterfield et al 1996: 1483) and therefore action was taken in the attempt to obviate potential researcher bias. An independent reviewer, "blind" to the research project (Isabella 1990:13) was introduced to code 20% (Butterfield et al 1996) of randomly chosen thought-units into categories and the goal was to achieve an inter-rater reliability of >0.8 (Butterfield et al 1996) to provide evidence that emergent categories fitted the data. A second blind researcher, independent from the first, repeated the process and clusters of thought-units emerged which possessed 'different degrees of the said categorization' (Glaser & Strauss 1967: 106). Finally, "coded categories and their relationships with one another [were] examined for patterns, themes and processes" (Isabella 1990: 13) with "unifying themes" (Butterfield et al 1996: 1483) emerging from the categories.
5.2.3 Thought-units and sub-categories

From the diary notes, 652 unique thought-units (Butterfield et al 1996) were extracted and are shown in the appendices. From these thought-units, and utilising the analytical methodology described above, 33 sub-categories were created with feedback received from Blind Researcher No.1 (see Figure 5.3).

5.2.4 Categories and unifying themes

With the feedback of Blind Researcher No. 1, the 33 sub-categories were formed into 12 categories, as shown in Figure 5.4. Blind Researcher No. 2 coded 132 (20.25%) thought-units into these 12 categories and an inter-rater agreement of 83% was achieved which lent support to the claim that the emergent categories offered an acceptable fit to the data. Following the creation of the 12 categories, eight unifying themes emerged (see Figure 5.5).

5.2.5 Main groupings

From the eight unifying themes, via an intuitive ‘creative leap’ (Isabella 1990), but also informed by literature, the unifying themes then formed three main groupings (Figure 5.6).

5.3 Study III discussion

Study III addressed the research question by documenting the researcher’s personal experience of the effect of their own leader’s behaviour on the researcher’s intentions to implement ideas. It also provided a self-reflective overview of the researcher’s journey throughout the entire study and in so-doing recorded the context of the study setting, the researcher’s impact on that setting and satisfied the requirement to assist in understanding the organisational and environmental conditions under which the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates may be stronger or weaker.
Figure 5.3 - 33 sub-categories

SC1 My leader insults & ignores me, doesn’t back me & can be disingenuous
SC2 I’m confused & don’t feel I can respect, trust & be honest with my leader
SC3 I’m suspicious of my peers and colleagues who seem fêted
SC4 My boss’ behaviour makes me switch off, but I will correct him if needed
SC5 Our leaders manipulate us, inflict pain & abuse their seniority
SC6 Staff are frightened of; resent & dislike leaders, especially when they fight
SC7 We’re not honest with each other, even when the leaders are wrong
SC8 My leader treats and manages me well
SC9 I trust my leaders’ abilities; share their goals & know my objectives
SC10 I want a better relationship with my leader; to accept their influence
SC11 I intend to act positively; I will help my leader and develop myself
SC12 My company acts positively; it’s a good atmosphere for innovation
SC13 I feel happy in my company; I want to achieve awards & stay a long time
SC14 I will fight to improve and grow my company, year after year
SC15 I judge myself harshly but recognise the impact of my behaviour on others
SC16 I’m frustrated, too emotional and work & private-life pressure is intense
SC17 I will be careful and control situations & communications on my terms
SC18 Leaders can be bureaucratic, self-centred and blasé
SC19 Our leaders are inconsistent, risk-averse, lack social skills & cohesion
SC20 Our leaders should do more on change & innovation
SC21 My company has problems with its communications; pay; culture etc
SC22 My company has specific issues which are working against innovation
SC23 External influences affect me and my company
SC24 These are hard times; no aspirations, unrealistic goals; I’m sick & tired
SC25 I’m focused on personal needs; more coaching & persevering with ideas
SC26 I tell my staff we’re all in this together; thank them & let them take sensible risks
SC27 I have positive experiences with my staff & reflect on my leadership style
SC28 I’ll show staff dignity in difficult times but will challenge them too
SC29 I have to be somewhat guarded with my staff & also control their risk-taking
SC30 My leader affects my relationships with my subordinates
SC31 My staff are drained; they don’t listen or show any urgency or respect
SC32 My employees are ignorant, perform poorly & will never change
SC33 I can do better than my employees who can be tiring & political
### Figure 5.4 - 12 categories

**Category 1 = My leader treats me/us badly**  
SC1 My leader insults & ignores me, doesn’t back me & can be disingenuous  
SC5 Our leaders manipulate us, inflict pain & abuse their seniority  

**Category 2 = I/we don’t like our leader**  
SC2 I’m confused & don’t feel I can respect, trust & be honest with my leader  
SC4 My boss’ behaviour makes me switch off, but I will correct him if needed  
SC6 Staff are frightened of; resent & dislike leaders, especially when they fight  
SC7 We’re not honest with each other, even when the leaders are wrong  

**Category 3 = Poor relationship between peers and colleagues**  
SC3 I’m suspicious of my peers and colleagues who seem fêted  

**Category 4 = Good relationship between leaders and subordinates**  
SC8 My leader treats and manages me well  
SC9 I trust my leaders’ abilities; share their goals & know my objectives  
SC10 I want a better relationship with my leader; to accept their influence  
SC11 I intend to act positively; I will help my leader and develop myself  

**Category 5 = I feel and act positively in my company**  
SC12 My company acts positively; it’s a good atmosphere for innovation  
SC13 I feel happy in my company; I want to achieve awards & stay a long time  
SC14 I will fight to improve and grow my company, year after year  

**Category 6 = I feel bad about myself and my position**  
SC15 I judge myself harshly but recognise the impact of my behaviour on others  
SC16 I’m frustrated, too emotional and work & private-life pressure is intense  
SC17 I will be careful and control situations & communications on my terms  
SC24 These are hard times; no aspirations, unrealistic goals; I’m sick & tired  

**Category 7 = Our leaders aren’t good enough and should do more**  
SC18 Leaders can be bureaucratic, self-centred and blasé  
SC19 Our leaders are inconsistent, risk-averse, lack social skills & cohesion  
SC20 Our leaders should do more on change & innovation  

**Category 8 = My company has problems which work against innovation**  
SC21 My company has problems with its communications; pay; culture etc  
SC22 My company has specific issues which are working against innovation  

**Category 9 = External influences affect me**  
SC23 External influences affect me and my company  

**Category 10 = I am self-centred**  
SC25 I’m focused on personal needs; more coaching & persevering with ideas  

**Category 11 = I treat my subordinates well**  
SC26 I tell my staff we’re all in this together; thank them & let them take sensible risks  
SC27 I have positive experiences with my staff & reflect on my leadership style  
SC28 I’ll show staff dignity in difficult times but will challenge them too  

**Category 12 = I have a poor relationship with my poor employees**  
SC29 I have to be somewhat guarded with my staff & also control their risk-taking  
SC30 My leader affects my relationships with my subordinates  
SC31 My staff are drained; they don’t listen or show any urgency or respect  
SC32 My employees are ignorant, perform poorly & will never change  
SC33 I can do better than my employees who can be tiring & political
Figure 5.5 – Eight unifying themes

Unifying theme 1 = Poor leader behaviour
Category 1 = My leader treats me/us badly
Category 7 = Our leaders aren’t good enough and should do more

Unifying theme 2 = Poor LMX
Category 2 = I/we don’t like our leader
Category 12 = I have a poor relationship with my poor employees

Unifying theme 3 = Poor MMX
Category 3 = Poor relationship between peers and colleagues

Unifying theme 4 = Good LMX and leader behaviour
Category 4 = Good relationship between leaders and subordinates
Category 11 = I treat my subordinates well

Unifying theme 5 = I feel and act positively
Category 5 = I feel and act positively in my company

Unifying theme 6 = I feel and act negatively
Category 6 = I feel bad about myself and my position
Category 10 = I am self-centred

Unifying theme 7 = Company culture problems
Category 8 = My company has problems which work against innovation

Unifying theme 8 = External influences
Category 9 = External influences affect me

Figure 5.6 – Three main groupings

Group 1
Poor leader behaviour (Unifying theme 1)
Poor LMX (Unifying theme 2)
Poor MMX (Unifying theme 3)
I feel and act negatively (Unifying theme 6)
Company culture problems (Unifying theme 7)

Group 2
Good LMX and leader behaviour (Unifying theme 4)
I feel and act positively (Unifying theme 5)

Group 3
External influences (affect me) (Unifying theme 8)
First of all appraising the contribution of Study III to addressing the research question; the analysis of the diary notes into thought-units, sub-categories, categories, unifying themes and main groupings (see Figure 5.7), demonstrated that a number of different leader behaviours were enacted both between the researcher and leader (as suggested by previous research, Oke et al 2009) but also between the researcher and their subordinates.

**Figure 5.7 Study III hierarchy of data analysis**

![Hierarchy of data analysis diagram](image)

Specifically, the iterative analysis and reduction of 100,000 words of diary notes to 652 thought-units to 33 sub-categories to 12 categories to eight unifying themes to three main groupings (which was the point at which no further reduction analysis was possible), highlighted the substantive contributions of Study III to addressing the research question. Specifically, Group 1 of the main groupings suggests that leader behaviour described as insulting, disingenuous, bureaucratic and inconsistent is associated with poor leader-subordinate and peer-peer relationship quality as perceived and judged by the subordinate/peer. Moreover, Group 1 suggests that poor relationship quality is associated with perceptions on the part of the subordinate that they are operating within an
oppressive organisational culture under a siege mentality, with low self-esteem and an unwillingness to act to implement ideas. Group 2 suggests that leader behaviour described as showing trust in subordinates, sharing regular communication, proffering dignity and adopting an inclusive style towards subordinates is associated with a good leader-subordinate relationship, more positive moods by the subordinate and a willingness to experiment and take risks in the attempt to implement ideas. Group 3 suggests that external influences are important in whether subordinates implement ideas.

These findings are supported by previous research which argues that leader-subordinate relationship quality will affect subordinates' idea implementation plans (Ohly et al 2010) and that leaders who are not tolerant of mistakes nor allow risk-taking will adversely affect their subordinates' innovation intentions (Sundström & Zika-Viktorsson 2009). The findings are also supported by research which proposes that employee stress can increase where the leader does not emotionally support the employee or provide them with a clearly defined role (Harris & Kacmar 2006). Furthermore, the findings are also supported by previous studies which have argued that where a subordinate judges their leader to be acting unethically and to be uncaring of the effect of their decisions, the subordinate will withdraw from creative, innovative activity (Valentine et al 2011). Finally, researchers have also proposed that disingenuous and inauthentic leader behaviour will be recognised by subordinates when the leader's espoused values do not match their actual behaviour (Fu et al 2010); a phenomenon observed in the diary notes.

Considering now the issue of Study III fulfilling its purpose of providing an overview of the research context whilst also recording the researcher's impact on the study setting (Parry 2008), the diary notes contain imagery and language that the researcher believes
accurately describes the situations at hand and which pertained at the time the diary notes were created. Nevertheless it is also true that the temporally disparate process of analysing the diary notes for inclusion in this thesis has assisted a dispassionate review of the findings and allowed them to be set against relevant theoretical arguments to assist in the understanding of the phenomena under observation. The longitudinal nature of this study has also, through its structural definition, captured important contextual evolutionary events such as the researcher's personal advancement via promotion, a change in leadership for the researcher and the slow degradation of the relationship between the researcher and their leader. It is hereby suggested that a shorter time-span study, perhaps any period of less than 4 years, could not have fully captured the detail of these phenomena. Finally, considering the contribution of Study III to assist in the understanding the organisational and environmental conditions under which the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates may be stronger or weaker, it is interesting to note that the lowest LMX quality experienced by the researcher coincided with the height of the global economic recession, and the improvement in LMX coincided with the researcher's organisation recording their best ever performance in their history. Clearly, any causal relationships between these phenomena are unknown and thus should be the subject of future research.

Being an embedded autoethnographer within the research subject group has provided the opportunity to present a 'warts-and-all' view of organisational life in relation to, in this case, the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates. It is recommended that a similar autoethnographic methodology be used in future research to better understand the antecedents of risk-taking behaviour in organisations; a relationship which was not adequately explained by the results of either Study I or II.
Chapter 6 Conclusions

6.1 Summary of findings

Study I addressed the research question as to 'the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates' via the testing of seven hypotheses using multivariate statistical analyses. The analyses offered support for the positive relation between transformational leader behaviour (TLB), particularly the sub factors of 'high performance expectations' and 'individualised support', and leader-member (subordinate) exchange (LMX). The analyses also offered support for the positive relation between LMX and autonomy, LMX and creativity, creativity and idea implementation, and autonomy (particularly 'work criteria' factor) and idea implementation (particularly 'idea implementation' factor). Furthermore, support for the interrelationship between propensity to take risks and idea implementation was demonstrated in the correlation matrix. However, no support was found for a statistically significant relationship between leader-member exchange and propensity to take risks.

Study II addressed the research question by subjecting the results from Study I to further scrutiny via a series of focus group meetings in order that they be questioned, corroborated or challenged. The analyses of the focus group meeting transcripts indicated support for the 'implementing ideas' and 'not implementing ideas' models (presented to the focus group meetings) and also lent support to the hypothesised relationships from Study I between idea implementation and autonomy, idea implementation and propensity to take risks, idea implementation and creativity, autonomy and LMX, creativity and LMX, and LMX and TLB. Whilst no relationship between propensity to take risks and LMX was found in Study I, the analyses of Study II did nonetheless suggest that leaders play an important role in encouraging subordinates to take risks. The analyses also
suggested that both the 'implementing' and 'non implementing' models accurately represent behavioural experiences in the same organisation but at different moments in time, and that therefore neither model describes the permanent state of relationship between the leader and their subordinate. It is therefore possible that both the 'implementing ideas' and 'not implementing ideas' models are found in all companies but with there being a predominance of one model or the other prevailing in entrepreneurial or non-entrepreneurial organisations respectively. It is also interesting to consider whether these two behavioural models represent the entire, perhaps dynamic relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates or whether there is a 3rd behavioural state separating these two; a state of 'quiescence' (see Figure 6.1). Previously in Section 3.1.1.5, arguments were proposed that an innovation risk gap may exist which needs to be traversed in order for organisational innovation to be realised. Might it be that the state of quiescence, if it exists, is the innovation risk gap which (and as inferred by previous arguments) reduces in size for higher levels of TLB, specifically the encouragement from one's leader and their individualised support to perform highly? Further research is needed to investigate these potential relationships.

**Figure 6.1**
Possible dynamic of 'implementing ideas' and 'not implementing ideas' models
Study III addressed the research question by documenting the researcher’s personal experience of the effect of their own leader’s behaviour on the researcher’s intentions or otherwise to implement ideas. From the analysis of the results (diary notes) into thought-units, sub-categories, categories, unifying themes and main groupings, the substantive contribution of Study III to addressing the research question was highlighted by the suggestion that leader behaviour described as insulting, disingenuous, bureaucratic and inconsistent was associated with poor leader-subordinate and peer-peer relationship quality as perceived and judged by the subordinate. Moreover, poor leader-subordinate relationship quality was associated with perceptions on the part of the subordinate that they were operating within an oppressive organisational culture under a siege mentality, with low self-esteem and an unwillingness to act to implement ideas. Furthermore, leader behaviour described as showing trust in subordinates, sharing regular communication, proffering dignity and adopting an inclusive style towards subordinates was associated with a good leader-subordinate relationship, more positive moods by the subordinate and a willingness to experiment and take risks in the attempt to implement ideas.

6.2 Theoretical contribution

A review of literature demonstrated a surprising paucity of prior research which investigated the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship or organisational innovation when conceived as the implementation of ideas by subordinates. Dr Kamal Birdi of the Institute of Work Psychology at the University of Sheffield, UK commented to the researcher (2008, personal communication) that researching the impact of leader behaviour on idea implementation by subordinates was “a good topic for research [as] there aren't that many papers on the issue”. Moreover, prior research had specifically argued that “[innovation] studies have tended to focus on the generation of ideas
(creativity) rather than on their implementation” (Axtell et al 2000: 265). In my literature review, I readily acknowledged the rich history of prior research which had studied the relationship between leader behaviour and innovation (from Miller 1983 onwards) and leader behaviour and creativity (from Oldham & Cummings 1996 onwards) but the literature review nonetheless demonstrated a surprising paucity of prior research which investigated the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates; surprising particularly with reference to arguments made in this study that idea implementation, not idea generation, is the crucial element of the realisation of organisational innovation and therefore of corporate entrepreneurship (from Pinchot 1985 onwards). Thus, the fact that this study focussed on idea implementation at all was itself very rare and, coupled with the research methodology under which the results summarised in Section 6.1 were obtained (see below for comments on contribution to methodological knowledge), the findings of this research (essentially that there is a relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates) were obtained from arguably unique research.

Referencing now the very small\textsuperscript{10} number of studies into organisational innovation which did consider and, in an even smaller number of cases, measure idea implementation, Bird (1988) presented hypotheses relating to ‘entrepreneurial intentions’ but failed to address the issue of the implementation of those intentions. Klein & Sorra (1996: 1074) in their model for ‘innovation implementation effectiveness’ highlighted the importance “the role that managers play in creating a strong implementation climate” and asked “are nonmanagers powerless to affect their organization’s implementation climate?” further stating that they “know of no research explicitly designed to answer this question”.

\textsuperscript{10} When compared the vast majority of research into organisational innovation
Taylor & McAdam (2004: 17) argued “there is a paucity of critical literature on the adoption and implementation of innovation within organizations”. Klein & Knight (2005: 246) argued “researchers have begun to identify the practices and characteristics that allow organizations to overcome the challenges of innovation implementation” but suggested that more research is needed to understand the process of innovation implementation. Choi & Price (2005) called for “longitudinal studies that track the introduction and implementation of innovations over time”.

Dong, Neufeld and Higgins (2008: 250), in testing Klein and Sorra’s (1996) model for innovation implementation effectiveness called for further research into how “transformational leadership behaviors ... encourage users to challenge the existing ways of doing things” and that “future studies might include additional work-related values (e.g. creativity, autonomy)”. Ling et al (2008) found that a CEO’s transformational leadership had a positive impact on corporate entrepreneurship performance but this finding appears inconclusive on the bases argued above that corporate entrepreneurship is realised by the implementation of ideas delivered ultimately by the CEO’s subordinates, but Ling et al (2008) are silent on the impact of the CEO’s behaviour on their subordinates. Michaelis, Stegmaier & Sonntag (2009) did measure idea implementation directly and found that it was positively related to charismatic leadership and trust in top management but they also recommended that the impact of supervisors’ behaviours and types of leadership on innovation implementation be the subject of future research. Finally, Rietsschel’s (2011: 343) investigation into innovation within teams questioned whether this phenomenon is “influenced by ... leadership style”. In response to the previous research above, the main findings of this thesis detailed in Section 6.1 demonstrate significant contributions to the knowledge of corporate entrepreneurship and
innovation in organisations by providing empirical evidence of positive associations between leader behaviour, leader-subordinate relationship quality, autonomy, creativity, propensity to take risks and idea implementation. Figure 6.2 summarises the main findings of the three studies and sets them into a contextual framework of other influences on idea implementation as discovered particularly through the analysis of Studies II and III, the results of which are detailed in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively.

6.2.1 Contribution to methodological knowledge
The researcher knows of no prior studies into the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates which has utilised mixed methods. Together with the ability to compare results from the separate studies as demonstrated by Studies II and III in relation to Study I results, the benefit of this approach was also demonstrated by the opportunity to postulate an innovation risk gap from Study II results (Section 6.1) which would not have been possible by analysing Study I results alone. A further strength of the research design was in the contributions made by Studies II and III in identifying antecedents to idea implementation other than leader behaviour. Again, these results could not have been discovered from the analysis of Study I results alone and they permitted the development of the comprehensive and holistic model relating to the research question as developed in Figure 6.2. Finally, specifically as a result of conducting Study II, it is recommended that the optimum number of members of a focus group should be four; and specifically as a result of conducting Study III, it is recommended that longitudinal research is undertaken in autoethnographies to be able to capture important contextual changes in the research setting. It is also hoped that this thesis has encouraged future researchers to make greater use of a mixed methods approach to their investigations in future studies.
Figure 6.2 Summary of main findings and theoretical contribution
6.3 Implications for practitioners

There is a clear message from this thesis for leaders within organisations, irrespective of their seniority within the overall organisational hierarchy (after ‘Cascading Effect of Leadership’, Avolio & Bass 1995): the nuances and subtleties of leader behaviour affect subordinates’ intentions to implement ideas. Whether ideas are implemented or not is the decisive factor in the creation of organisational innovation, corporate entrepreneurship and therefore organisational growth (argued above). Thus, unless leaders are to preside over organisations which pay lip-service to innovation, spend valuable resources creating unfulfilled ideas (after Hansen & Birkinshaw 2007), or even worse, generate new competitors from frustrated employees who are unable to get their innovations realised (Audia & Rider 2005), leaders need to recognise the impact of their overt and covert behaviour to ensure that subordinates feel autonomous, creative and prepared to take calculated risks to implement ideas. Specifically, leader behaviour which is transformational (Burns 1978), particularly in the actions of setting high performance expectations, but also then in the provision of individualised support, is more likely than not to result in subordinates implementing ideas. Leader behaviour which is the antithesis of transformational or which is judged to be inauthentic (Avolio et al 2004) will more likely result in the subordinate not implementing ideas (after Fu et al 2010).

Furthermore, in order that subordinates exhibit a greater likelihood to implement ideas, they need to feel able to modify the way in which they are evaluated in terms of the importance placed on aspects of their jobs that they, the subordinate, feels are important. Also, to implement ideas, subordinates need to feel that they can influence their leader’s decisions regarding their (subordinate’s) job objectives. Finally, leaders also need to grant subordinates some control over what they (subordinates) are supposed to
accomplish (Breaugh 1985). On the basis of these findings and summarising the main actionable points for leaders to promote, support and facilitate idea implementation (the details of which are laid out in the pages of this thesis), it is recommended that leaders:

(a) Demonstrate that they have high expectations of their subordinates by setting them challenging goals, the detailed realisation of which is not pre-defined but which allows the subordinate to create solutions.

(b) Insist on only the best performance and demonstrate that they will not settle for second best. This may be achieved by regular reviews against the set targets and, if necessary, sanctions being applied by the leader if these targets are not met.

(c) Show respect and care for the subordinates’ feelings and show in their (the leader’s) behaviour that they are thoughtful of the personal needs of their subordinates.

(d) Be consistent in terms of how they judge the performance of subordinates and provide regular feedback to this effect.

(e) Assist subordinates to fulfill their potential in terms of academic and vocational skills developments.

(f) Actively encourage subordinates to take calculated risks.

(g) Behave authentically (but whilst also following recommendation (c) above – being authentically disrespectful will not work!). Inauthentic behaviour will be recognised by subordinates who will react negatively in terms of their intentions to implement ideas.

(h) Grant subordinates the autonomy to contribute to and modify the way in which they are evaluated, what their objectives should be and what they are expected to accomplish.
6.4 Limitations of the research

It is recognised that this study concentrated on a single phenomenon, i.e. the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates. To be clear, no claim has been made nor is it inferred that leader behaviour is the only determinant of whether a subordinate implements ideas, similarly, no claim has been made that the sole outcome of leader behaviour per se is an employee implementing ideas. Thus, the sole relationship which was of interest to this thesis was the simple effect of leader behaviour on idea implementation by subordinates. As argued in Chapter 1, a rich constellation of variables exists which may additionally impact on innovation within organisations, some of which are discussed in the next section relating to future research.

Methodologically, Study I was subject to a number of possible limitations. The use of email to send the survey invitations may have introduced a selection bias which excluded other acceptable applicants (Cahan & Gamlicl 2001). The self-report nature (Podsakoff & Organ 1986) of perceptions of leader behaviour and experiences of implementing ideas risked common method variance (Campbell & Fiske 1959), the introduction of measurement bias (Meade et al 2007) and therefore measurement error (Podsakoff et al 2003). Confounding variables may also have been responsible for the apparent observed correlations between variables (McCandless et al 2007). In terms of research design, the scale used in Study I to measure propensity to take risks may not have been suitable for organisational environments (Kuo-Ting & Chanchai 2010) and there may have been inadequate constructions in the Study I research model. Propensity to take risks may have been inadequate as a mediator variable between LMX and idea implementation and it may have been better to use it as a moderator variable. Also, TLB may have been
inadequate as an antecedent variable of LMX and it may have been better to use it as a
direct antecedent variable of subordinate autonomy and creativity.

Study II was also subject to possible limitations in that, with the researcher being
employed by the research subject group, participants in the focus group meetings may
simply have told the researcher what they thought the researcher wanted to hear
(Easterby-Smith et al 2002). Some of the focus group dynamics were also seen to be too
complex based on too-larger number of members (Oh et al 2004) and thus the results
from that group may not have been representative of the whole group’s opinions.
Moreover, as the researcher selected which transcripts of the meetings to include in this
thesis, some inadvertent filtering may have occurred which distorted what was actually
said by the groups (after Easton et al 2000). Finally, Study II was, by design, a limited
sample size, and so this may also limit the possibility of generalising the results.

Furthermore, Study III was also potentially limited in that it may not have captured how
the research setting group functioned at all (Gans 1999) based on it being lacking in
objectivity (Pettigrew 2000). It may therefore lack any merit (Dennis 2005) to generalise
its findings beyond the researcher’s single perspective (Boyle & Parry 2007).

6.5 Recommendations for future research

The results of the three studies highlight the significance of being able to identify the
antecedents of risk-taking within organisational environments. It was argued in Chapter 3
(Study I) that an expected antecedent of such risk-taking, the quality of the relationship
between leader and subordinate, found no empirical support. However, the arguments in
previous chapters that risk-taking is an integral part of corporate entrepreneurship and
organisational innovation, together with the finding of Study II which suggested that encouragement by one’s leader is important to subordinate risk-taking, nonetheless suggest that antecedents of risk-taking in organisations should be considered as a priority for future research particularly in relation to the possible relationships depicted in Figure 6.1 above. Furthermore, a number of investigations into risk-taking within organisational environments were also suggested by further findings of Study II which demonstrated statistically significant relationships with propensity to take risks, as follows:

(a) The position of the immediate supervisor. It is therefore recommended that future research further investigates this apparent relationship which suggests that the higher the rank of the subordinates’ immediate supervisor, the higher is the subordinate’s propensity to take risks.

(b) The position of the subordinate. It is recommended that future research investigates whether the higher the rank of the subordinate is associated with a higher propensity to take risks.

(c) The amount of time the subordinate had been in their current company (negative correlation); recommendation for future research into whether the longer the subordinate has been with their current company, the more risk averse they become.

(d) The amount of time the subordinate has been in their current role (negative correlation); recommendation for future research into whether the longer the subordinate has been in their current role, the more risk averse they become.

(e) The amount of time the subordinate has been working for their immediate supervisor (negative correlation); research
recommended into whether the longer the period the subordinate has been working for their immediate supervisor, the more risk averse they become.

(f) The qualifications of the subordinate; research recommended into whether the higher and more professional the qualifications of the subordinate, the higher is their propensity to take risks.

(g) The age of the subordinate (negative correlation); research into whether the older the subordinate, the more risk averse they are.

(h) Whether the subordinate considers themselves to be a member of senior management or not; research recommended into whether subordinates who consider themselves to be members of senior management have a higher risk propensity than those who do not.

Other recommendations for future research include the phenomenon highlighted in Study III whereby there appeared to be some organisational and environmental conditions under which the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates was stronger or weaker. These findings appeared to show that the lowest LMX quality coincided with the height of the global economic recession whilst the improvement in LMX coincided with the research subject organisation recording the best ever performance in its history. A better understanding of the relationship, if any, between these occurrences would inform the main subject area of this thesis and it is therefore recommended for future research. Furthermore, and as highlighted in Study I, there appears to be value in further investigating the direct relationships between TLB, autonomy and idea implementation on the one hand, and also autonomy, propensity to
take risks and creativity on the other, in order to further inform the concept of idea implementation by subordinates.

6.6 Concluding remarks

The purpose of this research was to offer a theoretical contribution and be of practical relevance to the study of organisations which purposefully sought to grow given that this is important to all publicly quoted organisations and those soliciting external capital investment. There has been a paucity of empirical studies investigating organisational growth when conceived in terms of corporate entrepreneurship and more specifically in terms of the implementation of ideas. It was this latter concept which provided this study's main theoretical contribution to the body of knowledge relating to corporate entrepreneurship and innovation within organisations. Much of the previous research into organisational innovation had concentrated on creativity as its proxy, however in this thesis it is argued that the ultimate expression of successful organisational innovation is evidenced by the implementation of an idea. Idea implementation it is argued is influenced primarily by the characteristics of one's leader, this consequently gave rise to the research question: "What is the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates?"

An examination of various schools of thought relating to research philosophy determined that no one single research methodology could offer a complete account of the relationship between variables and adequately address the research question. Hence mixed methods were used to answer the research question as fully as possible. Each method might only claim one interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation but together the multiple methods were intended to provide a complementary strategy to
holistically consider what might otherwise be isolated findings. Three studies conducted at different times using three contrasting but arguably complementary methods were therefore used to answer the research question. Study I addressed the research question through the testing of seven hypotheses relating to the relationship between leader behaviour and idea implementation by subordinates. Data were analysed using multivariate statistical analyses of data produced from a cross-sectional quantitative survey. Study II addressed the research question by subjecting the results of Study I to further scrutiny via a series of focus group meetings to question, corroborate or challenge the Study I results. Study III addressed the research question by documenting the researcher's personal experience of the effect of their own leader's behaviour on the researcher's intentions or otherwise to implement ideas.

The main significance of this thesis is in terms of its contribution to knowledge of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational innovation via the empirical investigation of the key concept of idea implementation. Study I provided evidence of positive associations between leader behaviour, leader-subordinate relationship quality, autonomy, creativity, propensity to take risks and idea implementation. Study II supported the hypothesised relationships of Study I and also suggested that leaders play an important role in encouraging subordinates to take risks. Study III found that leader behaviour described as insulting, disingenuous, bureaucratic and inconsistent results in an unwillingness to act by subordinates. Conversely, leader behaviour described as showing trust, sharing communication, proffering dignity and adopting an inclusive style is associated with subordinates willing to experiment and take risks in the attempt to implement ideas.
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Appendices

Appendix 1
Study I online questionnaire

1. My immediate supervisor has provided me with new ways of looking at things which used to be a puzzle for me
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree

2. My immediate supervisor is always seeking new opportunities for the unit/department/organisation
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree

3. My immediate supervisor has ideas that have forced me to rethink some of my own ideas I have never questioned before
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree

4. My immediate supervisor paints an interesting picture of the future for our group
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree

5. My immediate supervisor shows us that he/she expects a lot from us
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree

6. My immediate supervisor fosters collaboration among work groups
   Strongly disagree: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor acts without considering my feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor encourages employees to be &quot;team players&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor leads by &quot;doing&quot; rather than simply by &quot;telling&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor gets the group to work together for the same goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor has a clear understanding of where we are going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor shows respect for my personal feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor has stimulated me to think about old problems in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new ways</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of my personal needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor treats me without considering my personal feelings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor inspires others with his/her plans for the future</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor insists on only the best performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor is able to get others committed to his/her dream of the future</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor provides a good model to follow</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor develops a team attitude and spirit among his/her employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. My immediate supervisor will not settle for second best

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. My immediate supervisor leads by example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Do you usually feel that you know where you stand and do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always know where I stand</th>
<th>Usually know where I stand</th>
<th>Seldom know where I stand</th>
<th>Never know where I stand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor understands your problems and needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Well enough</th>
<th>Some but not enough</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor recognises your potential?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>As much as the next person</th>
<th>Some but not enough</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use power to help you solve problems in your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainly would</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Might or might not</th>
<th>No chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, to what extent can you count on him or her to "bail you out" at his or her expense when you really need it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainly would</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Might or might not</th>
<th>No chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
28 I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if he or she were not present to do so

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainly would</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29 How would you characterise your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
<th>Better than average</th>
<th>About average</th>
<th>Less than average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30 I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done (the method to use)

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |

31 I am able to choose the way to go about my job (the procedures to utilise)

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |

32 I am free to choose the method(s) to use in carrying out my work

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |

33 I have control over the scheduling of my work

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |

34 I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what)

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |

35 My job is such that I can decide when to do particular work activities

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly agree |
My job allows me to modify the normal way we are evaluated so that I can emphasize some aspects of my job and play down others.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

I am able to modify what my job objectives are (what I am supposed to accomplish)

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

I have some control over what I am supposed to accomplish (what my supervisor sees as my job)

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement by putting a tick in the option you prefer. Please do not think too long before answering; usually your first inclination is also the best one.

39 Safety first

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Totally agree

40 I do not take risks with my health

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Totally agree

41 I prefer to avoid risks

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Totally agree

42 I take risks regularly

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Totally agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43</th>
<th>I really dislike not knowing what is going to happen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44</th>
<th>I usually view risks as a challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45</th>
<th>I view myself as a ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk avoider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk seeker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46</th>
<th>During the last year, to what extent have you thought of new ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47</th>
<th>During the last year, to what extent have you had ideas about how things might be improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48</th>
<th>During the last year, to what extent have you found new ways of doing things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49</th>
<th>During the last year, to what extent have you attempted to get support from others for your ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>During the last year, to what extent have you tried to get approval for improvements you suggested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. During the last year, to what extent have you got involved in persuading others to adopt your proposals for doing things differently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

52. During the last year, to what extent have you had your ideas implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

53. During the last year, to what extent have you had your suggestions for improvements adopted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

54. During the last year, to what extent have you had your proposals for doing things differently carried out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

55. What is the position of your immediate supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior Manager</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Managing Director/DCE</th>
<th>Don't know / rather not say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

56. How long has your immediate supervisor been in their position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1+ years</th>
<th>5+ years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
<th>Don't know / rather not say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

57. How old is your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 5 years</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>11-50 years</th>
<th>Over 50 years</th>
<th>Don't know / rather not say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

58. How many employees in your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>100+</th>
<th>200+</th>
<th>Don't know / rather not say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>What is your position in your company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Junior Manager</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Director/MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60</th>
<th>How long have you been working for your company?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>61</th>
<th>How long have you been in your current role?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>62</th>
<th>How long have you been working for your immediate supervisor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>63</th>
<th>What qualifications do you have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64</th>
<th>How old are you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20's or under</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65</th>
<th>Are you male or female?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>66</th>
<th>Do you consider yourself to be a member of senior management?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 67 | Are you happy in your company? ... please explain ... |
Appendix 2
Study 1 online questionnaire invitation

From: Researcher
Sent: 06 November 2009 16:52
To: Invitee
Subject: Questionnaire

Dear ‘EngCo PLC’ colleague,

I am writing to ask for your help to try and find out whether ‘EngCo PLC’ companies are entrepreneurial and if so, why.

I have received permission from your Managing Director to send you this link to an online questionnaire which takes no more than 10-15 minutes to complete. There is no compulsion for you to answer this questionnaire, there are no right or wrong answers to the questions and all responses are uncoded and anonymous - i.e. I cannot tell which company or person has completed it (all ‘EngCo PLC’ companies have been included in this survey):

http://www.surveymonkey.com/

The results of this questionnaire will be made available in the New Year.

Thank you for your help.

Kind regards,

Researcher.
Appendix 3
Study II focus group members

RE: Researcher.

C1: Focus Group meeting 1 at Company 1, Tuesday 20th April 2010.
C11: Member of C1, receptionist, female.
C12: Member of C1, shop-floor operative, female.
C13: Member of C1, sales assistant, female.
C14: Member of C1, purchasing assistant, female.

C2: Focus Group meeting 2 at Company 2, Wednesday 21st April 2010.
C21: Member of C2, managing director, male.
C22: Member of C2, support engineer, male.
C23: Member of C2, product developer, male.
C24: Member of C2, sales assistant, female.
C25: Member of C2, operations manager, male.
C26: Member of C2, administrative assistant, female.

C31: Member of C3, financial director, male.
C32: Member of C3, technical director, male.
C33: Member of C3, design engineer, female.
C34: Member of C3, sales assistant, female.

C4: Focus Group meeting 4 at Company 4, Thursday 22nd April 2010.
C41: Member of C4, applications engineer, male.
C42: Member of C4, production assistant, female.
C43: Member of C4, sales office manager, female.
C44: Member of C4, financial assistant, female.
C45: Member of C4, production assistant, female.
C46: Member of C4, customer services manager, male.

C5: Focus Group meeting 5 at Company 5, Friday 23rd April 2010.
C51: Member of C5, finance manager, female.
C52: Member of C5, managing director, male.
C53: Member of C5, sales office manager, male.
C54: Member of C5, health & safety manager, male.
C55: Member of C5, sales director, male.

C6: Focus Group meeting 6 at Company 1, Monday 26th April 2010.
C61: Member of C6, production assistant, male.
C62: Member of C6, procurement engineer, male.
C63: Member of C6, engineering manager, male.
C64: Member of C6, sales director, male.
1. My judgement is not valued by my leader
2. My leaders don't back my judgement
3. My leader doesn't back my judgement
4. My boss failed to back my judgement about a subordinate’s ability
5. My leader sends strong signals that I have poor judgement
6. My boss forces me to stand alone in terms of taking on company risk
7. I'm not sure I've got my leader's full support
8. Management support could be a lot better
9. My leader doesn't support my personal development plan
10. My leader keeps useful information confidential from me
11. Our leaders should be more open with their staff
12. My leaders don't always give me honest feedback
13. Some leaders can't criticize their staff face-to-face
14. Our leaders only sometimes say what they really think
15. My leader’s intransigence is impossible at times
16. My leader’s intransigence causes problems
17. My leader’s pettiness causes problems
18. My leader can over dramatise problems
19. My leader’s style utilizes fear and ‘my boss said’
20. My leader uses their position to win arguments
21. My leader lets me know that they’re the boss
22. My leader lets me know who’s boss
23. My leader will ensure he wins the argument, not me
24. My leader is inconsistent in the advice they give me
25. My leader’s change of mind causes serious problems
26. My leader’s inconsistency has caused me big problems
27. My leader asks me to perform conflicting tasks
28. My leader is just so inconsistent
29. My leader’s tone keeps changing
30. My boss doesn’t like to hear what I truly believe
31. My leader doesn’t listen to me
32. Our leaders don’t listen to us
33. Our boss doesn’t listen to us or consider our thoughts
34. I have to shout to be heard in my organisation
35. My boss ignores me when I share good performance news with him
36. My leader does not notice my concerns
37. My leader dismisses my concerns
38. My leader is dismissive of my concerns
39. My boss has ignored my request for us to talk openly about the lack of trust
40. My boss says my company’s performance “risks becoming irrelevant”
41. I am forever judged on my leader’s initial opinion of me
42. In my leader’s opinion, I cannot change for the better
43. My leader doesn’t understand me
44. My leader doesn’t know me
45. My leader doesn't respect me or know what I need
46. My leader does not respect my judgement
47. My leader has no respect of my time
48. The lack of respect by my boss has now turned to insults
49. My leader can be very insensitive
50. My leader can be so utterly insensitive
51. My immediate boss can be too indiscrete
52. Sometimes, my leader's cheek is breathtaking
53. My leader sometimes publicly belittles me
54. My leader publicly insults me, seemingly without any care
55. My leader publicly criticises me and my peers
56. My boss sometimes publicly calls my ideas "complete bollocks".
57. My leader publicly humiliates me
58. My leader sometimes insults me
59. My leader sometimes publicly insults me
60. My boss publicly ridicules me as having bizarre ideas.
61. My boss and subordinate seem to be jointly humiliating me
62. My leader accuses us of ignoring reality
63. Once stigmatized by a senior leader, others join the attack
64. My leader 'takes' from me and 'gives' very little
65. My leader sometimes takes advantage of my honesty
66. My leader smothers me
67. My leader can be disingenuous
68. My boss often claims he was misunderstood or misrepresented
69. My boss sometimes publicly lies about not knowing controversial facts
70. My boss said he'd consult me on strategy but never did
71. My leader's words are good but I interpret them differently
72. My boss says he's forced to take holidays due to his children but I don't believe him
73. I feel vulnerable when I answer back to my boss
74. I'm fearful of expressing my true feelings about my leader
75. I know the things I shouldn't talk about with my boss
76. I'm afraid to tell my leader what I really think of them
77. I don't believe I can express my views confidentially
78. I cannot express my views confidentially
79. I treat my bosses' apparent change of behaviour with deep suspicion
80. My leader's praise often sounds so insincere
81. I see through my leader's apparent concern for me
82. I can't deal with my boss' faux-kindness
83. My leader and I do not share the same values
84. My leader and I have different values
85. I and my leader have different values on recruitment
86. My senior staff and I don't share the same values
87. My staff and I have very different values
88. The Group's leaders have different values to the rest of us
89. Not sure if I trust the leaders
90. My leader's actions create mistrust and unease in me
91. I distrust my leader's motives
92. There isn't sufficient trust between my leader and I
93. Each time I feel I trust my leader, I soon discover I can't
94. Trust seems to determine my quality of relationship with my boss
95. I don't trust my leader
96. I can't trust anybody, my boss, my peers, my subordinates.
97. Some of my subordinates can't trust my boss.
98. My employees don’t trust my leader
99. My employees don’t sufficiently trust each other
100. My peers distrust my leader
101. There is not sufficient trust between me and my team
102. Some management style leads to distrust
103. I’m extremely unhappy with the management
104. I sometimes get publicly annoyed at my leader
105. Generally, I am not inspired by my leaders
106. I’m embarrassed when my leader acts disgracefully
107. I feel utter contempt for my leader
108. I have no respect for my leader at times
109. I describe my boss by his caustic negativity
110. My relationship with my boss today is as uncertain as it’s ever been
111. I don’t know where the **** I am with my boss
112. Do not know if I’m doing a good job
113. I don’t know where I am with my leader
114. I feel damned if I do and damned if I don’t sometimes with my boss
115. Is my leader deliberately testing me out?
116. I feel my leader messes me around
117. My feelings towards my leader are changing all the time
118. I’m furious and grateful in equal measure when my boss can’t meet me
119. I like my boss, but not their boss
120. My leader is the problem, his boss is ok
121. Motivation depends on which leader you have
122. My leader often doesn’t deserve the support I give him
123. I’d never let anyone know when I feel good about my boss
124. I’m suspicious of my peer’s motives
125. My peers feign interest or even worse, concern, about me
126. I’ve zero interest in, or respect for, my colleagues
127. Some of my peers are fêted mealy-mouthed arrogant bastards
128. My leader seems to give more leeway to my peers
129. My peer seems to have the support of my boss to destroy my company
130. My colleagues interpret our leader differently from me
131. My peers and seniors are playing a game and I haven’t been given the rules
132. Some of my peers float along without realising they’ve ever been born
133. My peers’ relative wealth seems to give them more confidence
134. I can’t be bothered to talk to my boss about issues that never get resolved
135. I don’t care whether my boss is right or wrong anymore
136. I try and avoid contact with my boss
137. I feel I do all I can against my leader’s intransigence
138. I’ll never win an argument with my leader
139. I had a rare agreement with my boss that qualified risk-taking was ok
140. When my leader swears at me, I switch off
141. It de-motivates me when my leader acts without integrity
142. My leader tacitly encourages me to be two-faced
143. My boss makes people miserable
144. My leader’s treatment of me diminishes my creativity
145. I need time after meeting my boss to decide what’s been said
146. The last meeting with my boss was catastrophic
147. I sometimes feel like **** after meetings with my boss and peers
148. I need to get my leader’s authorisation for most actions
149. I know my limits with my boss now and I won’t risk anything
150. I will not innovate without my leader’s permission
151. At times, I will tell my leader what I really think
152. Occasionally, I’ll tell my leader how I really feel
153. I need to fight my boss’ acidic and mendacious attempts to undermine me
154. I will tackle my leader if I think it’s best for my company
155. I feel the need to correct, in writing, my boss’ unfair targets for me
156. I will challenge my leader if I believe they’re wrong
157. I will challenge my leader about their judgment of me
158. I tell my colleagues they are wrong, when it is needed
159. If I’ve got a problem with my employees, I tell them
160. I told my boss that when people feel threatened, they react emotionally
161. Our leaders can be patronising
162. Some leaders inflict their pain onto their employees
163. Management see how much they can degrade you
164. Our leaders are manipulating their employees
165. Some leaders are permanently biased in their views
166. Management are abusing their position
167. Senior management have degraded morale
168. There is a culture at a senior level that destroying people is ok
169. Our leaders often use their seniority to win arguments
170. Some employees are too frightened to be honest
171. My peers are frightened to say what they really feel
172. Many employees follow their leaders due to fear
173. Working in fear of losing your job is not right
174. Nothing we do for management is good enough
175. Tremendous resentment is growing with the leaders
176. My peers dislike my leader
177. My peers ridicule my boss openly, but he deserves it
178. My employees know my leader’s failings, and will say
179. When leaders fight each other, their employees suffer
180. When leaders fight, their staff do too
181. Employees don’t like it when leaders get angry
182. My colleagues won’t expose or share their true values
183. My peers know my leader’s failings, but wont say
184. Our relationships are not honest and open enough
185. Vested interests make it difficult to find the real truth
186. We do what our leaders want, even if they’re wrong
187. I do what my leader says, even when they’re wrong
188. I think my leader knows when he’s got it wrong
189. I don’t believe my boss would admit to being wrong
190. My opinions are valued and strengths recognized
191. I feel I am highly respected
192. My leader respects my values and beliefs
193. I have an opportunity to voice my opinion
194. My leader praises good work
195. My leader does praise me, sometimes
196. My leader does praise us, sometimes
197. My boss has unusually said: “Super job, thanks”
198. My leader is right to stop me if they think I’m wrong
199. I don’t mind my leader setting me targets
200. My leader sometimes protects me from myself
201. My leader gives me regular feedback on my performance
202. My leader has provided much needed direction
203. We can all produce more with the right leadership
204. Feedback from my leader is very welcome
205. Hearing from my boss makes me feel good
206. I like my leader to share news about company innovations
207. Generally, I respect the leaders
208. Generally, I trust the leaders
209. I am generally inspired by the leaders
210. My leader is a highly professional person
211. Our leaders are good at delivering profit
212. I share the leaders’ goals
213. I share our leaders’ goal of growth
214. I understand my objectives and am motivated
215. The relationship with my boss should be better
216. Sometimes I just want to ‘curry favour’ with my boss
217. I would like a better relationship with my leader
218. I quite like the idea of conforming and not fighting any more
219. I need to be happy to accept my leader’s influence
220. I genuinely want to help my leader
221. I want to help determine the values of the Group
222. I should help my leader to help myself
223. I owe it to my leader to improve my performance
224. I’ve changed my style to please my leader
225. When my leader helps me, he deserves my praise
226. I am a whole-hearted advocate of people development
227. My leader wants me to develop my employees
228. I have been well developed by my company
229. Leaders say investment in people & products is at a record high
230. My leaders encourage me to develop myself
231. Leaders say people are our most valuable asset
232. My leaders are prepared to train me
233. My own positive actions make me feel more positive
234. I believe I will get major rewards for major achievement
235. I can change, it’s the others who can’t
236. I accept we have to innovate more
237. I need to experiment more
238. I intend to innovate more
239. I believe I’m accepting of innovative ideas from elsewhere
240. The atmosphere in the company is important
241. My company is a warm and friendly place
242. Many of our employees are shareholders
243. The continual improvement atmosphere is nice
244. Plenty of challenges but not too stressful
245. Solid company always looking to improve
246. I feel part of a cohesive management team
247. I love the people I work for and with
I have great co-workers and management
Good teamwork and work/life balance
I'm happy, I work with great people
I work with very professional and courteous people
There is vision for the future and teamwork
We all contribute, not just senior managers
It's like a family and management cares
I've learned to work with different people
I work in a very empowering environment
The company lets me work in an unexpected way
I have the necessary autonomy to try new initiatives
I have the autonomy I need to be innovative
I have the freedom to get my job done
I have freedom to experiment and change
Managing Directors have sufficient autonomy from Group
My company encourages innovation
My company is prepared to take risks
I sometimes take big risks when I innovate
My leader is tolerant of me getting things wrong
The innovation award encourages me to be innovative
I feel I can have a tangible impact on the business
I can make changes to dramatically improve things
I can create and act on ideas
We can implement our ideas quickly
I have been successful with my ideas
We have adopted new inventive ways
We are innovative with new ideas and products
Implementing ideas is easier in a disciplined team
My boss has stated that leadership is important to innovation
Motivation to innovate depends on which leader you have
It doesn't take a lot of money to be innovative
Growth requires the exploitation of innovation
The success of the innovation is all important
The Group FTSE classification drives innovation
Why are some Group companies more innovative?
I love the many ongoing challenges for growth
I'm happy with the challenges and stretch goals
I'm happy with a lot of challenges in front of us
I'm happy because things are changing
If we continue like this, we'll achieve every award going
I am hoping to stay in my company a long time
I forget how well my company treats me
I fight for my company very seriously
I intend to do all I can to protect and grow my company
"There's always next year" to improve our company annual ranking
My prejudices affect my relationship with my leader
I've neglected my subordinates who I could have helped
I shouldn't pour out my anger and frustration to my staff
I know I shouldn't shout at my employees
My cynicism is preventing people expressing themselves
I sometimes realise how unreasonable I'm being
I need to be careful not to project my stress onto others
I may judge myself more harshly than my leaders
I know when I'm not doing a good job
I accept I need a quantum change in my behaviour
I'm now questioning my own judgement
I feel as though I have misjudged my leader
I do wonder if I'm cut out for leadership
I'm feeling pretty ***** off with the World again
I'm sick of feeling high then low in the very next moment
I feel crushed once again
I feel like I can't escape this ****
I feel conditioned into basic personal survival
I'm not especially happy, I'm under challenged
I feel apprehension and fear in uncontrolled situations
I feel isolated, fearful for my job, and deeply depressed
I am frustrated
I'm made to feel that my contribution is largely worthless
I feel I've been conditioned into a permanent state of distrust
I've become more negative in the last couple of years
Problems at work affect my home life
Problems at home affect my performance at work
I can't cope when personal problems add to company ones
I obey my leader due to my private-life pressures
Personal distractions can mask the effect of work-place based problems
Is there any benefit in me openly showing my emotions?
Trying to be honest just gets me into trouble again
I am too honest with my feelings
I will continue to play a careful hand and fight battles when I'm ready
I will communicate bad news on my terms
I will control information flow so it's not compromised
Leaders' focus is on profit protection and control
Leader's focus is on short-run profitability and cash
My leader if often concerned with petty details
My leader can't distinguish between trivial and crucial
The relationship with our leaders is very bureaucratic
The leaders' focus is short-term rather than long-term
My leader often gets lost in petty, controlling details
Our leaders are too involved in the fine detail
My leader's primary concern is their own reputation
My leader is only concerned about how they perform
My boss is singularly concerned with his own reputation
My leader changes his advice to me to protect himself
My leader still puts most blame on me, not himself
My leader is only interested in how his boss perceives him
I suspect my leader's motives are about impressing his boss
My leader's interest in my development is due to his boss
My leader is simply a mouthpiece for his leader's ideas
My leader does what Group says
348. My leader follows political expediency, not conviction
349. My leader is only really interested in his boss’ initiatives
350. My boss only reacts to my suggestions when his boss tells him to
351. My leader’s main concern is pleasing his boss, not me
352. It’s important to my leader to show me they’re right
353. My leader has great faith in his own abilities
354. Leaders do not welcome criticism of themselves
355. My boss thinks that his subordinates’ actions are not due to his behaviour
356. My boss hasn’t got a clue, or a care, about the effect of his behaviour
357. My leaders don’t have a clue about the damage they make
358. I can’t believe my boss’ boss accepts his behaviour
359. I notice everything about my leader’s behaviour
360. The senior leaders don’t work together closely enough
361. My manager is undermined by his manager
362. My leaders don’t all deliver the same message
363. No cohesion between leaders and staff
364. We are not all trying to accomplish the same goals
365. The leaders were not employed for their social skills
366. My boss may not have the skills to recognise his poor man-management
367. My leader has hired some very poor employees
368. I am left wondering about my leader’s business sense
369. My bosses follow dogma rather than market-based economic logic
370. Business decisions are ignored or mishandled
371. There is a lack of decision making and no backing
372. There is a lack of clear leadership
373. We have haphazard/undisciplined leadership
374. Some of our senior leaders aren’t good enough
375. Some of our leaders have been promoted once too often
376. There is a complete breakdown of management
377. The Group’s leadership is not culturally diverse enough
378. My leaders are not culturally diverse enough
379. I have to filter my leader’s advice for clear errors
380. A boss sends his staff emails with spelling and grammatical errors
381. My senior colleague can’t spell or use the correct words
382. My boss can only behave in one way
383. True leadership would make it better
384. The positive effect of a new leader soon wears off
385. Pressure from a new leader soon feels like tyranny
386. The change of boss was catastrophic for me.
387. Getting a new leader worries me
388. A new leader may change my plans for innovation
389. Leaders who are too open, can exacerbate problems
390. Leaders’ attempts to be honest can de-motivate staff
391. Inconsistent leader messages cause stress
392. Our leaders don’t communicate enough
393. The leaders don’t communicate what their goals are
394. Have the leaders established core values?
395. Have the leaders agreed core values?
396. My leaders are more risk-averse that I am
397. Our leaders are too cautious
My leaders are far more risk-averse than I am
My leader is far too risk-averse
My leader backs 'safe bets'
Only if you're doing well, does my boss give you any autonomy
My leader's support for poor employees demotivates me
It's frustrating to see my leader supporting poor employees
Our leaders have their favourite employees
Leader's favouritism determines employees' opportunities
I think my boss may be 'positioning' to protect his favourites
My leader's favourite employees tend to prevail
I'll expose my boss' unfair support of his favourite employees
My boss says he prefers "kick-arse" employees rather than "theoreticians"
The leader should personally lead the change
My leader must communicate the need for change, not me
My leaders haven't explained why I should change
We have not changed and there is little leadership
Our leaders need to give us more time to change
Our leaders get frustrated with our lack of change
Interference from my leader hampers change
We must not declare 'we have changed' too early
I need my leader to help me innovate
I want my leader to help me be innovative
I need more management support for innovation
I need my colleagues to help me innovate
Our leaders should encourage us to be innovative
I wish there was better communication in our company
I am never told what the plan is for our company
I would like feedback and a simple thank you
I don't fully understand why my new idea was rejected
There is a lot of lip-service paid to change
Recent changes have not always been right
We deal with the same issues year in year out
We are now driven by profit and greed
The focus is solely on company profits
The company is too inundated in incrementalism
Working environment 'reactionary' not 'planned'
Things are getting too formal and tightly controlled
Things move slowly, but are improving
There are new challenges but a little uncertainty
There's still a lot of work to do to improve performance
An employee thinks our performance is "interesting but disturbing also"
The company is complacent but has potential
There can be plenty of talk but little action
Saving face at other's expense is sickening
Some people insist on sharing the pain they're in
I'm frustrated with why people prefer to gossip
There is no fear of getting things wrong
Some senior employees have a too cavalier approach
People are not responsible for their actions
Separate factions in my company severely affect growth
There is a segregated feel in each department
Not all employees believe their actions affect sales
I’m torn between my company and my employees
Better cooperation within Group would benefit us all
Too much politics
Bullying takes place here
Stress levels in the business are very high
Petty fraud and theft are taking place in my company
These are our company’s new values – to disrespect and insult
Sometimes bad behaviour is ignored
Morale is low due to company performance
Meeting forecast can mean extreme hours for me
There is a lack of motivation and incentives
My leader rewards poor employees the same as me
Compensation for my employees is a problem
Pay and bonuses do not reward the right people
Job cuts and no pay rise shatters our motivation
We are not part of the wealth we create
My salary does not reflect my skills
Retention of talent at current salaries will be difficult
Leaders set de-motivating pay and bonus schemes
Consistent success is not sufficiently rewarded
Rewards for innovation don’t drive innovation
Our company is focused on cost control, not innovation
There are limited opportunities to innovate
I am bored and the status quo discourages innovation
Innovation is encouraged only on the surface
We don’t really believe in the need for innovation
The focus on new products has ceased
We don’t recruit the right people for innovation
Employee training has not produced more innovation
A new workforce is needed here to increase innovation
A lack of intellectual capacity works against creativity
Arguments between employees work against innovation
Friendships at work can slow down innovation
Disciplinary action and innovation do not mix well
This emotional roller coaster is no good for innovation
Tolerance of innovation failure is low
Are we tolerant of our employees failing?
When innovation fails, there is a price to pay
Fear of my leader if I fail stops me from innovating
If we don’t take risks, we won’t innovate
Not enough attention is paid to the issue of innovation risk
The Group’s leaders do not encourage innovation
My leaders don’t know how to drive innovation
My leaders don’t really understand innovation
My leader doesn’t fully understand how innovation works
My leaders want innovation, but only on their terms
Our leaders can’t agree on what it takes to drive innovation
Our leaders can’t agree on what it takes to be innovative
I've tried to innovate, but didn't get any support
Fighting within the senior team doesn't help innovation
We are weak at implementing our ideas
Most employees don't persevere enough with their ideas
Ideas aren't the problem; it's implementing them that is
Most employees can't make a business case for a new idea
Employees delay too long before implementing ideas
The external economy affects how I feel
External market dynamics affect our internal actions
The external economy partly affects how I act
External company factors hugely affect my motivation
External so-called experts do not always know best
Group implements their ideas irrespective of what I think
Group's financial controls discourage growth
Group concerns outweigh subsidiary company ones
‘Group needs’ transcend ‘subsidiary company needs’
Excess profits are taken by Group rather than reinvested
Group plans enforced directly onto subsidiaries is wrong
Group thinks it can do better than the subsidiary companies
I won't allow Group to take what I've worked hard to create
Local versus centralised Group control hampers innovation
Larger market opportunities exist, but via NPD
We're all about niche market opportunities
We give our customers what they want
I'm happy to have a job in this economy
I'm happy to have a job in these hard times
I'm happy the way I am, I don't want to change
I won't sort out problems, I'll wait for my leader to do it
I'm getting sick and tired of reducing staff numbers
It doesn't sit well with me how people are to be axed
I want to create the positive rather than cut costs
The company is being damaged by all these cuts
Profit growth via cost-cutting damages the company
Employee reductions don't galvanise others into action
Have the job cuts made people give up?
I have personal safety concerns as I remove some staff
I felt like a 2nd-class citizen at the company annual conference
I'm dreading attending the company annual conference
These cost cuttings have left me battered and bruised
Unrealistic expectations often set us up for failure
I don't believe we can achieve our goals
Innovation on its own will not deliver growth
We're still paying for previous leader's decisions
My aspirations are being brushed aside
Not making use of my skills
Little time for personal development
My leader's uninterested in my self-created development
The company is not utilizing potential fully
Good company but I've reached the ceiling
I believe my boss is ridiculing me for taking a PhD
There are little promotional opportunities here
Career and personal feedback has been limited
If you’re too good, you get stuck in your job
I want to achieve for me, not for my leader
I’ll put up with anything at work to achieve my personal goals
My personal goals are more important than company goals
My own private goals affect how I deal with my leader
It is important to me that I achieve for my company
I have a strong need to show I know what I’m doing
I consider my share-options as blood money for putting up with my boss
Unless I get personally involved, it isn’t done
I am better than my company at generating ideas
I am better than my company at implementing ideas
If I think I’m right, I’ll keep trying with my ideas
I want to be nominated for development rather than apply
Leaders don’t coach their employees enough
I need coaching rather than mentoring from my leader
My leaders should invest in those that are already trying
We must all get the chance to learn from our success
I congratulate and thank my subordinates for their efforts
I tell my subordinates, we’re all in this together
I tell my subordinates, unless we work together we’ll not achieve our goals
I thank my colleagues when I think I need to
I’ll let my staff take a sensible risk if they’ll learn from it
My employees surprise me sometimes with their wisdom
I felt better after my subordinate pointed out where we had succeeded
My subordinate personally apologised for his failure
As a leader, you can’t have friends at work
As a leader, should I challenge those that challenge me?
Should I share my personal background with my staff?
Are we micro-managing our employees too much?
My leadership behaviour differs with different employees
My expectations of my younger staff may be unreasonable
When my staff criticize me, I have a right to respond
My self-worth affects my relationships with my staff
At very high levels of LMX, damaging information may be shared
I will ensure as much dignity as possible in cutting jobs
We must challenge other’s negative perceptions
Employees that won’t change have to be removed
I can’t let my staff take foolhardy risks
Sometimes my staff wish to take too much risk
It’s my job to know the size of risk in my staff’s actions
We need a balance of employee freedom and control
Do I have to be underhand and secretive with my staff?
I am not prepared to share all I know with my subordinates
Some of my employees just won’t open up to me
Most staff can’t take honest, open debate
My staff don’t like to be told the truth about themselves
My employees don’t express their true feelings enough
My staff respect me, although would never admit it
598. Are my employees ready to accept honesty from me?
599. Are my staff trying to hide something from me?
600. I can’t rely on my subordinates to keep confidences
601. My boss’ past actions affect my current relationship with my subordinates
602. My leader makes me distrust my staff sometimes
603. My leader upsets my relationships with my own staff
604. My relationship with my boss affects my relationship with my subordinates
605. My relationship with my boss makes my subordinates risk-averse
606. The way my leader treats me affects my own staff
607. My leader sometimes goes over my head to my staff
608. My subordinate acts superior to me, based on my boss’ support of him
609. I won’t let my subordinate disrespect me, even though my boss loves him
610. My subordinate, who my boss loves, is far too over confident
611. The continued pressure is draining the staff
612. Employees are giving up on problems
613. Employees are handing on problems to their leaders
614. Our staff won’t take ownership of situations
615. My employees won’t show initiative and responsibility
616. My employees don’t have a sense of urgency
617. My staff do not want to develop themselves
618. My staff do not listen and learn from me
619. My staff sometimes only hear what they want to hear
620. I have to shout for my staff to understand it’s serious
621. My employees don’t want to hear the harsh reality
622. My employees don’t take the advice I give them
623. Some of my staff don’t learn anything from experimenting
624. It seems we’re wasting our time with some employees
625. We’re at rock bottom now with the staff
626. Our staff seem to have lost their respect for us
627. My staff don’t know what ‘good’ performance looks like
628. My staff don’t know what ‘good’ and ‘bad’ looks like
629. Some of my staff can’t perceive the risks in their actions
630. Our staff don’t seem to realise the situation we’re in
631. My staff need to embrace reality
632. Some of my staff suffer from sheer incompetence
633. Maybe my staff just can’t handle autonomy
634. Some of my staff will never change for the better
635. My staff don’t want me to disturb their cosy existence
636. I’ve been truly shocked by the childish reaction of my subordinate
637. Why do my staff defend the indefensible?
638. My staff make a stand over the wrong issues
639. Why do my staff act in a sloppy, non-caring way?
640. It annoys me when my employees justify poor performance
641. I can’t rely on my subordinates to do what we agreed
642. Some employees are both volatile yet essential
643. My staff constantly flip between care and carelessness
644. I could do a better job than most of my employees
645. I shouldn’t have to do my employees’ work for them
646. Sometimes, I have to protect my staff from themselves
647. Difficult employees can be energy sapping
648. I’m tired of my ambitious subordinate trying to show how clever he is
649. Some senior employees should show a little more gravitas
650. Some of my staff only act when Group gets involved
651. My employees tend to defer to my boss, not to me
652. I cannot stand or tolerate a breach of trust from my staff