

## OADM2100 1 Leadership in Complex Organizations

# Kandidat 59

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

### OADM2100 1 Leadership in Complex Organizations

Emnekode	OADM2100	PDF opprettet	02.02.2017 11:40
Vurderingsform	OADM2100	Opprettet av	GJ5ezT 2u7kuq
Starttidspunkt:	03.05.2016 07:00	Antall sider	12
Sluttidspunkt:	03.05.2016 11:00	Oppgaver inkludert	Ja
Sensurfrist	Ikke satt	Skriv ut automatisk rettede	Ja

# 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.
- Leders beslutninger anses som legitime.**  
Endring kan skje ved å utøve tvang mot tilhengere.  
Stillingstype avgjør lederens autoritet.

## 2 OPPGAVE

### 2

Hva kjennetegner institusjonaliserte organisasjoner?

*Velg ett eller flere alternativer*

- De er verdsatt primært for hva de er.**
- De har fått en særegen kompetanse eller utilstrekkelighet.**
- De har et støttende miljø.**
- De tillegges verdi utover tekniske nødvendigheter.**  
De legger vekt på å maksimere effektiviteten.

# 3

Hva kjennetegner offentlige organisasjoner?

*Velg ett eller flere alternativer*

- De har mindre klare mål enn private organisasjoner.
- De er mindre effektive enn private organisasjoner.
- De varierer når det gjelder "offentlighet" ("publicness").
- De likner på private organisasjoner i følge kjerneperspektivet ("core approach").
- De blir mer utsatt for ekstern granskning enn de private.

## 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

#### Task 1

There are two types of crises, situational and institutional crisis. A situational crisis is exogenous, which means that it is something that is happening outside of the organization, they are not to be blamed for it and it does not have its origin of nature inside the organization, but outside. An example of a situational crisis may be a terrorist attack or a natural disaster. An institutional crisis on the other hand, is endogenous, which means that it is something that is happening inside the organization and has developed here. It can for example be the government, public institutions or how public officeholders lead. Example of an institutional crisis may therefore be inefficient emergency response.

A crisis can either come sudden or creeping. Therefore we can have sudden situational crisis and creeping situational crisis, or sudden institutional crisis or creeping institutional crisis. An example of a sudden situational crisis may be a terrorist attack, and a creeping situational crisis may be environmental degradation. An example of a sudden institutional crisis may be inefficient crisis management, or a creeping institutional crisis may be erosion of citizens trust in government or public officeholders.

The two types of crisis may develop from one to another. Often a situational crisis may develop into a institutional crisis because of inefficient emergency response. An example of that is 22 of July in Norway. It

started as a terrorist attack, a situational crisis, outside of the government. Because of ineffective emergency responses and the lack of the police admitting fault, it developed into an institutional crisis. Another way a crisis may develop from a situational crisis to an institutional crisis may be because the population has the need to find someone to blame. In today's society there is an expectation of everything being under control. When a situational crisis emerges, the population asks themselves: who did it? Who is responsible? The witch hunt for someone to be held responsible and the need to allocate blame may cause a situational crisis to develop into an institutional.

## Task 2

There are four core-functions of institutional leadership. They are definition of mission and role, institutional embodiment of purpose, defending institutional integrity and ordering of internal conflict.

Defining institutional mission and role is a key element for institutional leadership. Selznick says that having a coherent mission is an essential part of what makes an institution an institution. Having a good mission and role is therefore very important. A role is a way of behaving according to the social system you are in, as well as a philosophy of "the way we do things around here". The mission will guide your decision making in how to reach your goals. It develops a special way of seeing the world for the individuals. The purpose of a mission is to ensure institutional survival. This is therefore an essential element.

The second core function is institutional embodiment of purpose. This is about how the institution are going to reach their mission and goal. The leader needs to develop ways of working. It is also about doing what is best for the organization. This involves hiring and firing specific people, and promoting some individuals over other. As a leader you base decision on the organizations best, and what can be done to reach mission and goals. Therefore it is important for the leader to keep the right amount of distance towards his followers. It is important not to be too personal, but be objective so that personal life do not interfere with the decisions being made.

Third there is defending institutional integrity. There is a need to defend when it is threatened. This is a characteristic of institutions, self-maintenance and ensuring institutional survival. An institution is valued primarily for what they are, not just for what they do, and it is therefore very important to defend institutional integrity when it is threatened. An example of threat may be that other organizations try to perform and take on the same tasks as you. A turf strategy says: fight enemies that tries to take on your tasks, and this is exactly what the leader should do. It is important to protect the uniqueness of the institution, this is after all what is special about this exact institution, its uniqueness.

The last core function is ordering of internal conflict. It is important that if there is an internal conflict the leader need to make sure that institutional values and norms really are underneath the skin of the members of the institution, so that these always will be protected and guide the members decision making towards the

common goal. It is also important that the leader include the members of the institution. He can't just wheel his power as a boss, but should listen to them and try to satisfy them.

### Task 5

There are different ways of understanding team leadership in "executive courts". We have four such courts and these are the following: court as think tank, as sanctuary, as arena and as ritual.

Court as think tank is based on collaboration. The essence is that members of the court share information and develop solutions together. It is a joint problem solving process. An example of such a group are policy advisors. The danger with court as think tank is that the group may overlook important events, underestimate situations or oversee other important solutions. This may happen if the members of the group are very similar.

Court as sanctuary offers the members of the group comfort, security and emotional support. In such groups it may develop a strong "we against them" feeling. This can be positive in that it might work as a common identity, but may also be dangerous for example the strong we against them feelings under Hitler. The members might lack self-criticism, underestimate others and overestimate themselves. It is also a danger of developing a norm for mutual support. This will make it extremely hard to disagree.

Court as arena is a stage for negotiating and conflict. Here different meanings are positive. Many different actors with different meanings get together and try to collaborate to find solutions. The danger is that the different members often will not manage to find a solution they all can agree on. There is no leader and no form for hierarchy, so there is no one who can take the final decision if it does not come to an agreement. Worst case scenario is that there will be no solution to a problem. The other possibility is that they might agree on an absolute minimum, but this may not really solve the problem at all. They agree to disagree.

Court as ritual is the last of the four courts. In this case the court has a more symbolic value. Often decisions are being made in informal groups, but the formal court may be rooted in law and continues to exist because it creates legitimacy for the decision. An example is the meeting between the government and the king of Norway, where decisions are being made beforehand, but this has a symbolic value and creates legitimacy for the decisions, and is as well rooted in law.

The danger of such courts is that they may develop "group think". This is the dark side of collective leadership. This can be that they oversee important events and do not examine other possibilities for solutions, that dissent or opposition may be impossible because of a norm for mutual support, it develops a strong "we against them" feeling with a lack of self-criticism, or that there will be no solutions. The lesson can be that leaders need advisors that differ in terms of interests, values and ways of thinking. This will bring several opinions and possibilities to the table, and it will be easier to find the best solution. It can also be

sufficient to have a form of hierarchy, for example as the Prime Minister in Norway, first among equals, to take the final decision if they face stagnation.

---

# 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

### Task 1

#### Administrative leadership - only a tool?

A traditional view of administrative leadership is that it only is a tool for political leaders and superiors to implement the chosen policy. That it has no legitimacy in shaping and formulating decision-making. This is something that can be strongly argued against. A more modern view will on the other hand emphasize the importance of both roles. They argue that they play two different parts: political leaders bring value and norms to the policy formulation, while administrative leaders bring professional expertise. In this essay I will argue for the modern view, and try to answer what the role of administrative leadership is as well as why it is important to talk about administrators in implementing politics.

#### Theory

Administrative leadership is one of three forms of public leadership. We have political leadership, administrative leadership and civic leadership. Administrative leadership, one can argue, is about balancing both political interests and civic interests. Administrative leaders has three core features. The first feature is about policy formulation. It is about serving democracy while leading professionals, and balancing responsiveness, professionalism and ethical integrity of the policy process. The balance between political and public interests are here essential. The second feature is implementation, making government work at the front line. Administrators task is simply said to implement the chosen policy. They are a tool for the

politicians, so they can be sure their policy is put to life. The more modern view will undermine that administrators as implementors has a legitimate role in shaping and forming decision making and policy implementation. This is also a phase where it is important to create public value that is presented by the elected politicians. There is also important to balance different interests when policy formulation are going to be implemented. Administrators has to balance the interests of political superiors, the public and its own organization. The last feature in administrative leadership is about institutional leadership. It is about balancing and preserving organizational capacities in changing environment and political circumstances. It is important to see if the structure of the organization either helps or hinder the mission and goal. It is about adapting to changing environments if that is needed, but at the same time protect mission, role and uniqueness, but ensure survival.

Political leadership consists of two features. The first is creating an identity, a common narrative that followers feel a part of. Inclusion and exclusion of social groups are here an important role in creating an identity. Second, they are policy entrepreneurs. They forge and select public policies. They try to gain support for them and build powerful coalitions. If they manage this, they will be patient and wait for the right time to implement it, this can be a window of opportunity.

There are two elements that are important for administrators or the civil servants role. The two elements are political loyalty and professional autonomy. Political loyalty is about serving the government of the day. Professional autonomy is about giving advice and professional opinions to the politicians. These two roles may collide, but are both very important.

### **Discussion**

Political loyalty is something every government expects from their administrators. This can be connected to the more traditional view of administrators, that they are a tool for politicians and that their main task is to implement policy. Politicians are relying on administrators to get their policy implemented, and it is therefore very important that they are loyal to the government of the day. This is easier said than done, and there can be many challenges. First of all, can being loyal to the government of the day cause problems when there is a shift of government? Will administrators be able to shift loyalty from one government to another, or will their loyalty stay with the former government? Too much political loyalty can therefore develop to be a problem. This may as said above be a problem when there is a shift of government, but may as well result in independent expertise being questioned. Questions may be raised if these expertise advices that are being given actually are their professional opinion, or if that is what the government wants to hear, and gives the government a reason to implement their expertise because it is based on professional advice. Administrators can also be too neutral. If they are too neutral they may not have enough sensitivity on political subjects. A more drastic step is if administrators lack or have no attention to political leaders. This may lead to the two roles starting to overlap each other and practical purposes of the roles may erode. If administrators do not care about the political leaders they may start being political active themselves, and since they have a great legitimacy in forming public policy since they are implementing it, this can be dangerous. In Norway politicians are elected by the public to represent them, and are supposed to carry out politics they are chosen

for. If administrators lack attention towards their political superiors, the implemented policy may not be a reflection of what the public elected. But why even discuss political loyalty when we are discussing if administrators even has anything to do with policy implementation? The administrative role give the administrators an ability to shape policy formulation and implementation, and therefore their loyalty to the government of the day will have a great meaning in how this is done, and to what degree. If they are very loyal, they will do what is best for the government, but if they lack this loyalty, they may do what themselves think is best. Therefore this is an important aspect of their role in policy implementation.

Professional autonomy is another important element of the administrative role. Administrators are policy advisors and has expertise on different areas, and is a tool for the politicians to make sure that policies are based on professional expertise. Administrators are supposed to give professional advice and opinions to politicians. This may be done in two ways. They can either give them advice and opinions about how to formulate the best policy according to what the politicians wants to implement. But as experts, they may also disagree with the policy the government are forwarding, and see implications that may happen in the future, and may therefore give advice that they know are in contradiction with what the political superior wants. It is very important that professional expertise run freely between administrators and government, to ensure that all aspects of the case are taken into account, and that the best possible decisions are being made. It is therefore important that administrators has enough professional autonomy to forward political advice, even if it is in contradiction to what the politicians originally want. Too much professional autonomy on the other hand, can lead to insensitivity on political subjects. Administrators may then only care about what they think is best for the country, and not how the elected politicians policy may be the best it can possible be. This may be a case where political loyalty and professional autonomy may collide. But why talk about professional autonomy, does this has anything to do with implementation of elected politicians policy? Yes. Administrators role is as mentioned to give professional advice and opinions to political leaders, so they can formulate a policy based on independent expertise. The administrators therefore play an important role in what advice they give and has a great opportunity to affect the choice of politicians. Politicians may rely blindly on advice from administrators, and trust that they always give the best professional advices, but it may not always be so. If we connect this with political loyalty as mentioned above, administrators may still feel a strong loyalty to the former government of the day, and may therefore give advice to the new government that is pointing them towards what the former government wanted, and in that way still practice loyalty to the former government. Administrators are not just tools and doing what they are told to do without asking questions, but are individuals who also gives advice (as well as implementing it), and therefore has a legitimate role in shaping policy implementation.

That administrators are not just machines designed to do a job that do not question anything, points us to another important part of the relationship between political leaders and administrative leaders: the expectations. Both politicians have expectations towards the administrators, and they as well have expectations towards the politicians.

The administrators expect to be given direction by the politicians so that they don't get lost, and to be included. They want the politicians to use the expertise within the government. They also want to know what their priorities are so that the attention does not get fragmented on many areas, but that they can focus on what is important first. They also want to know what are the expectations of the politicians to manage to do in their time of tenure. They expect them to make good figures in public and defend policies when needed. Last they expect them to stay out of organizing and staffing, after all the politicians' concerns are political issues.

Politicians expect the administrators to be knowledgeable about their business and give good and timely advice, and to implement what they have promised in public. To implement is here the most important part. Expertise and advice is something the politicians can get from outside of the administration, but they fully rely on them to implement the chosen policy. They also expect administrators to foresee implications that may develop from different policy proposals. They may challenge the politicians in the preparation process with disagreeing about the policy, but the politicians have the final word, and when that is said their job is to implement that, no matter if they agree or disagree. The last expectation the ministers have is to handle external relations themselves. Internal voice is accepted, but external voice for administrators is much more limited.

What is the point of talking about the two roles' expectations towards each other? The expectations they have are playing a part in forming the two roles. For example, ministers expect administrators to be knowledgeable about their business, and give good advice. Administrators want the ministers to use the expertise that is within the government, and not outside. To maximize the possibility of the ministers to use administrators as professional experts, political loyalty is important, because they want to give advice that the government feels satisfied with, and they therefore want to do what is best for the government of the day, and not former government. You can discuss if this may play down the effect that administrators have on affecting policy formulations, that they may have a more downplayed role.

### **Conclusion**

To conclude, there seems to be an asymmetry between the two roles of politicians and administrators, but that doesn't mean that administrators are not important in affecting policy. In this essay I have argued for that they are more than just machines and tools for government, but that they also have a legitimate role in affecting policy. This is also something that is implemented into their role; part of their role is to give professional advice. This may collide at times with political loyalty, and often when they do, political loyalty wins. Political loyalty often weighs more, and this will have an effect on administrators' role in shaping policy, because they tend to end up with what the politicians want, even if they may disagree. In other words, when the politicians weigh stronger, they are after all elected by the public and should weigh more.

Administrators do not simply have to implement what elected politicians have decided, but have a legitimate role in shaping it as well. But part of the traditional view of them as just a tool for the government still exists, after all political loyalty weighs the most, but the two roles may be more equally important than a

traditional view would expect and the more modern view is therefore more sufficient to look at, since this emphasizes the importance of both roles when implementing policy decisions.

---