UiO : Universitetet i Oslo

OADM2100 1 Leadership in Complex Organizations

Kandidat 89

Oppgaver		Oppgavetype	Vurdering	Status
1	1	Flersvar	Automatisk poengsum	Levert
2	2	Flersvar	Automatisk poengsum	Levert
3	3	Flersvar	Automatisk poengsum	Levert
4	Kortspørsmål/short questions	Skriveoppgave	Manuell poengsum	Levert
5	Essay	Skriveoppgave	Manuell poengsum	Levert

Eksamen OADM2100

1	OPPGAVE

1

Hva karakteriserer det relasjonsbaserte perspektiv på ledelse?

Velg ett eller flere alternativer

⦿ **Det finnes ingen ledere uten tilhengere.**

Det er viktig for ledere å finne ut hva tilhengere mener.

Endring kan skje ved å utøve tvang mot tilhengere.

⦿ **Leders beslutninger anses som legitime.**

Stillingstype avgjør lederens autoritet.

2	OPPGAVE

2

Hva kjennetegner institusjonaliserte organisasjoner?

Velg ett eller flere alternativer

⦿ **De tillegges verdi utover tekniske nødvendigheter.**

De er verdsatt primært for hva de er.

De har et støttende miljø.

De legger vekt på å maksimere effektiviteten.

⦿ **De har fått en særegen kompetanse eller utilstrekkelighet.**

3

Hva kjennetegner offentlige organisasjoner?

Velg ett eller flere alternativer

De er mindre effektive enn private organisasjoner.

◉ **De varierer når det gjelder "offentlighet" ("publicness").**

◉ **De har mindre klare mål enn private organisasjoner.**

◉ **De blir mer utsatt for ekstern granskning enn de private.**

De likner på private organisasjoner i følge kjerneperspektivet ("core approach").

4	OPPGAVE

Kortspørsmål/short questions

Del 1B: Kortsvarsoppgaver.
Besvar *tre* av følgende fem spørsmål (ca. 150-200 ord per spørsmål)

1. Forklar forskjellen mellom situasjonsbestemte og institusjonelle kriser. Gi eksempler.

2. Definer og beskriv kjernefunksjonene i institusjonell ledelse.

3. Beskriv de ulike kildene til legitim autoritet fremsatt av Max Weber, og forklar for hver type hvordan lederens autoritet kan forsvinne.

4. Forklar forskjellen mellom «å inneha en posisjon» og «å ha autoritet».

5. Beskriv ulike måter å forstå gruppeledelse i «eksekutive domstoler» («executive courts») .

Skriv ditt svar her...

BESVARELSE

2. Core functions of institutional leadership.
Institutions are hard to manage and require leadership, not only management. Selznick describes four functions of institutional leadership. First, it is about *defining organizational mission and role*. Creating a "uniqueness" and an identity. A good policy platform is crucial for institutions. It is important to take both internal and external interest into account while defining the mission and role. It is important to listen to the employees' wishes to ensure commitment and motivation, however, due to the fact that the institutions need external support it is also important that these views are taken into account.

Institutional embodiment of purpose is about creating new ways of seeing the world and new ways of working, training etc. within the organization. Implementing the core-values.
Defense of institutional integrity is also very important due to the fact that their core values are shed light on and debated in the public, and it is very important for the leader to defend these to be able to conserve the uniqueness and protecting the "turf".
Furthermore, *ordering of internal conflict* is important. It is important to take different views into account to avoid the problems of "groupthink". Moreover, it is important to make sure that the employees have implemented the core values, dissent among the core-values is not preferable for an institutional leader.

3. Sources of legitimate authority

Tradition-based authority values the historical aspect, society has a tradition of following this person or this person's family. An example would be the Norwegian monarchy. Motto: Follow me because you have followed my predecessors! This authority can get lost if a charismatic leader makes a rival, or due to that the position is heritaged, the leader might not have the skills, only the relation and reputation. (leadership capital index)

Charismatic authority values the personality and the capabilities. These leaders often have something extraordinary. Examples of this are Jesus, Mandela and Ghandi.
Motto: Follow me because of who I am and what I am able to do! This authority can also get lost if the leader does not have the skills, however it is in the eye of the beholder, and therefore society's views regarding the person with authority "ebbs and flows".

Legal-rational authority is common for e.g. prime ministers that are known for making decisions which are beneficial for the society.They get authority because people believe more in the system, than the actual leader. Motto: Follow me because I abide by rules and norms while I have authority. This can get lost through erratic, amateur behavior, and violation of norms and rules.
On a more general basis, authority can get lost when mismanaging crisis, mismatch of leadership style and context, underestimating dissent among constituencies, making powerful enemies,picking the wrong battles etc. The leader cannot take the authority for granted, it is something that ebbs and flows, it involves taking risks and sacrifices. Authorizing leadership means spending some of your leadership capital.

5. Leadership in "executive courts"

Think-tank- values agreement, and making sure that there is a coherent and one voice from the organization. e.g. in times of a scandal. The problem is that they might overlook important events and threats, and overestimate their own effectiveness, and underestimating dissent.
Sanctuary- create a "we against them"-feeling, so the employees feels comfort and protected from the outside. The problem is that this creates absence of critical thinking, which again will bring some of the same problems as the "think-tank".
Arena- a stage for enacting discussions and conflict. Different views and opinions are important and conflict is not a negative aspect. The problem here is that when there is no leader or "primus inter pares", this can go on forever without reaching a solution.
Ritual- A symbolic act, the important decisions are made already in "the back room", but it is important to create legitimacy. The problem here is if the employees find out the leaders will loose authority and will be looked upon as hypocrites. E.g. every Friday the government meets with the king, but he has no authority to change the suggestions.
To avoid the problems of groupthink it is important to bring persons with different views and opinions into the court, if not, this may have fatal consequences for the organization.

5	OPPGAVE

Essay

Del 2: Essay

Besvar én av følgende essayoppgaver:

1. Drøft denne påstanden: Det gir liten mening å snakke om «administrativ ledelse» - administratorer skal bare gjennomføre det folkevalgte politikere har bestemt.

2. Drøft denne påstanden: For å håndtere en krisesituasjon, må politiske ledere være dyktige beredskapsledere («emergency managers»).

3. Drøft denne påstanden: Ledelse i offentlige og private organisasjoner er fundamentalt likt i alle uviktige forhold.

Skriv ditt svar her...

BESVARELSE

3. Leadership in public and private organizations is fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects.

Introduction

Leadership is an interactive process which unfolds in a relationship between the leaders and followers and the environment this interaction takes place. Leadership is about coping with change, this change can be demographic, socio-cultural or economic and put pressure on existing policy processes and institutions. Leadership is about taking decisions about whether to conserve, defend, adjust or repudiate core values and the ways of working in an organization. In all organizations both public and private, leadership and management is required and demanded.

Public and private organizations even though they share the same managerial tasks the content and context of them may vary. Public organizations addresses market failures, are exposed to public scrutiny, and often have vaguer goals then the private sector. Whereas the private organization focuses on identifying shareholders and maximizing their profit. However, is it reasonable to argue that they are fundamentally the same in all unimportant respects on this basis? Stereotypes and prejudices are common against the public organizations, are they true or are they standing on shaky grounds?

The distinction between the two kinds organizations has been studied and researched for many years. One the one hand, some argue that this distinction is simple to make, and that they differ in terms of ownership.

On the other hand, some argue that it is not that easy. There are different shades of grey that needs to be taken into account, and that each organization has a "degree" of publicness, some more than others.

The first part of this essay takes on the characteristics of public organizations compared to the private ones. Furthermore, this essay discusses the stereotypes against public organizations, and why some might argue that these are standing on shaky grounds. Then, it discusses fundamental differences between the organizations and possible ways to compare the two organizations, finally it discusses the problematic term "unimportant".

Characteristics of public organizations

Paul T. Hart describes three different aspects of the public organizations compared to the private organizations. The first characteristic is that they differ in *strategy*. The public organizations have to abide by formal- legal constraints, which sets boundaries for what tasks and policy they can perform and establish. Moreover, the public organizations are a lot more affected and exposed to political influences than the private ones, they need to make sure that they can depend on and gain the political support.

The second characteristic is *internal management*. The public organization suffer to a greater degree of less clear and ambiguous goals. In addition, it is harder for the public organizations to control and measure the employee's performances, and it is also harder for the leaders to direct their followers and subordinates than in private organizations.

The third characteristic is *external constituencies*. Is is raised extremely high demands from society on openness, transparency and loyalty from the public organizations. It is expected that the public are "the good guys", and therefore they are also a lot more exposed in media and to public scrutiny. However, the public organizations' activities have a greater symbolic value and significance upon society than the private organizations.

Stereotypes on shaky grounds

Stereotypes are common, however they are subjective and in the eye of the beholder. Therefore, they can be dangerous or at least cause damage in e.g. collaborative governance where there is a need for organizations working together on solving a problem.

Some common stereotypes against public organizations is that they are *less efficient* than the private ones. This might be true, however it is important to distinguish efficiency and effectivness. Efficiency is the ratio between inputs and outputs, but effectivness is about in what degree and in what kind of manner have you been able to reach your goals. Some argue that public organizations are at least as effective as private organizations, and that efficiency is not the only way to measure success. Another stereotype is that the public organizations *have to abide by high ethical standards*. This might also be true, however it does not mean that the private are not obligated to do the same thing, maybe only to a smaller degree. Another stereotype is that public organizations *have no competitors*. This is correct in some of their working areas

e.g. policeforce, military, street-lightning. However, in many different working areas, even though they are public you have the possibility to choose. E.g.. Dentist, local doctor etc. As mentioned, we all have stereotypes, however, it is important to take into account that there are many arguments and views that all are correct at the same time, and to be short-minded will often backfire.

Differences between public and private organizations

Antonsen and Jørgensen wrote a paper on the "publicness" of organizations. Where they described two different approaches to distinguish public and private organizations. The *core-approach* is one-dimensional. And argues that the way to distinguish them is to look at the terms of ownership. Are they government owned or are they privately owned. However, the *dimensional approach* is more complex and multi-dimensional. "Publicness" is a matter of degree, with many shades of grey. They use both ownership and funding to measure this publicness, whereas "high public organizations" are both publicly funded and owned e.g. department of Justice. On the other side, "low public organizations" that are both privately funded and owned e.g. a supermarket chain. This dimension demands empirical research for every organization, which makes the distinction time-consuming and hard. Furthermore, it is difficult to label the e.g. organizations with public funding but private ownership, and vice versa.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to argue that the organizations have different time perspectives and the time in the position of power, whereas the public leader is selected for a limited time, his time-horizon is shorter than the private leaders. On this basis, some argue that the private leaders are more capable of planning ahead. As previously mentioned the public have to abide by higher ethical standards, greater goal ambiguity, a greater probability of dealing with "impossible jobs" and are more exposed to public scrutiny and debate in society. In addition, there is also a constitutional difference where the public have set constraints in a much larger degree than the private ones, which limits their freedom to take on the tasks they might wish to carry through.

How can we compare public and private organizations?

Comparing the two organizations becomes hard if you are a supporter of the dimensional approach, however there are ways to find out differences between them by comparing one another.
One way might be to compare public and private organizations that seem to perform the same tasks, here the best outcome will be if their size also is similar. An example of this is to look at a public vs. a private schools, hospitals etc. and see in what manner they differ. Another way is to look at organizations that were public but have become privatized. What are the effects of the change? And what has actually changed?

Decision-making within organizations

As you can see there are several differences between the different types of organizations, however when it comes to the day they are both *organizations*. A technical rational instrument which aims to achieve a desired end. The leaders as rational desicion-makers which has the power of a formal hierarchical structure. (Transactional leadership) It has formal rules and objectives and is an expandable tool that will change and adapt if a more efficient tool becomes available, they will grab it to be able to come closer to the desired end.

When we look at the aspect of decision-making organizations have to make both routine and critical decisions. *Routine*-decisions are day-to-day decisions that do not affect the nature of the organization e.g. Who will be the speaker on Friday's meeting. *Critical* decisions on the other hand are big and drastic decisions which have the possibility to affect the core values etc. of the organization. e.g. Should we carry a reform into effect?

The vagueness of "unimportant respects"

Some might argue that the routine decision-making which does not affect the nature of the organization could be characterized as an unimportant respect. Both public and private makes them and therefore they might look like they are dealing the same managerial tasks, and are fundamentally alike in "unimportant" respect. However, it can be discussed whether it is reasonable to argue routine-decisions as unimportant. To label aspects of the organizations as unimportant is short-minded, and will overlook the organization as a whole. Every small detail, every employee, every resource and every ones small decisions, together, will help the organization achieve its goals, which is the main purpose of creating an establishing an organization. In other words, "un-importantness" is vague. To be able to achieve the goals in the best way it is important to set specific aims, and give every job (big, or small) a meaning and a purpose of their labor.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the characteristics of public organizations and why there are many reasonable arguments to say that the stereotypes against the public organizations often are incorrect. It has shown fundamental differences between public and private organizations and different approaches to make a distinction of them. The distinction between the two types of organizations demands even more research, and for now, it is in the eye of the beholder whether to take the core or the dimensional approach.

When it comes to the end, both public and private organizations are *organizations.* And it is therefore, for some, easy to conclude that they are fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects such as their basic managerial tasks, and that the leader's routine-decision-making in the different types of organizations, basically are the same. However, reality is rather on the contrary. Even performing the routine-decisions public leaders have boundaries to a much larger scale than the private leaders, even if it does not appear that way from the outside. The public leaders have to abide by high ethical standards, be more open, more transparent and honest than the private leaders and therefore it will become a lot harder for them to perform the basic managerial tasks. Defining the organization of mission is an important task for all organizations, but when all these elements needs to be taken into consideration for the public leader, public organization ends up with vaguer goals. Yet, one way of looking at this could be that leaders of public organizations have a tougher job getting the organization towards its aims, however, if they succeed, they will obtain even greater prestige than the leaders of the private organizations. It is not reasonable to argue that public and private organizations are the same, there are basic fundamental differences which also affect the leader's possibilities of these organizations. It is important to recognize this difference between the two, even

if the differences necessarily are not that big. Lastly, unimportance is a vague term, what aspects of the organization that can be characterized as unimportant is debatable, and it is even discussable if there is such thing.