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Abstract

In days of growing competitiveness, notions of efficiency, productivity and innovation are central inquiries of organizations. In order to meet those challenges, a special attention has to be made to the way the organization is leading its workforce. Leadership is the key component holding together organizations and connecting it to its goal. However, this Leadership should take into account all the internal and external demands of the organizations in order to adapt to it. By looking into a way to match Leadership to its demands, we have developed our model of Distributed Leadership. Detaching the lead from a singular individual and empowering people are solving the main issues that organizations are facing these days. Moreover, it is a unique way of valuing the workforce and capturing its potential. Distributed leadership can be seen as a probable trend in the next decade, because it has already proven its benefits in many organizations.

In this thesis, we develop our own model of Distributed Leadership that emerged from our research. We collected secondary data through an extended literature review, and we combined it with empirical data collected through case studies realized by the mean of interviews. We focused on illustrating the potential of Distributed Leadership and developing its process of implementation in order for organizations to meet its benefits.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Thesis

We are entering in the post-modernism era in which a customer is not anymore considered as a variable in segments but as somebody with specific preferences, expectations and taste that need to be focused on. But beyond the customers, the retirement of the baby boomers, the arrival of the generation Y in the job market and the necessity of innovation and creativity to survive in the globalization push the organization to change their profit orientation to customer and employee orientations. However, the change is still difficult and some fields like insurances or banks meet tough obstacles to implement it mainly because of their culture and organization that must control many risky operations. However, some companies already managed to become employee-oriented and they proved by far the performance of this change, either private establishment or public services.

During this year studying a Leadership program, we learned a lot about all the facets of this field. Leadership has been a big concern among humans since the beginning of times. As soon as you are part of a collective, you are facing issues related to leadership because you are constantly influencing and influenced by others. Our interest in Leadership therefore is not only related to business issues, but mostly to all human issues we can face in our daily life.

As students of this program, we see ourselves as potentials leaders in the future, and this awareness was the start of our reflection about our thesis. Leadership is a dynamic field, thus leadership in the future probably won't be similar as leadership as we studied during this year. This interest about the evolution of leadership was our starting point in selecting a topic to explore in our research. We had the belief that the top-down nature of leadership was not going to be sustainable on a middle-term and long-term perspective, for many reasons. Complexification of the world, or expectation of the Generation Y taking over the organization for instance were putting the actual nature of Leadership as a top-down relationship into question. We also believed that this kind of relationship between the leader and its followers was not capturing and exploiting fully the potential of the workforce. From these reflections, we started to look for alternative modes of leadership that could suit those changes. The most viable and interesting way to step away from this top-down mode of leadership was for us to develop a way to distribute the lead within the organization, as a solution to the issues above. As a result of those reflection and discussions, we chose to
explore the field of shared leadership and especially distributed leadership. Our goal was to collect knowledge that already existed about these concepts and to build on this with our own empirical research.

We selected a specific angle to tackle this topic focusing on illustrating the benefits and developing procedures of implementation of distributed leadership. We will focus along our research on distributed leadership on a team scale. Our research illustrated that most of the companies which successfully implemented such kind of leadership were operating with self-managed teams (Poult, Gore, ChronoFlex, SPF etc.). That is in this context of leadership distributed in small teams that we will develop our model. Furthermore, we will develop a model in which these teams are enabling to combine both distributed leadership and empowerment. Indeed, on a first level, distributed leadership is performed when a leader emerged regarding his attributes to lead the team for a period of time according to the context and requirements. On a second level, this leader will empower the whole team and share his power, enabling people within the team to be autonomous and efficient.

That’s why after many discussions and reflections, we wanted to “bring our stone” to increase the understanding in the field of employee empowerment by distributing leadership.

1.2. Research Orientation and Research Issue

As stated before, our focus on this thesis is both on illustrating the advantages of distributing the lead and developing processes to implement such kind of leadership. A fundamental notion on our thesis is the concept of empowerment. When distributed the lead within an organization, empowerment is a central requirement, because it is only with an empowered workforce that you can benefit from distributed leadership. Empowerment is the mean by which you can capture the value and the potential of your workforce. We chose to use the metaphor of the "toolbox" to illustrate this value within the workforce. This toolbox is composed by the individuals within the organization with different attributes and skills and so on, that can be valuable regarding specific situations or context requiring a specific set of abilities. We will formalize this toolbox through an advanced profiling tool incorporating the main individual facets influencing leadership.

Some of the benefits of distributing the lead are pretty obvious, such as the access to more brains, thus the first question we asked ourselves is the following: why is it not more developed in organizations nowadays? The answer is that this kind of leadership comes with a
lot of prerequisites. It requires deep adjustments and constraints from the organization itself and its actors. The issue is therefore to see if the benefits can outweigh the costs of such changes. We will bring the answer to this question by developing the benefits of distributed leadership as well as the requirements. The two main pillars of our research will therefore be the organizational requirements and the human requirements in order to implement distributed leadership.

The two research questions we address are the followings:

- What is the potential of Distributed Leadership?
- How to implement Distributed Leadership in order to exploit its potential?

Thus, our goal is to develop processes in order to implement distributed leadership on a team scale. In order to achieve it, we try to understand the mechanisms that affect the decisions and functioning in organizations as well as the organizational change. Alongside, we propose to develop a “leadership toolbox”, specific for the human potential of each organization, in which are recorded the characteristic of the “potential” leaders, member of the organization that can solve out daily issues and projects by leading team and using her/his personal qualities that are the right ones for some specific issues. Thus, an assumption of our thesis is to consider that most people can take the lead, with their own leadership styles, with the necessity to activate it with crucibles of experience.

1.3. Structure of the Thesis.

This thesis was structured around both literature review and collection of empirical data. The combination of the two gave birth to our model.

Before diving into the topic, we explain our choice of methodology. This part provides understanding to the reader about the way to get our results and their validity. By understanding the choices we make and the process of this thesis, it will be easier to go through our work. We chose to do our research according to the Grounded Theory in order to suit the qualitative nature of our research.

After justifying our choice of methodology, we start to go into the topic by presenting distributed leadership, his history, and his connection to the broader field of shared leadership as well as the related issues. This part is important and is introducing our main concepts and
our understanding of it. We chose to do this part separately from the introduction in order to go more in depth into those concepts that needed to be treated with precision. This part will provide a pre-understanding to a reader of what does distributed leadership means for us, what are the implications, the stakes and so on.

The following step in our thesis is to review existing knowledge about our two pillars cited before in order to gain understanding. We explore in depth theories related to human issues connected to distributed leadership. For instance, how to manage the knowledge with individuals in a context of shared leadership. We also develop our concept of the toolbox by showing advantages of empowering diversity in your organizations with specificities linked to gender, culture or authenticity. We also develop the benefits of using all kind of leadership styles to deal appropriately with specific issues. Then, we address the issue of how to enhance the desire for individuals to take a leading position and to gain power in their work. Finally, we complete this part by illustrating how the emergence of the Generation Y in organization is requiring changes in the leading philosophy, and how this generation is particularly likely to perform in a context of distributed leadership.

The second of our pillars we are tackling is the organizational perspective related to distributed leadership. As well as the individuals, the organization has to operate changes in order to adapt to distributed leadership. This part is dealing with how the implementation of distributed leadership is affecting the organizational culture as well as the organizational structure. A crucial part in this section is about organizational change, and is presenting theories related to the process of organizational change, resistance to change and so on. Finally, a last theoretical part is presenting the notions of empowerment and self-managed teams which are to be studied both on an individual and organizational perspective.

In the next part of our thesis, we are exploiting the empirical data collected through interviews. Based on the same pillars that we develop through the literature review, we are operating four case studies through interviews within a small law firm, a big corporation, a public service and a bank. Each of the interviews was developing key points of our research, such as empowerment, operation with self-managed teams, change process toward distributed leadership and limits to distributed leadership. This empirical data enable us to get more practical information about how to operate the transition towards distributed leadership or about conducting empowerment of the employees for instance.
The last part of our thesis is the integration, summarizing the outcome of our research. We present in this section our model, connecting all the elements developed with the core of our research, oriented toward implementation of distributed leadership. This part is answering our research question based on the analysis and the coding. Implementation of change on an organizational level is presented as well as individuals' requirements necessary to fit this change. Finally, the concept of the toolbox, illustrating one of the main purposes of developing distributing leadership on a team scale is developed.

2. Methodology

In this section, we explain our process of knowledge creation (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008) through the justification of our choice of methodology. Finding the appropriate methodology had the most crucial impact on the outcome of our work. We reflected about what do we want to produce, and how will we get there. The Grounded Theory was the medium in-between, enabling us to turn our expectations into results. Our choice of methodology was therefore anchored in the purpose of our research, our expectations about it, and also connected to the nature of our study.

2.1. Premises of the research.

Co-writing a thesis was a very rewarding experience for us, and provided us a great opportunity to discuss, challenge and grow every idea of each of us. The first few meetings we had together, when discussing about our expectations, were very constructive. Hours of brainstorming turned out to be very positive and have led us to decide to explore the area of Shared Leadership. We saw a lot of potential in this field and we felt that we could add value and bring our part in it. This stage was very much about self-reflection, trying to find something that will motivate us for the upcoming months, and our interest in this topic was real and deep. After targeting a field and a concept to build on, we accumulated broad knowledge about it. This stage was more about a general understanding rather than an expertise about it. At that point, we were looking at the surface of the topic rather than diving deep into it. It was also important to be aware of our pre-existing knowledge in this field in order not to be influenced by it.
This done, we went to the critical stage reflecting about a research issue. Once again, being able to brainstorm together was very rewarding in this phase of critical thinking and it turned out to be positive for us. We decided -at first- to aim our research at developing what we had called "Democratization of Leadership". Our basic idea was to develop processes to empower the workforce and make leadership more accessible, in order to value the diversity and richness within an organization. Even if we evolved later in terms of terminology, we always kept in mind our basic idea. We purposely left this first research issue very broad, according to our methodology. We soon realized that this concept of Democratization was confusing especially because of the terminology, so we decided then to talk about developing Shared Leadership through organizational and personal changes. We felt that we were not able to be more precise at that point without closing some interesting doors, especially because this research question was going to set the direction of our data collection. This research question was then going to be narrowed down along our process.

After a few weeks of broad research and pre-understanding, we realized that the concept of Shared Leadership was probably too broad and covering too many different things. We then decided to focus on the concept of Distributed Leadership, which was capturing key aspects for us while not being too extensive. It was for instance capturing the notion of empowerment which was essential for us.

After accumulating a sufficient amount of knowledge about our research, we reflected about our research question which we narrowed down along the weeks to finally deal with this issue: "Developing distributed leadership through organizational and behavioral adjustments, in order to empower the right potential leader." We prefer to refer to it as an issue rather than a question, because the outcome will be more a process or a guideline. After this first steps in our research and our methodology, we went more in depth by accumulating and interpreting data according to our choice of methodology.

2.2. The Grounded Theory.

This thesis is a process of knowledge creation (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008), and this process is long and complex. Therefore, we felt the need to have a methodological background to help us and guide us in this task. Exploring several sources such as Methodology for Creating Business Knowledge (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008) as well as Grounded Theory in Practice and Basics of Qualitative research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Practices (Strauss & Corbin, 1997) gave us a fair overview of various methodologies we could apply in our work.
Our perception of Grounded Theory is that it is a methodological approach which purpose is to build theory from data, it is therefore using induction. The data is analyzed with no preconceived ideas, and therefore the outcome, the theories, are inducted by the data. Our aim was to use both primary and secondary data to deepen our understanding around our research question. Matching a methodology choice with our research project oriented us towards the Grounded Theory.

The choice of this methodology was, among other things, related to the fact that we felt the need for some flexibility in our research process. Our research process needed to be intuitive and creative and thus flexibility regarding the methodology was important for us. We stayed in the outline of the Grounded Theory all along the process but without being restricted by it.

The other methodologies we looked upon were not suitable for our research. The Analytical view (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008) requires formulating precisely our research from the beginning in order to formulate specific hypotheses. This very formal approach was not flexible enough for us, and also, our choice of doing a qualitative research was also not a good match with the analytical view. Also, we did not plan on producing generalizable results (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008, p.49); our findings would not necessarily be universal objective knowledge. We put our focus on creating meaning and understanding among the readers, rather than seeking truth. The system view, on the other hand, caught our attention because of its focus on the relationship between different components (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008, p.116). However, its unpredictability and the need to delimit every system made it complicated for us to use.

Finally, we did not select the actor's approach as a suitable one either. The analyze of organizational components cannot be restricted to only actors, and the results provided by the actors view such as language developments are not what we aim for. The main reason why Grounded Theory was the suitable methodology for us was the qualitative nature of our research.

2.3. A Qualitative Research.

“There are many reasons for choosing qualitative research, but perhaps the most important is the desire to step beyond the known and enter into the world of participants, to see the world from their perspective and in doing so make discoveries that will contribute to the development of empirical knowledge” (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.16)
Qualitative analysis is defined as the following: "A process of examining and interpreting data in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge" (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.1). As stated before, creating meaning and understanding for our reader was our main goal. According to us, meaning would be created and transmitted in a better way with qualification rather than quantification. For instance, by asking someone what were the resistances to change rather than asking him or her how many people were resistant. This quest for causality, in order to build our model, oriented us toward a qualitative study. Making the reader to reflect and question about our issues and leading him or her toward understanding and solutions was our way of processing. We did not plan on seeking the truth and developing generalizable results, but rather on creating knowledge that the reader could assimilate and interpret.

Thus, adopting a qualitative research seemed to us as the best way to serve our purpose, reach our goal and optimize our outcome. That choice to do a qualitative research motivated even more our choice of the Grounded Theory. By looking upon organizational elements or human behaviors, we did not feel that quantitative data would be very pertinent. Leadership by essence is relational, especially with our aim to share it. We felt that using quantitative data could not really capture the human perspective we wanted to investigate. Leadership is connected to individuals, organizational, or external aspects and so on. Analyzing complex relationships between actors themselves or actors and their environment (their organization) should be done in a qualitative manner. We wanted to make order out of disorder through our qualitative study, and our commitment to our research also pushed us toward a qualitative study (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.13).

Our research is mainly exploratory, and is aiming at finding understanding of actions and motivations for instance, and providing explanations of phenomena. Quantification is not our focus on this thesis. Our data collection was done in a qualitative way, through readings and interviews for instance, that we will develop in the next part. We put a certain focus on our research on the sharing of experiences, and that is done best with qualitative methods. This orientation towards empirical data was suiting the qualitative approach.

Our research was qualitative because of the nature of our research issue. By reading our research question, we can see that the "answer", or the solution, will not be brought by statistics or any quantification. It is rather by qualitative investigations, observations, interpretations and deductions that we would build our model. This choice was also made because of the dynamic nature of our field, which is in opposition with the rigid format of
This choice of doing a qualitative research was then directed the whole process of data collection.

2.4. Data collection

Our data collection started after the first stages developed above. The pre-understanding and the setting of a research question enabled us to have a direction for our data collection and to go ahead. "One of the virtues of qualitative research is that there are many alternative sources of data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.27). We had lot of different options to collect our data, and we reflected about what could serve the best the purpose of our thesis. We chose to combine Secondary Data with an extensive literature review and Primary Data with case studies realized through interviews. We did not separate collection of primary and secondary data in stages and we realized those two steps in the same time according to our methodology. This combination provided us with a complete amount of data of both theoretical background and empirical data to build our model. This step was about open coding, collecting raw data, labeling them and delimiting concepts.

2.4.1. Secondary Data.

Secondary data refers as "Using material previously collected" (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008, p.176). In other words, secondary data is data which already exists and which has been collected by someone else. In this phase, we did an extensive review of technical literature. We first look for general references about shared and distributed leadership, and read articles and books about our main concept. For instance, some of the references below were the first sources that we used (among others):

- Pearce, C. L., C. C. Manz, and H. R Sims, Jr. (2009) Where Do We Go From Here?: Is Shared Leadership the Key to Team Success? Organizational Dynamics
- Pearce, C., Manz, C., Sims, H.P. (2013). Share, Don't Take the Lead, Paperback
After collecting general data about our main concept, we started to structure our thesis about some pillars and we went more into details. We read technical literature about organizational issues connected to distributed leadership. For instance, we went through the references below (among others):


We also went through literature about human issues connected to distributed leadership, such as diversity, leading styles and so on, for example with the following references (among others):

We chose to operate a literature review through secondary data because of the richness in the field. This data collection was self-alimented because each reference we read was leading us to other references, and we followed those tracks until we found all the elements we needed. We found relevant references about distributed leadership that foster our understanding and developed our research further. We also looked among the massive literature of organizational structure and human behaviors to select what could be an asset in our research and bring value.

The collection of secondary data enabled us to create a solid background for our research. The theories we encountered and explained were the foundations on which we built our model. However, lot of this data were either academicals or very theoretical, so we felt the need to combine it with more empirical data, that is why we used as well primary data in our research.

2.4.2. Primary Data

Our literature review was the foundation of our work, and the primary data was the empirical knowledge coming to build on this foundation. Primary data refers to "Collecting new data (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2008, p.176). It means data directly created by the researcher. Arbnor & Bjerke present three types of this primary data: Direct Observations, Interviews and Experiments. Direct observations would have been really hard for us to perform, because in order to have reliable results we would have need a lot of time to do extensive field observations. Experiments could have been a possible solution for us, but the nature of distributed leadership made it very complicated to develop reliable results from experiments.

We then chose to realize interviews, not by default, but because it was a great opportunity for us. Those interviews were used as case studies. We targeted participants regarding the structure in which they were evolving, and then regarding their position in this structure. Before going to the interview stage, we studied these organizations with articles, documentaries, videos and so on in order to gather knowledge before going deeper with our interviews.

The selection of interviews participants was crucial to have valuable results. The nature of our research enabled us to target at people in organizations practicing distributed leadership and empowerment. We did a lot of research about companies who had such types of philosophy, and we selected 4 structures to study by means of interviews.
- One structure was a small firm of law that caught our attention because of its way of sharing the lead and because of its rather small size compared to the other structures we studied. We interview one of the partners.

- Another structure was the GORE Corporation, very well known for its humanistic philosophy, its low hierarchy and for the empowerment of its employees. We interview one of the director of Gore Scandinavia.

- The third structure was the Belgian Social Security. It took our attention because of the changes they are developing since a decade, trying to empower their employees by autonomy. It was also valuable because it was a public organization unlike the two other structures. We interviewed the responsible of the juridical side which is also working with the President and who worked a lot on implementing those changes.

- The last structure we studied was a Bank, we interviewed a manager of a big bank in order to analyze the structural limits of distributed leadership and empowerment.

Regarding our interviews, we did them following the same process:

On a technical side, we did most of our interviews on Skype except from one on the phone, because of the distance with our interviewees. We recorded every interviews and then we did a transcript of them. Obviously, we gave importance in being polite and respectful. We chose to keep the identity of participants anonymous in order to get full honesty in the results.

About the interview itself, we started every interview by "setting the interview stage" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p.154), in which we introduced ourselves and presented our research as well as our interest in the interviewee and the organization. This phase was setting the purpose of the interview. It was about not to go off the tracks and to frame the interview within the frame of our research. This choice of setting the purpose from the beginning was motivated by the fact that we did not operated a "funnel-shaped interview" where we hide our purpose (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p.156). Clearly stating our purpose was able to maximize the connection of the data collected with our research.

We had a script prepared before every interview with pre-established questions. Those questions were covering specific topics regarding the nature of the company and the person we were interviewing. However, this script was more like a guideline and we used it with flexibility. We often deleted questions that were already answered or added second questions to precise interesting points. These second questions were very interesting for us to precise key points and also to show active listening from our part (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p.164).
Our interviews were very interactive, and we started most of the questions by a connection to what our interviewee had said before. Besides that, our questions were short and precise. We asked questions regarding knowledge that we wanted to produce, meaning the content to extract, and also regarding the interaction that we wanted to provoke: "An interview question can be evaluated with respect to both a thematic and a dynamic dimension".

This collection of primary data was aiming at collecting data from various sources: a small firm, a big corporation, a public organization and a bank. This diversity of sources was a choice we made in order to have specific elements that would be conceptualized and incorporated in our model.

2.5. Data Analysis.

The data analysis phase started after collected enough data to start analyzing it. Though, the phases of data collection and data analysis were not separated and independent from each other, we proceed to the analysis as soon as we started collected data. In some cases, the analysis of data was giving the direction for another phase of data collection, because new concepts and questions emerged during the analysis leading to new data collection. This is connected to the theoretical sampling we have been doing, we explored this circular process until we reached saturation (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.145) and felt like we explored enough to answer our research question. Every time we collected data, we connected it to our research question and tried to analyze how can it fit and help us to conceptualize. We then collected other data and did the same process, until our model was built. We proceed to axial coding in this step and we built relationship between concepts that emerged during open coding. Our data analysis was mainly based on our empirical results from the interviews we conducted. We analyzed those interviews and tried to connect them to the theoretical frameworks developed before with the secondary data.

During the analysis, one important thing for us was to write memos (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.117). We kept track of our choices and our reflections all along the process of our analysis. It was important in order not to get overwhelmed by the amount of data to analyze and to keep some structure. Most of our memos were about structuring our process and our analysis. It gave us insight about our analysis. Diagrams were also important for us to gain and provide understanding during our analysis and integration, especially about relationships between concepts or components. Diagrams are "Conceptual visualization of data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.124), and helped us to create meaning both for the researcher and the reader. Another
important point for us was to analyze data with sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.32). As it is hard to be objective in a qualitative research, it is important to be sensible to the data in order to grasp insight by being intellectually responsive to it.

During the analysis of our interviews, we focused both on meaning and on language to create understanding for the reader and us.

We mainly analyzed our interviews through meaning. Analyzing through meaning is about interpretation of what is being said in these interviews: "Meaning interpretation may extend the original text by adding hermeneutic layers that enable the researcher to understand the meaning" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p231). This interpretation can be accomplished by "Recontextualizes the statements within broader frame of references" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p235), leading to develop every idea explained during an interview and build on this idea. For instance, we built on some of the ideas or concepts which appeared during the interviews by reframing them in our theoretical frameworks studied before when it was appropriate. In sum, analyzes focusing on meaning occur when "The interpreter goes beyond what is directly said to work out structures and relations of meanings not immediately apparent in a text" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p235). In order to grasp and extract the maximum out of our interviews, it was necessary for us to go beyond what was said and extract as much as we can from this data.

We also in a lesser extent used some part of the language analysis (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p.249) to identify patterns and the focus put by the interviewee. For instance we studied the most recurrent words in the interviewees. This linguistic analysis (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p.249) illustrated the main focus of the interviewees and emphasizes his main concerns he wanted to convey, maybe unconsciously. We also proceed to narrative analysis and focus on the stories told during the interview. In some interviews, we had a lot of empirical examples or analogies, which was very interesting to analyze. Those business situation examples were what we were looking for in these interviews, because of their practical nature that was missing in the literature review. "Narrative researches try to identify the plots that typically appear in stories" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p256). Our analysis of those stories was about capturing the point that our interviewee was trying to make.

The analysis of our interview was based on the combination of these methods as well as with some bricolage (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p267). We refer to it as bricolage because we also analyzed our interviews with flexibility. We used various methods to create meaning such as
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trying to capture the overall impression of the interview, target at specific parts, develop the
metaphors to capture key understanding and so on (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p267).

During our analysis, especially on the meaning interpretation, we put a focus on keeping the
exact meaning of what the interviewee said, in order to preserve the validity of our results.
The validity of our interviews can be seen by objective results, resulting in "reliable
knowledge, checked and controlled, undistorted by personal bias and prejudice" (Brinkmann
& Kvale, 2015, p278), and that was what we aimed for in this research.

2.6. Integration

The last phase of our thesis was to integrate our result and building our model. Integration is
referred as "The process linking categories around a core category and refining and trimming
the resulting theoretical construction"(Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p.263). We proceed to
selective coding, identifying a core category and subcategories to integrate within it. The
integration was around a core category which was the implementation of distributed
leadership. Within this core category, we introduced other categories related to organizational
issues, change management, human issues and so on.

This step represents the formalization of our model, and represents our findings. We presented
steps of implementation of distributed leadership regarding the data collected about
organizational change and related elements to deal with. We specified and summarized the
main requirements from the individual perspective. We develop our concept of toolbox as
well. Those three categories enabled us to match our model with our research question. We
used a lot of diagrams in this integration phase in order to create meaning. Those diagrams
aimed at illustrating relations, causality, consequences and relations within concepts as we
developed in the axial coding phase.

2.7. Final Comments about Grounded Theory.

We presented above why did we chose to use the Grounded Theory and also how did we used
it. This methodology was very appropriate to the qualitative nature of our study, and enabled
us to turn our expectations into results by providing us tools as well as a guideline. Quality of
a research led with the Grounded Theory approach is difficult to appreciate, however we tried
to keep in mind four important principles in our thesis process (Strauss & Corbin, 1997,
p.268): First, collecting valid and credible data to have reliable results. Then, having a
research process suiting our choice of methodology. Third, having a solid empirical ground for our research. Finally, the last and not the least is to provide valuable results through a good and solid model.


Leadership is a very dynamic field, especially over the past decades. By looking back into history, we can observe the story and the development of Leadership in organizations, with for instance times of paternalism or individual heroic leadership (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003). Recently, alternative modes of leadership have emerged, among which the idea of sharing the lead within the organization. It is seen as a good solution for the problems and the new challenges that organizations are facing these days. The demands on leadership today are very different than the ones of the past century, thus this field may have to adapt and operate a transition. This idea of sharing the lead is open to a lot of different interpretations and applications, it is a very broad concept. From this idea, tons of concepts has emerged, for instance collective leadership, co-leadership, dispersed leadership, distributed leadership or shared leadership. In a quest for clarity, we will refer on this thesis to the last two, shared and especially distributed leadership, which are seen as the two main concepts born from the reaction to the classical hierarchical leadership style (Fitzsimons, Turnbull, Denyer, 2011).

3.1. Historical emergence of shared and distributed Leadership.

As we said, phenomena of shared leadership have recently emerged in organizations in order to face certain issues (Pearce, Manz, Sims, 2013). However, if the raise of interest is recent, this idea of sharing the lead was out there since a long time. In the antic Roman Republic, co-leadership was implemented with success during more than four centuries (Sally, 2002). Athenians gave born to democracy centuries ago, because of their will to share the power of decision and give the possibility to involve citizens in the society. In the organizations, the reflection is the same, and this idea was formulated for instance in 1924 by Follett, stating that leadership could be attached to the appropriate skill in a specific situation rather than to an individual: "One should not only look to the designated leader, but one should let logic dictate to whom one should look for guidance" (as cited in Crainer, 2002, p.72). She is also developing the idea of "power with" rather than "power over", stepping away from coercion...
and developing collective relations and collaboration. In 1948, Benne and Sheats also detached leadership from the individuals, relating it rather to functions and making it therefore accessible to several people. Later on, Gibb (1954) also evokes the distributive pattern of leadership: "Leadership is probably best conceived as a group quality, as a set of functions which must be carried out by the group." (Gibb, 1954, p.54). Furthermore, in the 1960s, McGregor's Theory Y shows that individuals can be underused in organizations and that they are able to control themselves and take decisions if they are associated with the goal of the organization. It is about sharing the decisions that affects the workers, in order to make them satisfy and therefore provoke motivation and performance. In 1966, Bowers and Seashore's study shows the positive effects of a leadership coming from the peers. Blau and Alba (1982), as well as Conger and Kanungo (1988), developed the idea of empowerment in organizations. Hodgson (1965) or Heenan and Bennis (1999) developed alternatives modes of leadership in which a designated leader can be substituted by groups within the organization.

All these examples above showed that the intention to share the lead in organization is not new. However, its application has never been an actual trend and was often left to the theoretical part. In the last decades, this tendency is starting to change and the interest for shared leadership is becoming real, and its application in organizations has met success in lot of cases (Pearce, Manz & Sims, 2013).

The future of shared and distributed leadership is quite unknown, and we can imagine three possible evolutions. First possibility, it might just be a short trend and never overcome the traditional form of leadership to finally fade away and disappear. Second possibility, it might grow bigger and bigger and substitute traditional forms of leadership, and become the standard of leadership. Finally, it is possible (and likely) that shared and distributed leadership will continue to live side by side with the traditional top-down types of leadership.

### 3.2. Shared Leadership, a broad and extended context.

Shared Leadership was the first concept we looked upon in our research. It has been define as "broadly sharing power and influence among a set of individuals rather than centralizing it in the hands of a single individual who acts in the clear role of a dominant superior." (Pearce, Manz & Sims, 2009, p234). This definition is quite broad, but is giving an overview of the essence of shared leadership. Shared leadership is firstly an opposition to the traditional
hierarchical structure of leadership. Shared Leadership represents an alternative, and is about decentralization of the power, and is about detaching the lead from one single individual. Shared leadership is the global term which is more commonly used to define such things in organizations.

We believe that this concept has two sides: sharing the position of leader and/or sharing the power, which are two different things. Shared leadership can be a situation in which several people possess the role of leader in an organization or a project and are leading collectively (co-leadership for instance). It can also be, according to us, about empowering people which are not technically set as leaders. By empowering and involving them, you are sharing your own power with them and that is why we see it as a practice of shared leadership. This distinction is important, especially in big organizations where it can be unproductive to have a few thousands leaders at the head. Instead, a possible efficient practice of shared leadership would be to develop procedures and attitudes from the head of the organization to empower people for the bottom and involve them in decision making and in setting the vision. This is the idea of distributed leadership that we will develop later on.

The following quote by Goldsmith gives more insight about this concept and the whys and the hows of shared leadership, as well as the outcome:

"Shared leadership involves maximizing all of the human resources in an organization by empowering individuals and giving them an opportunity to take leadership positions in their areas of expertise. With more complex markets increasing the demands on leadership, the job in many cases is simply too large for one individual." (Goldsmith, 2010, p.1)

This definition caught our attention because it was highlighting several meaningful points for us. The maximization of the human resources of an organization is for us the finality of implementing shared leadership. By sharing the lead, organizations can optimize the use of all the potential of the workers. It is answering the "Why" of our ambition to develop a collective way of leading. Then, the next part of this definition is giving some clues about the "How", by referring to empowerment. We see empowerment as the mean to share the lead. It is ambivalent, because the empowerment has to be made possible by the structure (the organization) but also by the will of the people within the structure. That will be our two main pillars in this research, on which we will build on. Furthermore, the notion of expertise is also meaningful for us. Sharing leadership is relevant only if it is made to enlighten the "gifts" of people and value the diversity of the organization (De Pree, 1987). We believe that sharing the lead won't be fully relevant and beneficial if everyone is developing the same formalized
leadership style. Our conviction is that every actor has to rely on his own attributes in order to find his own leadership style by leading with authenticity.

Sharing leadership is related with self-expression. This is supported by Bennis "So the point is not to become a leader. The point is to become yourself, to use yourself completely—all your skills, gifts, and energies—in order to make your vision manifest." (Bennis, 2008, p.106). By restraining people in situation of subordination they are not able to express themselves completely. The hierarchy and the structure is holding them back. Not being able to express yourself is leading to frustration, and shared leadership represents a solution to this issue. Finally, Goldsmith's definition also emphasizes that sharing the lead can be a solution to the complexification of the leader's task. This idea is supported in the book Share, Don't Take the Lead: "The three powerful Cs of complexity, change, and competition, from around the globe, call for a new more potent and robust form of leadership [...] one that truly taps the capacity, experience and creativity of the entire workforce." (Pearce, Manz & Sims, 2013, p xi). Here again, this quote is related to the optimization of the workforce value, which is getting harder and harder to reach with the classical form of hierarchical leadership possessed by one single individual. This idea is supported by O'Toole "The challenges a corporation faces are so complex that they require a set of skills too broad to be possessed by any one individual" (O'Toole, Galbraith & Lawler, 2002, p68).

In the literature, Shared Leadership is also defined as "a team process where leadership is carried out by the team as a whole [...] through a collaborative process" (Fitzsimons, Turnbull, Denyer, 2011). Those notions of team and collaboration are essential to specify the concept of shared leadership. According to the notion of teamwork, there are a few requirements expected from the members to make a sharing of leadership successful. This has been formulated by Cox, Pearce and Perry: "First, team members must understand that constructive lateral influence is a standing performance expectation. Second, members must accept responsibility for providing and responding appropriately to constructive leadership from their peers. Third, the team members must develop skills as effective leaders and follower" (Pearce & Conger, 2003, p.53). This illustrates that conditions to the implementation of a shared leadership are not only structural but also rely on human abilities of the actors within the organization. They must develop skills as well as positive attitudes in order to develop collective intelligence and act effectively in a situation of shared leadership. If done in the right way, shared leadership has been positively correlated with team-effectiveness (Hiller, Day & Vance, 2006) and team performance (Hoch, 2014).
Shared Leadership is not an absolute notion; it is not black or white regarding its application. The lead is most of the time shared in some extent; it is a matter of degree. Most of the famous historical leaders were supported by other leaders in the fulfilling of their mission. For instance, Gandhi was supported by Nehru or Martin Luther King by Jesse Jackson (O’Toole, Galbraith & Lawler, 2002, p66). The human limits, as well as the time and energy constraints, requires even to the most authoritarian leader to give away some of his power if he or she wants to achieve performance. This extent to which the leadership should be shared is a crucial point of our research. The vision is often seen as the most essential thing that should be shared in the organization (Pearce, Manz & Sims, 2009). Smirch and Morgan (1982) are referring to socially constructed organizations. They say that the task of a leader is to set a point of reference and frame the reality of his followers in order to build a common understanding (Smirch & Morgan, 1982, p. 258). However, this process of management of meaning is hard to perform, and there is always reluctance from people to have their own reality framed by others and a universal acceptance of the leader’s reality is not reachable. He or she will face opposition and pressure from people who will not embrace his reality and who will not be willing to be framed and to surrender their control over their own reality (Smirch & Morgan, 1982, p. 258). This socially constructed organization could therefore be seen as superficial, representing only the leader’s own vision and his ability to influence the people around him to embrace it. Implementing a truly shared leadership is different and has to reach a better involvement of the organization’s members. The vision has to be co-created, and would therefore not be the vision of a leader but the vision of the organization, to which everyone can relate.

3.3. Distinction: Distributed Leadership.

Distributed leadership is often seen as a synonym of shared leadership but those concepts have some notable distinctions. Distributed leadership is somehow going further than shared leadership. It is not only about practically involving several people in the practice of leadership, but also about focusing on the interactions of the people and observing the situation where this distributed leadership occurs (Fitzsimons, Turnbull, Denyer, 2011). This was formulated by Bennet: "Distributed leadership is not something ‘done’ by an individual ‘to’ others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization [...] it is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action" (Bennett et all, 2003, p. 3).
According to Spillane (2006), there are three forms of distributed leadership. First of all, Collaborated distribution is when several people are collaborating directly in the same place and at the same time. Then, in Collective distribution, they are no longer working in the same time and space but they are still dependant on each other. Finally, Co-ordinated distribution "refers to leadership practice that has to be performed in sequence" (Fitzsimons, Turnbull, Denyer, 2011, p.318).

Distributed leadership is often practiced in education context, but it is also very relevant in organizational and corporate context. It relies on the key notion of collaboration and shared purpose. "Distributed Leadership happens most effectively when people at all levels engage in action, accepting leadership in their particular areas of expertise. It requires resources that support and enable collaborative environments together with a flexible approach to space, time and finance which occur as a result of diverse contextual settings in an institution." (Jones et al, 2013, p.21). It also relies on an open culture, meaning that the organization has to provide the conditions to exercise such leadership. For instance a culture in which sharing and developing new ideas is encouraged.

We specified earlier the difference between sharing a leading position and sharing the power. Distributed Leadership is more about sharing the power. For instance, not everyone will be a decision-maker, but everyone will take part in the process of decision-making.

The following diagram summarizes this concept of Distributed leadership.
Conceptual Model of Distributed Leadership.

<http://emedia.rmit.edu.au/distributedleadership/?q=node/143>

This diagram shows engagement as a key to share the lead, and illustrates that its implementation requires people, processes, support and systems. Involvement is about making people responsible and accountable for their work and furthermore for their organization, by associating them to the outcome.

We will refer to Distributed Leadership in this thesis because this concept is a good basis for our work. It is capturing lot of points we want to develop, such as for instance involvement, collaboration and its benefits. For us, it is giving more sense than the term of shared leadership which is too broad and a generic term of all kind of situations in which there is not one singular omnipotent leader. Distributed Leadership is pointing more on several key points especially empowerment, which is a cornerstone in our work.
3.4. Challenges to address when sharing the lead.

Distributed Leadership is something highly difficult to implement. Even if its benefits are not contested by many, the lead is still not shared and distributed in many organizations because of all the issues, prerequisites and constraints that come with it.

The main reason is probably a cultural/historical reason. The first definition of leadership provided when searching on Google is the following: "a process of social influence in which a person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task" The universal understanding of leadership always relate it firstly to a single individual. The idea of its sharing among several people is therefore provoking some reluctances. "This resistance to the notion of shared leadership stems from thousands of years of cultural conditioning. We are dealing with a near-universal myth: in the popular mind, leadership is always singular" (O'Toole, Galbraith & Lawler, 2002, p.65). Plato contributed to the building of this myth: "Four hundred years BC, Plato wrote that leadership is a rare trait, typically possessed by only one person in any society, an individual who has a unique lock on wisdom and truth" (O'Toole, Galbraith & Lawler, 2002, p.65-66). This social construction of leadership as singular is hard to overcome, and it requires lot of time and efforts to change this deeply rooted conception. Because of its paradoxical nature, this concept of distributed leadership has to struggle to justify its existence. However, the many proved benefits of it are the reason why this tendency is starting to change and the universal conception of leadership as a singular activity is now contested.

Other challenges of shared leadership are more pragmatics. The implementation of shared leadership can be difficult because of the constant need to reach consensus and common agreement. Collective Intelligence is hard to reach. The single process of decision making can be extremely difficult if the decision has to be made by several individuals. The more individuals take part in the process, the harder it gets to reach an agreement. Shared leadership can thus be seen as counter-productive: "No successful, profit-making company that I know of has ever been run by a team" (Locke, 2003, p.273).

Providing and fulfilling a vision is the key challenge for any leader, and here again, sharing the vision with many actors is hard to accomplish. As human beings, we all have different aspirations, different expectations and different ways of thinking that are often difficult to combine. For this reasons, giving the lead to one single individual is suppose to solve this problems by providing unilateral decisions and vision. However, it can be seen as a simplistic
solution that facilitates the daily procedures indeed, but without optimizing the outcome and the internal human potential within an organization.

3.5. The Liberated Companies as an illustration of Distributed Leadership.

Distributed leadership in application can be observed through the example of the Liberated Leaders and Liberated Companies (Carney & Getz, 2009).

In a liberated company (Carney & Getz, 2009) the employees are not told what to do and how to do. They are involved into the why are they working, they are co-creating the vision of the company and therefore they are sharing it. By doing so, they feel involved and excited about this vision and the purpose of their work. Those companies rely on the notion of empowerment. For instance, when facing a problem, the employees are left with full autonomy to deal with it and solve it. It is not about stressing the employees, but about listening and making them responsible. Letting the employees take initiative is a way to share the lead, and this way of leading is called Liberating Leadership (Carney & Getz, 2009). Thus, the leadership position is not shared per se, but the leadership is distributed among the employees because the liberating Leader is giving away some of his power to his followers.

Employees, by taking their own decisions, are said to be self-motivated (Getz, 2009). This self-motivation is made possible by the environment that has to satisfy people's needs. If the environment does not fits the needs of the people, motivation has to be accomplish externally (control, punishment, incentives) and it is not optimal and only a short term solution. Thus, a liberated company providing an environment of trust, autonomy or listening in which the employees can blossom do not have to motivate the employees with incentives or control. This is well illustrated by Mc Gregor: "The answer to the question managers often ask "How do you motivate people?" is: You don’t. Man is by nature motivated. His behavior is influenced by relationships between his characteristics as an organic system and the environment" (Mc Gregor, 1967, p.10-11).

A worldwide study by Gallup in 2012 over 142 countries showed that only 13% of the employees are feeling engaged at work. 63% of them are feeling not engaged while the remaining 24% are feeling actively disengaged (Crabtree, 2013). It is an actual problem for organizations, disengagement being negatively correlated to performance. Those Liberated Companies represent a solution to this issue. This concept rest on four principles: "Stop
telling and start listening; Start openly and actively sharing your vision of the company so people will own it; Stop trying to motivate people; Stay Alert" (Carney & Getz, 2009, p.8). This process, however, is quite long, it is said by Isaac Getz to take three to ten years regarding the size of the organization.

Application of those Liberated Companies can be seen through the example of two French companies: FAVI and Poult.

FAVI is a French copper-alloy foundry very well known for its success and its innovative organization. Favi's employees are acting with complete freedom and responsibility to do their work. According to the former director Jean-François Zobrist, the power is given to the productive people because they are the one who have the knowledge. He also emphasizes the importance of the "why" and the purpose at work. The main principle and value of FAVI is that confidence is bringing more than control. Control is expensive and costs time, and FAVI, through his director Jean-François Zobrist, believes that men are good. Control is therefore unnecessary. They also developed a creative solution to both involve people and co-create the vision of the company: a suggestion box. Any employee is free to submit suggestions or ideas in a box and each month the two best ideas are rewarded with 2000€. For instance, one of the technicians won the bonus by proposing a way to reorganize his machine in order to save time and gain productivity. Another principle of FAVI is that the employees are not working for their superior but they are working for their clients. An important portion of FAVI's benefits is shared with the employees with an annual bonus which is the same for every employee. By acting as a Liberated Company, FAVI's performances are excellent, as explained by Isaac Getz: "exceptional quality (at the time of our visit the company was at twenty million units delivered without a single quality reject), on-time delivery (FAVI has not missed a deadline in more than two decades), and impressive growth (the company grew its share of the highly competitive European auto-parts market for its brass gear forks product line from near 0 to 50% and garnered a share of the Chinese market as well). FAVI experienced a three-decade-long double-digit free cash-flow and solid margins—in a market in which its European competitors either are manufacturing at a loss, or have disappeared" (Getz, 2009, p.33).

Poult is also French Company, which principles are similar to FAVI's. In 2010, Poult dedicated a day for all the employees to meet and discuss about the orientation of the company. It was a gigantic brainstorming with over 400 employees discussing about the future of the company. On this day, they decided to delete lot of levels of hierarchy. All the previous managers got new jobs within the company, even if most of them decided to leave.
Direction Committee meetings don't happen anymore in Poult, and every decision is made by meetings with any kind of employee who wants to attend. After this drastic change, they were recording a growth of 12% and some of the biggest companies from across the world were sending HR specialist and consultants to study this success and the organization of Poult.

Both of FAVI and Poult were rewarded with times with trophies for their innovations. These examples are illustrating very advanced cases of distributed leadership, but obviously leadership can also be distributed in a less drastic manner. However, FAVI and Poult are some of the best examples of those Liberated Companies illustrating the practice of successful Distributed Leadership.

As we said before, Shared and distributed Leadership are representing a solution to many issues that organizations are facing. However, it comes with a lot of prerequisites and conditions to be applicable, which is the reason why it is so difficult to implement and why it is not totally expended yet. We will next develop those constraints and prerequisites more into details, both for the structure itself and the actors within the structure. We will beforehand present the external factors influencing the implementation of distributed leadership. We will then address the issue of whether the benefits of implementing Distributed Leadership outweigh the cost of its constraints and prerequisites.

4. Secondary Data

This section highlights the secondary data collected around the two pillars of the research: the individual perspective and the organizational perspective. Moreover, it highlights the external factors influencing the implementation of distributed leadership and it is developing theoretical frameworks around the notion of empowerment and self-managed teams. This section is reviewing the literature and the existing knowledge about those key components of the research.

4.1. The External Factors Influencing Distributed Leadership.

To understand the mechanism that influence the organization and in our case, the levers that ease and harden the changes in organization to implement distributed leadership, it is necessary to use some concepts to identify and classify the influencing actors and field in order to get a filter that enables to facilitate the conceptualization. Indeed, PESTLE and the
five forces of Porter are excellent tools to identify the external factors and actors that influence the dynamism of the organizations. Thus beyond, they will enable us to determine the accelerators and obstacles for implementing distributed leadership in the organization according to its business environment and so on.

4.1.1. The PESTLE/ PEST analysis.
One of the main tool to develop a business plan, the PESTLE analysis is a marketing tool in order to track the environment in which an organization is operating. It singles out 6 fields which are:

- Political (Services, infrastructure, tax policy, regulation)
- Economic (Growth rate, inflation, labour costs, business cycle)
- Social (Demography, education, cultural norms, income distribution)
- Technological (Emerging tech, Tech transfer, R&D Efforts, Communication)
- Legal (Regional laws, law enforcement, court system)
- Environmental (Resources management, energy availability, workforce health, climate change).

Thus, using PESTLE analysis would enable to have a first insight of the organization’s situation. Among those environmental factors, some can have a significant influence on the implementation of distributed leadership. For instance, the level of development of technological environment can provide tools facilitating distributed leadership, for instance communication tools. On the other hand, the legal environment can also have a decisive influence on distributed leadership. Some sectors operating with high risk such as the financial sector have to deal with a lot of constraints regarding the law. Those laws act as obstacles to share the lead. These legal measures can force the organizations to exercise control and develop the incapacity to empower the employees.

4.1.2. Five forces of Porter.
Like The PESTEL/ PEST analysis, the Porter five forces analysis enables a better insight of the level of competition within a market to implement a strategy development. It is composed
into five forces, threat of new entrants, threat of substitutes, bargaining power of suppliers, bargaining power of customers and intensity of competitiveness.

- Threat of new entrants: barrier to entry, government policy, capital requirements, absolute cost, economies of scale, economies of product differences, product differentiation, brand equity, expected retaliation, access to distribution, customer loyalty, industry profitability.

- Threat of substitutes: Buyer propensity to substitute, Relative price performance of substitute, Buyer propensity to substitute, Perceived level of product differentiation, Number of substitute products available in the market, Number of substitute products available in the market, Ease of substitution, Substandard product.

- Bargaining power of suppliers: Degree of differentiation of inputs, impact of inputs on cost or differentiation, presence of substitute inputs, strength of distribution channel, supplier concentration to firm concentration ratio, employee solidarity, supplier competition.

- Bargaining power of customers: Degree of dependency upon existing channels of distribution, Bargaining leverage, Buyer information availability, availability of existing substitute products, buyer price sensitivity, differential advantage, RFM analysis, the total amount of trading.

- Intensity of competitiveness: Competitive advantage, level of advertising expense, powerful competitive strategy, market share, degree of transparency
Some of the forces presented above can have an influence on the implementation of Distributed Leadership. For instance, an important bargaining power of suppliers can give them too much control over the organization and influence the decisions. If the suppliers are not likely to collaborate with an organization functioning with a distributed leadership it can make its implementation impossible. In another way, an extreme rivalry on the market can force an organization to innovate in order to stay competitive. Distributed leadership and empowerment are a way to develop creative thinking and to improve innovation. Those examples illustrated how the external environment of an organization can either act as a facilitator or an obstacle to the implementation of distributed leadership.

4.2. Individual perspective

In this part, we focus on the concepts related to human issues, to understand the potential of the leadership toolbox for organizations. The purpose of this section is to determine human potentials usable in leadership, the ways to highlight them through each individual and to push them to take the lead. Therefore, this part aims to find fields of research to incorporate to the “leadership toolbox” of the organization by profiling the individual human skills of the organization’s members and alongside to develop a process that push the potential leaders to be empowered.

4.2.1. Personal Characteristics.

This section focuses on presenting the main characteristics influencing individuals. The learning style, the gender aspect and the cultural aspect are developing the "toolbox" through the differences between peoples. The Generation Y and its specific characteristics are presented as well.

4.2.1.1. Learning Style

Distributed leadership can be efficient only if there is transparency. It doesn’t mean that it’s necessary to provide also confidential data, which can cause serious aftermatts to the organization, but it means to guarantee the exchange of information related to the mission and tasks of the employees. Moreover, empowering employees mean to provide necessary
knowledge for decision making. That’s why Knowledge Management is a necessary concept to understand in order to develop distributed leadership.

According to Ikujiro Nonaka (1994), they are four dynamic of knowledge creation depending on the dynamism of the knowledge creation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From/To</th>
<th>Tacit Knowledge</th>
<th>Explicit Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>SOCIALIZATION</td>
<td>EXTERNALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>INTERNALIZATION</td>
<td>COMBINATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SECI model)

- Socialization enables tacit knowledge to be shared and to become collective. The conversion doesn’t process through language but through direct observation.
- Externalization articulates tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge, to take the form of codified knowledge like concept or models. It’s based on metaphors and analogies.
- Combination aims to combine explicit knowledge together, to systematize shared concepts into a knowledge system. In this case, existing information are reprocessed and reconfigured.
- Internalization enables the conversion of explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) suggest that the knowledge creation follows a cycle between the previous four dynamics in which **implicit knowledge** is 'extracted' to become **explicit knowledge**, and explicit knowledge is 're-internalized' into implicit knowledge. By creating knowledge, it follows the cycle and enables the potential leaders to change his/her behavior and to take the lead.
By following the process, the initial individual knowledge is integrated to the shared information of the organization. If we plan to empower potential leaders to lead team projects, it is necessary that the knowledge of the managers and current leaders be reachable to the empowered employees in order to optimize their decision-making and to develop their individual knowledge of their new tasks faster.

However, the theory is limited mainly because:

- It assumes tacit knowledge is convertible.
- It claims knowledge is a social construction but it treats it as an objective functional resources.
- Confuse process of managerial decision making with knowledge creation.

To complement the theory of Nonaka, Brian Braclker (1995), defined five common knowledge types: embrained, encoded, embodied, encultured and embedded knowledge.

- **Embrained knowledge** is defined as an explicit, formal and abstract form of knowledge, relying on individual conceptual skill and cognitive abilities.
- **Encoded Knowledge** is defined by explicit knowledge through symbols and signs.
- **Embodied knowledge** is based on individual tacit knowledge. Action-oriented it depends on people presence, sensory information, acquired by doing.

- **Encultured knowledge** is the collective form of tacit knowledge as a social system of meaning.

- **Embedded knowledge** is present in high technological organization in which information is related to a mix between individual, interpersonal, technological and social structural factors.

Thus, knowledge creation may be created through the shift between tacit and explicit states, through different aspect such as symbols, social systems or cognitive. Potential leaders can improve the needed knowledge of their future task among these five common knowledge types.

But individuals are different according to the way to assimilate knowledge and can be understood through the Kolb’s (1976) theory of the learning style preferences. He proposes a concept to understand this phenomenon. He noticed that learning is a cycle in which it starts from a **concrete experience**. Then, **observations and reflections** are in process to develop **new concepts and generalizations**. Those concepts are finally tested in new situations that lead to a new concrete experience and the cycle restart again.

However, as humans, we are more or less more sensitive to one of the step of the learning cycle. That’s why two axes can be singled out:

- The Perception axis between concrete experience and Rational Abstract conceptualisation.
- The processing axis between active experimentation and reflective observation.

According to the sensitivity of an individual related to these two axis, four learning styles with specific attributes are identified which are, converging, diverging, assimilating and accommodating.

Kolb’s learning style preferences

- Converger: Strength lies in the practical applications of ideas. This person is the best in situations where there is a single correct solution to a problem. They can focus on
specific problems and they are likely to be unemotional. This style is characteristic of many engineers.

- Diverger: strength lies in her/his imagination, to view concrete situations from many perspectives and to organize relationship into a meaningful pattern. They are performant to lead a brainstorming session. Interested in people, they have emotional intelligence. They are often found in personal managers and organization development consultant manager.

- Assimilator: Strength lies in the ability to create theoretical models through inductive reasoning and in assimilating observations. This style is more present in basic sciences of mathematics and are likely to be found in research and planning department.

- Accommodator: Strength lies in doing things, carrying out plans and involving people in new project. They tend to be risk takers. They are perfect to adapt in emergency situation. Not close to theories, accommodator mainly uses their intuitions to make decision. The analytic ability is performed by the others, that’s why trust is important. They are likely to be found in action-oriented jobs such as marketing and sales.

The work of Kolb shows that team with diversity enable to complete the learning cycle but beyond, to strongly increase the brainpower. Moreover, it seems that accommodators are more likely to be potential leaders mainly because action oriented. However, some team tasks may request more observation, and conceptualization, less active experimentation and concrete experience. That’s why we consider that diverger, assimilator and converger profiles can be also potential leader but more focus on specific project in which they don’t need to make decision but to be reflexion-oriented. Anyway, Kolb’s leadership style is a great tool to determine the human potential of an organization and beyond, to develop a toolbox of leadership that organization can use to empower the right potential leader to solve out a specific issue.

4.2.1.2. Gender Leadership.

To understand the diversity of leadership and the potential resources that can be inserted to the leadership toolbox, it is essential to focus on gender leadership. Studies related to the work of Michael Gurian with Barbara Annis (2008) show that both men and women can have male brain or female brain. Thus, gender leadership may develop specific traits that bring further resources and approaches to deal with specific issues. By determining the advantages and
differences of each trait from gender, it is possible to add further criterias to assess the profile of potential leaders to incorporate in the leadership toolbox.

Thus, Michael Gurian with Barbara Annis (2008) made research on this field. Female brains are more likely to remember more details and they use more words. Male brains are more sensitive with motions, they think and reflect for the competition, they have more difficulty to get emotions and they focus on one element without distraction. Whereas female brains are more sensitive with colours, are more focus on comfort and relationship, are easily influenced by emotions and can easily multitask. Male brains distress by using objects around them whereas women need to talk through problems. Female brains are more likely to analyse through human context whereas men tend to analyse through facts and figures. Finally, female brains are constantly active whereas male brains tend to go in rest state periodically.

All these differences show that both male and female brains are smart but in different ways. That’s why their leadership styles tend to be different. Thus, Male brains are more prescriptive (to tell people what to do more aggressively) whereas female brains are more descriptive (spend more time detailing to employees). Moreover, male brains seek out more direct conflict than female brains in conflict management. Male brains become conflict avoidant in workplace conflict involving women. Female brains remember better meeting and forgive more easily.

Therefore leaders with male brains tend to be focus on result and achievement, more comfortable in hierarchy, impede emotions to be performant, promote risk taking and independence, expect discipline and appreciate skills assessment, support authoritative thinking and encourage immediate actions. For leaders with female brains, the focus is more on bond with co-workers, multitasking activities and team development, promote the verbal emotion expression instead of actions, think and act with empathy, verbally encourage skill and talent development and involve themselves in personal emotional issues of the employees to improve the overall bonding system.

It’s important to single out gender behaviour from gender type, which means that, a woman can behave and think like a man and vice versa.

According to this study, understanding the skills and inconvenient of both gender brains, it is possible to develop a more accurate and effective leadership toolbox to deal with specific
issues. For example, in case of internal conflict between employees, a project that needs accurate feedback, or teamwork that has to deal with several elements, Leaders with female brain could be more likely to lead to the goal in a good way. But in case of project in a competitive environment, a very specific goal to reach in a context of overwhelmed information, or in hierarchical issues, leaders with male brain seem better to deal with them.

4.2.1.3. Cultural Leadership

We saw that according to the gender, an individual is likely to get specific traits that influence her/his potential leadership style. Using the same principle, according to her/his culture, an individual may have specific behavior with different interpretations and goals. Thus, multinational organizations can get access to a valuable resource of diversity, which while included in the leadership toolbox, enable to the organization to figure out issues with different approaches and point of view. However to be able to use this potential, it is necessary to deeply understand the different concepts that build the existing cultures.

To understand culture, Ed Schein (1985) proposes a model to understand the subtleties of culture. The first level, the observable part of the iceberg is what is called “artifacts and behaviors”. The culture is beheld through symbols, rituals and myths. However they don’t enable to understand a culture. However, those artifacts and behaviors are based on beliefs and values. They can be extracted from interview, discussions and questionnaires. Beliefs and values are not visible are constantly present through behaviors, ways of life, expectations and communications. But the invaluable stages are the basic assumptions. In this level, only interpretation enables to touch it. There are no evidences about their existence but they can be partially highlighted via the two previous steps.

There is an example about this friend from Russia. Swedish friends were surprised about the engaged fight of our Russian friend with another guy. The reason of this fight was that the adversary insulted badly the Russian friend’s mother. After two times, the Russian friend engaged the fight. This is the artifacts and behaviors stage. But why did he act this way? Because in Russian culture, the honor is the most important value and beyond reason and diplomacy. Treating one’s mother is considered as a case that deserves retaliation. For most Swedish and even French people, the first behavior would be to not consider the attack mainly because the adversary may arouse one’s anger in order to push one to fight him. Thus, the desire of fight would be the reason of the verbal assault. That’s why being cleverer and not considering it would make his strategy a failure. Thus, these two visions can be singled out in the “belief and values” level. But the basic assumptions stage was visible through discussion, we tried to have the Russian friend understand that he will meet other assaulting people like the last one and they may use his sensitivity for insult to have him fight and that’s why he should change his behavior. But whatever we tried, he preferred to keep his behavior to stay close to his values and beliefs. He didn’t provide more arguments, except for the concept of honor and family, but on the other hand, he told that even if his close mates are wrong in a conflict, he will be ready to defend them against others. This example enables to understand the complexity of individual cultures and the impossibility to change one’s basic assumptions. That’s why we cannot change cultures but at least we can collaborate with each other.

Therefore, to understand the potential of cultures in leadership means to understand the basic assumptions of the different cultures. Many researches have been done to determine the dimensions of culture in a high scale research such as the GLOBE project, Schwartz’s culture model or Hofstede’s model.

Each one proposes different approaches that show the complexity of understanding cultures. But it is possible to organize and synthesize the dimensions of culture considered most relevant to management in order to provide an integrative framework that can be used to recognize cultural differences within and across countries and companies, adapted from Andre Laurent works, Professor emeritus INSEAD, divided in 8 sections (Natural environment, activity, reality, human nature, relationships, space , language and time (Schneider.S, Barsoux. J-L, Stahl.G, 2014, 44-55 ).
### Cultural dimensions


### Natural environment:

- **Control over nature/ fatalism:** In some cultures, the nature can be controlled and guided *to make things happen*, like in western ideologies, whereas eastern culture based on Islamic religion consider the nature beyond the mankind and advocate *to let things happen*.

- **Uncertainty tolerance/ Uncertainty avoidance:** Uncertainty tolerance means to deal with uncertainty by not controlling all the system, but by living with it in harmony (The Feng Shui in China). Uncertainty avoidance is connected with the control over
nature. In this case, to reduce unpredictability and mistakes, the goal is to impede uncertainty (Centralized control of eastern Europe countries)

**Activity:**

- **Doing/being:** In this dimension, doing means the preference to act even if the decision is bad related to the principle that “it is better to make the wrong decision that no decision”. In this philosophy, action prevails reasoning (Northern American and northern European managers). By being, it means thinking than doing. It’s better to analyze the situation first to provide the best action (French managers).

- **Achievements/ascription:** Like in the US values, an individual must not be considered by her/his titles and graduations, but by her/his achievements. At the opposite, the elitist French culture values those who went in prestigious “grandes écoles” and great cursus. Therefore in ascription value, titles and rewards are more important than the achievement itself.

**Reality:**

- **Truth in numbers (material)/feelings (spiritual):** The truth can articulate through analysis, report and numbers. But there are different shades. In US, they tend to highlighted result but not necessarily to understand it. In European countries and above all in France, Results and figures must be connected in order to provide logic and to understand the dynamism. In Latin culture and Islamic influenced countries, the truth comes from feelings. Thus intuition prevails logic.

**Human nature:**

- **Theory X/Theory Y:** In theory X, workers are assumed to be lazy and need constant supervision. Workers are different from managers. In theory Y, mankind is assumed to be self-directed, to be willing to take initiative.

- **High trust, low trust:** Some cultures and countries are more likely to trust people, like the Nordic countries. At the opposite, the trust is difficult to get in slave countries and Latin America.

**Relationships:**
- Task oriented (performance)/ relationship oriented (social warfare): North American and Northern European prefer to single out tasks from relationship. They consider that rationality can be interfered if feelings and preferences from social ties are included in the judgment. That’s why the supervision is based on result and familial companies can be disregarded. But slaves, Asian, Arabic and Latin countries are more focus on relationship. Mainly because their environment is not enough regulated, but also because trust is necessary if an incident happen to know more about the partner and her/his job. The supervision is based on informal social control and familial companies are valued.

- Universalist/ Particularist: In Universalist cultures, people believe that rules and regulations should apply to everybody, and judgments are made without regard to circumstances. The focus is more on formal rules than on relationships. “USA, Germany, Sweden). In particularist society circumstances and relationships are more important in deciding what is right or good (Russia, Indonesia and China).

- Egalitarian/ Hierarchical: Some cultures are used to implementing hierarchy. In France, the CEO is a prestigious title and is empowered with many powers that in other countries, they would have been shared. At the opposite, Nordic countries are reluctant with hierarchy and prefer democratic ways to manage and lead.

- Individualism/collectivism: Individualist people promote the differences and the fact to deal the problems by oneself as an individual. Collectivist people promote the work team and tend to consider their tasks in the collective effort. The individual is not the purpose but a part of a group.

Space:

- Public (diffuse)/private (specific): In some culture, like the Japanese one, The work place is implemented in a open space, according to the value of collectivism, and space saving. In Western countries, the preference is for sealed individual office for better confidentiality and visibility of one’s position in the organization.

Language:

- Low context/ High context: In low- context cultures, communications are expected to be clear and direct, or explicit. The person and the situation are not particularly relevant to the discourse. Everyone should be able to understand the message and have
equal access to information. The person and the situation are not particularly relevant to the discourse. Everyone should be able to understand the message and have equal access to information. In high-context cultures, communication is highly dependent upon the person and the situation. Information is shared among people, and some people have more privileged access than others. Information is not a free good. Language is not the only way for communication and non-verbal expression is very important.

- Neutral/Emotional: In countries such as Western countries, showing emotions is important and silence uncomfortable. But in Asian countries, showing emotion is considered as a disadvantage and silence as a token for trust.

Time:

- Future/past: Past oriented cultures alike European countries pay attention about famous personalities and events. Change is something disturbing and is difficult to implement. In Future-oriented culture alike USA, they envision the future and don’t consider so much the past and present. Therefore, they are more likely to implement change.

Thus, according to the dimensions of culture, it is possible to elaborate the cultural profile of a potential “leader” and to identify is strong and weak points related to various situations. For instance, if an organization has to empower a leader to lead a team in order to work on an urgent project on social problem, which needs an action oriented resolution, in cooperation with Japanese counterpart, a leader with a Doing, Uncertainty tolerance, achievement, social welfare, neutral and high-context profile, may have high potential to lead the task in the good way. Having potential leaders from different cultures enable to solve out problems with different possible approaches, sensitivity and processes. Thus, despite the many challenges that international organizations have to surpass because of the complexity for communication, understanding and sharing through various cultures, it also provide better performance that national organizations, if the potentials are well managed.

But these dimensions of culture can be also used to determine the level of reluctance for change that an organization may suffer, according to its culture (see section “culture in organization”
4.2.1.4. Expectations of the Generation Y

Organizations are living a revolution through their members themselves. Indeed, more and more managers must deal with a new kind of people with new and specifics expectations, working styles and regards on work. These people are the Generation Y and in the next few years, it will be the first workforce of organizations. Therefore, it is crucial to understand this aspect in order to adapt the distributed leadership with these new parameters.

The Generation Y refers to people born approximately between 1980 and 2000. They are also referred as Millenial Generation. They are put in opposition with the Generation X which refers to the individuals born before 1980. This generation presents lot of singular characteristics, among which many are very well suited for the practice of Distributed Leadership. The Generation Y has specific beliefs, values, attitudes or expectations that are especially pronounced at work. For instance, they are said to value diversity of experiences, to be technology savvy and to value flexibility (Martin, 2005).

This generation is also said to be open for opportunity of career advancement and personal growth. They see their work not as a burden but as an opportunity to grow, and giving them chances to take a lead and sharing power with them will be highly appreciated. The Yers want to see how their work will make a difference; therefore they are involved in the purpose of their organizations. They do not only focus on their task, but are implicated in the "why" of their actions. Thus they don't really engage in functional stupidity as we talked about before.

In opposition to the Generation X, they are less likely to be directed." Yers do want clear directions and managerial support, but they also demand the freedom and flexibility to get the task done in their own way, at their own pace." (Martin, 2005, p.40). This appetite for autonomy is well suited for empowerment.

They like to collaborate and contribute, they are therefore not afraid to take responsibilities: "Y sees increasing responsibility not as a burden to be avoided but as a proving ground for their skills and talents." (Martin, 2005, p.42). This is also corroborate by Coleman: "Evidence pointed to them being hungry for leadership positions, suggesting they are engaged and motivated as bosses, with 64% citing ongoing career and personal development as most important to them, and showing an appetite for extra responsibility" (Coleman, 2014). All of those aspects are very suitable with the concept of distributed leadership, into which this Generation is likely to blossom. According to Lawrence Knowles, Vice Chairman in MidlandHR, "With their demand for a more collaborative leadership style – involving an entire business in decision making processes, rather than reaching conclusions behind the
closed doors of the boardroom – it becomes apparent that organizations under Generation Y leadership will become much flatter, rather than bound by strict hierarchies” (Cited in Coleman, 2014).

Thus, with a Generation Y taking over the organizations by 2020, it is important to take into account their characteristics and expectations, and developing Distributed Leadership is a way to do it.

4.2.2. Leadership

The practice of leadership on an individual perspective is presented in this next section. It emphasizes the specific expectations for individuals: the need for authenticity or the need to develop one's own leadership style. This section also presents the transformational leadership and its interest in a distributed leadership context. Finally it develops why and how to develop the will to lead in individuals within the organization.

4.2.2.1. Authenticity

As we illustrated previously, culture or gender are providing diversity for an organization. However, this diversity is going far beyond only gender or culture. As humans, we all have a unique set of values, principles, skills, abilities and so on that makes us different from one another. All of this things combined within one person is making every employee a unique asset for its organization, feeding the "toolbox". As De Pree puts it, everyone has specific gifts, and the role of a leader is to enlighten those gifts (De Pree, 1987). By distributing the leadership and empowering people, you can value all this diversity and take the best out of the resources at hand. However, this diversity has to be expressed through authenticity and self-expression.

The concept of authenticity has often been connected to the field of leadership. It is often seen as a prerequisite for effective leadership. This concept comes from the Greek philosophy and has the meaning "To thine own self be true" (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p.319). In other words, it is about being true to yourself and not to others. It is about never giving up your true self in order to fit the demands of your role as a leader or else. Avolio, Luthans and Walumbwa (2004) define authentic leaders as "those who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who
are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral character" (in Avolio, Gardner et al., 2004, p.4).

Shamir and Eilam (2005) define Authentic Leadership with four main characteristics: "(1) rather than faking their leadership, authentic leaders are true to themselves (rather than conforming to the expectations of others); (2) authentic leaders are motivated by personal convictions, rather than to attain status, honors, or other personal benefits; (3) authentic leaders are originals, not copies; that is, they lead from their own personal point of view; and (4) the actions of authentic leaders are based on their personal values and convictions" (in Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p321). They are also illustrating how the "Life Stories" are shaping one's personality, by reflection, and are a good indicator to assess the authenticity of a leader by the followers. Self-awareness (Bennis, 2008) is the cornerstone of authentic leadership. Self awareness is an ongoing process, requiring lot of reflection, and is the basis of authenticity.

Avolio and Gardner illustrate some of the benefits of such leadership anchored in the values and personality: "We believe authentic leadership can make a fundamental difference in organizations by helping people find meaning and connection at work through greater self-awareness; by restoring and building optimism, confidence and hope; by promoting transparent relationships and decision making that builds trust and commitment among followers; and by fostering inclusive structures and positive ethical climates" (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p331).

Authentic Leadership provides a good ground and is a good basis for implementing distributed leadership. It is providing the basic requirements such as trust, engagement, commitment and a good environment. As we said before, fostering a positive environment is of great importance in implementing distributive leadership, because it is generating self-motivation and commitment.

We believe that the relation between authenticity and the sharing of leadership goes much further. In distributed leadership settings, authenticity is not only a requirement for the Leader, but for the entire organization. If you want to promote and empower the diversity within your organization, you have to make sure that everyone is acting according to their own self. It is necessary if you want to develop the "toolbox". We can talk about authentic followership, and it is developed by authentic leadership at the top enhancing the authenticity of the followers: "Our central premise is that through increased self-awareness, self-
regulation, and positive modeling, authentic leaders foster the development of authenticity in followers. In turn, followers’ authenticity contributes to their well-being and the attainment of sustainable and veritable performance." (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p.317). In other words, you develop your authentic followership if you are following an authentic leader for authentic reasons. By going further, we can say that by being self-involved and motivated regarding the purpose of your organization, you assimilate and integrate this purpose as your own and you develop an authentic relation with this organization. You are sharing this vision/mission/purpose if it is anchored in your values, personality and so on. You can then take ownership of it, feeling involved, and start acting as a leader.

In a context of distributed Leadership, it is important for the leader to be authentic in order to foster authentic followership. By having authentic followership, you make sure that you promote the diversity within your organization by not shaping similar individuals. As Philippe Daudi, professor at Linnaeus University, quoted in one of his lecture: "If we are both the same, then one of us is redundant". If every individual would be similar, there will be no point in developing distributed leadership among those individuals, because it will not bring any creativity, innovation or any benefits. The toolbox will not be enriched by those formatted individuals. This brilliant quote by Oscar Wilde sums up pretty well the need for authenticity: "Be yourself, everyone else is already taken".

4.2.2.2. Leadership Styles.

We can safely say that, somehow, there are as many leadership styles as there are leaders out there. For instance because of the concept of authenticity we just developed, which is making every leader orienting his leading style regarding his own self-attributes. However, we can distinguish general tendencies and styles in which most people could more or less fit in. All this styles of leading are of course also part of the toolbox, providing different skills for an organization and an opportunity to adapt and fit a leadership style with a leadership demand. For instance, it can be very valuable regarding conflict resolution. We will now give a few examples about those different styles and about the pertinence to have them in an organization which is distributing its leadership.

Daniel Goleman is defining six types of leadership derived from the concept of Emotional Intelligence. According to him, "'Emotional Intelligence' refers to the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing
emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships" (Goleman, 1998, p.317). The six leadership styles are summarized by the board below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use it</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commanding / coercive</td>
<td>Dictatorship - &quot;Do what I say&quot;</td>
<td>In urgency - when time is scarce, and in crisis.</td>
<td>Members can feel stifled as they are treated as workers and not asked for an opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary / Authoritative</td>
<td>Mobilises people towards a vision</td>
<td>When a new vision and direction is needed.</td>
<td>Lacks the ability to help team members understand how they get to a vision or goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Focuses on emotional needs over work needs.</td>
<td>Best used for healing rifts and getting through stressful situations.</td>
<td>Confrontation and emotionally distressing positions can be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Uses participation, listening to both the bad and the good news.</td>
<td>To gain valuable input from employees and to gain Buy-in when there is time to do so.</td>
<td>Can be lots of listening but very little effective action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacesetting</td>
<td>Builds challenging and exciting goals for people.</td>
<td>When the team is already highly motivated and competent</td>
<td>Can lack emotional intelligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>connecting corporate goals whilst helping people find strengths and weaknesses, linking these to career aspirations and actions</td>
<td>Coach, mentor and develop individuals when they need to build longer term strengths</td>
<td>Can come across as micromanaging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Obviously, all of these different styles are relying on very different skills. It is very hard to imagine one singular leader possessing all the attributes allowing him to switch effectively from one style to another. However, all this styles are appropriate in specific situations that an organization can face, thus there is a potential issue in having a singular leader which can lack some of the required attributes. Distributed leadership can be seen as a good solution to this issue. By using the potential of the workforce, and picking into the toolbox, which contains all the skills to exercise those different leadership styles, you can imagine some sort of distributed leadership adapted to the situation at hand empowering the most appropriate leader. This is a way to distribute the lead. Daniel Goleman is formulating this idea of distributed leadership: "There are many leaders, not just one. Leadership is distributed. It resides not solely in the individual at the top, but in every person at every level who, in one..."
way or another, acts as a leader to a group of followers — wherever in the organization that person is, whether shop steward, team head, or CEO" (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002, p. xiii-xiv).

Furthermore, Esther Cameron (2008) also formulated classification of leadership styles. He presents the five following basic models of leadership containing traits, skills or attitudes of leaders:

- The **Edgy Catalyzer**, which is good at provoking change by identifying problems and "create discomfort". He/she needs to be really proactive.
- the **Visionary Motivator**, which is good at creating an inspiring vision and engage people into this vision. He/she needs good communication skills.
- the **Measured Connector**, which is good at reaching and connecting the different parts and actors of an organization. He/she needs facilitation skills.
- the **Tenacious Implementer**, which is really task oriented and is somehow the closest to a manager. He/she needs perseverance.
- the **Thoughtful Architect**, which is good at reflecting upon the organization's structure and identifying improvements for a future better design. He/she needs to be very conceptual.

(Cameron, 2008)

These different models are quite different that the ones developed by Goleman, however they are showing the same point: the demands on leadership are very diverse. It is quite hard to imagine a leader having the skills and requirements to be the same time visionary motivator, a thoughtful architect, a measured connector, an edgy catalyzer and a tenacious implementer. Therefore, the myth of the singular leader is called into question again, and the need to share the lead reaffirmed. Distributed Leadership seems like a viable solution, providing a toolbox among the workforce able to handle all of this kind of leadership according to the requirement of the context.

This toolbox can also be very valuable in conflict resolution, as illustrated by the graph below by Gladwin and Walter (1979):
The point in conflict resolution is to reach compromise, because in that case no one will feel cheated. In order to reach this compromise, different "strategies" can be used according to the different abilities at hand, and here again having a toolbox full of different skills can be a great asset to reach compromise faster.

In a position of leader, you are required to possess an extensive amount of skills. However, it is quite hard to reach a full mastering of all these skills. You always have some areas of expertise and some areas of lacks. Or you might have a general profile, being "average" in lot of things without really mastering any of the leadership skills. Those skills can be found easily in assessments profile, such as the GARUDA Profile or the Focus Profile (© Matsusan Consulting). These profiles are developed and were presented by Mats Bruzaeus.

The Garuda profile is based on sixteen personality traits which are the following: system flexibility, comprehensiveness, abstract thinking, risk willingness, self control, empathy, social contact, social flexibility, support, confidence and trust, competition, influence, self confidence, independence and freedom, psychological strength and physical energy (© Matsusan Consulting). The combination of all gives a glimpse of the core personality, and in

---

**Figure 8.6 Resolving conflicts**

order to lead you need a specific mix of those skills. Moreover, for the organization, you might need a leader with a different mix regarding the situation, the context of the organization or the task at hand.

Here is an example of a potential profile:

By relating to the previous styles, this profile can show someone who can be an efficient affiliative leader (Goleman, 1998) thanks to his good social skills (Blue area). We can imagine this person as a good communicant with a high interest for the people's needs and feelings. This kind of leadership can be appropriate in a team of people with high need of support and attention. However, despite a probable ability in communication, he/she probably won't be an optimal Visionary Motivator (Cameron, 2008), because of a small lack in abstract thinking to formulate a vision and a small lack of influence to motivate and involve people to fulfill the vision. Therefore, this person won't be an appropriate leader for a start-up trying to find its place on a market. The point is that an organization possesses a tank full of various profiles that can be used regarding a specific context. In a team looking for more attention the lead can be taken by an affiliative leader while in the team very focused on a goal you can
give the lead to a Tenacious Implementer (Cameron, 2008), whose skills will be for instance competitiveness and physical energy.

The focus profile by Matsusan Consulting also illustrates the differences in the leading styles. It is defining a profile around four aspects: Integration, Baser, Development and Results. Here is an example of a focus profile:

![Focus Profile Diagram](image)

Each of these aspects are pointing more specific skills. Everyone has a different profile suiting his attributes, and this is precious addition to the leadership toolbox. Those profiles can be a great tool for an organization to have an idea of the leadership skills they possess and that are not necessarily used.

The almost infinite variety of those profiles are illustrating again how the "toolbox" is an actual asset for an organization, providing many different leadership styles to use. Distributed Leadership is giving access to this toolbox by empowering people and enabling them to use their skills and abilities in their areas of expertise.
4.2.2.3. Transformational leadership

Transformational Leadership is a concept coming from the work of James McGregor Burns (1978). If we relate to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943), Transformational Leadership is a leadership style pointing at the high-level needs of followers, such as esteem or self-development. It is therefore specific in a way that it is not targeting at the low-level needs such as security or the physiological needs (food for instance) coming from the money you get from your job. Burns refers as transformational because such leadership is about changing the organization or the group processes. Transformational leadership is about pushing the followers to explore and go beyond their potential and to value their intellect. It is interesting in a context of distributed leadership because such transformational leadership at the top represents a good way to empower people at the bottom, and thus to distribute the lead. It is also fostering shared goals. Bass is also developing this concept, and according to him, transformational leadership is characterized by charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Bass, 1998). The last two are particularly interesting in a context of distributed leadership. Regarding intellectual stimulation, that means that this kind of leadership incites followers to question what is going on and to develop new ways of looking at problems and to solve them. This kind of empowerment is required in distributed leadership. They also say that transformational leadership is based on individualized consideration, meaning that leaders are encouraging personal development by acting as coaches. (Bass, 1998).

4.2.2.4. Developing the will to lead

We illustrated before some requirements and benefits of distributed leadership on a human perspective. Self-awareness and authenticity are basic requirements, and the access to gender and cultural diversity as well as the variety of leading styles provided by Distributed Leadership are important benefits. However, one important point to develop is the will for people to take a leading position when they have the potential and the opportunity to do so. Even if the organization provides an opportunity for a potential skilled leader to be empowered, he/she does not necessarily accept it.

We can take the illustration of the concept of Functional Stupidity (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012). Alvesson and Spicer refer to functional stupidity as "an absence of reflexivity, a refusal to use intellectual capacities in other than myopic ways, and avoidance of justifications" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1194). They also refer to it as an "inability and/or unwillingness to use
cognitive and reflective capacities in anything other than narrow and circumspect ways" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1201). In other words, individuals are acting without reflecting about the meaningfulness of their actions and they are lacking critical thinking. The organization in this case is not effectively mobilizing its cognitive capacities (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012).

The basic idea is that it is somehow easier for some people to just follow instructions rather than questioning what is going on, it deserves less efforts. It also brings some other positive outcome for individuals: "Organizational members are able to adopt a more relaxed attitude to reflexivity, critical scrutiny, or justification. For the individual, this minimizes disruptive reflection" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1209). Being functionally stupid can be somehow more comfortable for people, because "The result is that organizational life and one's career involve much less friction" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1210). On the other side, the organization can also value this, because with this application of functional stupidity, people are not disturbing the processes of the organization. This is often true in manufacturing factories for instance. "This can save the organization and its members from the frictions provoked by doubt and reflection. Functional stupidity contributes to maintaining and strengthening organizational order" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1196). It is also saving time and money for an organization by saving resources " By cultivating functional stupidity, organizations are able to avoid the costs associated with broader critical thinking" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1210). Despite the negative meaning attributed to the term "stupidity", Alvesson and Spicer are illustrating how it can be valuable for

However, Alvesson & Spicer are also developing the limits of functional stupidity. This concept is obviously quite in opposition with the idea of distributed leadership. People acting with functional stupidity are not empowered, and are certainly not reaching their full potential and developing their skills at an optimum. In those situations, we believe that the employees' capacities are underused, both because of the organization and the employees themselves who have no will to step away from this functional stupidity. Furthermore, they can lose the connection between their activity and the purpose of their organization, and this dissonance could lead to cynicism, alienation, and decreased motivation and commitment (Costas and Fleming, 2009; Fleming and Spicer, 2003 in Alvesson & Spicer, 2012). Functional Stupidity doesn't only represents a shortfall for the organization, but also a risk. If people don't engage in critical thinking they will not tend to raise problems and they might go on undetected and
damage the organization. That is also a big justification why empowerment is decisive for an organization, to identify and solve problem as early as possible.

Besides causing lack of reflexivity, justification and lack of substantive reasoning, functional stupidity is also causing a lack in motivation and emotions (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012). Individuals can encounter lack of motivation if they are lacking curiosity or, for instance, if they don't engage in the purpose of their organization. In that case, they just consider themselves as professionals for their task rather than an actual part of an organization to fulfill its mission. "It may throw doubt on the meaning and purposes of the individual’s working life" (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1210). In that case, it is impossible for them to embrace a leading position, they need to be involved in the vision of the organization for that. Regarding the lack of emotions, anxiety is said to be reinforcing functional stupidity (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012, p.1200). We are once again coming back to the importance of developing a nourishing environment in which individuals can feel good, blossom and be self-motivated. In these conditions, they would be more willing to take a leading position if they can avoid anxiety and be more at ease.

In order to develop Distributed Leadership, it is necessary to avoid such situations of functional stupidity. In those situations, people are not really taking ownership of their organization's vision and purpose, they are just focusing on their task. If you want to empower people, the organization has to provide a nourishing environment and the actors within the organization have to develop their ability to think critically and to make sense out of their daily actions. It requires more efforts for both parts, but it generates benefits.

This example is one way to look at why individuals are not always embracing a leadership position or why they could be not at ease when empowered. It gives some solutions to solve this issue, which is necessary when implementing distributed leadership. There is also some other possibilities for developing the will to lead and a positive attitude toward empowerment. For instance, self confidence is probably one of the main obstacle, individuals who are not self confident will not be at ease to be empowered and to have some autonomy, take their own decisions and so on. To face this issue, developing coaching or mentoring can be a good solution to assist individuals in this process. Being close to them and support these people can improve their confidence and make them realize their potential. This coaching can for example be oriented on the crucibles, trying to use previous experiences to foster a desire to lead. Leadership development programs are as well a good way for leaders to learn how to
successfully empower people, and for individuals to develop their will to lead by identifying
and then developing their leadership potential.

Developing the will to lead is the first step. After that, it is important to develop leadership
skills suiting our model of distributed leadership and empowerment. After a leader emerges
and takes on the leading position in the team, it is important that he/she empowers this team.
Thus, he/she needs to develop the ability to act as a multiplier (Wiseman & McKeown, 2010).
This ability can develop good processes of empowerment through listening, good
communication, involvement and so on. The leader acts as a liberator and creates an
environment in which people can think critically and be committed. He/she involves his team
in decision making, shares the ownership of good results with the team, challenges people and
finds the best use for the followers in the team. These multiplier behaviors are a key in order
to empower people within the team and distribute his lead efficiently with them.

This section aimed at presenting elements regarding the human issues raised by the
implementation of distributed leadership. Distributed leadership and empowerment have a lot
to do with promoting the diversity within the organization in order to feed the toolbox. For
instance, promoting and identifying the various leadership styles within the organization are
important in order to take the best out of a context of distributed leadership. Access for people
to knowledge and authenticity are also key elements that we presented. Furthermore, an
important concern in this field is to develop the desire for individuals to take on leadership
responsibilities if they have the opportunity. We identified and presented several aspects that
can both enhance and prevent this will to lead. Finally, on a dynamic aspect, it is capital to be
aware that the raise of the Generation Y is going to raise new expectations from the
employees. An adaptation, through principles of empowerment and distributed leadership,
will be necessary on a short term from organization to suit those changes. This adaptation has
to be made according to the issues presented above but also regarding a lot of organizational
matters that we will develop in the following section.

4.3. Organizational Perspective

In this section, we focus on organizational fields. We determine the different obstacles that
structure can suffer in implementing the change to distributed leadership in the organization,
in order to develop processes for change in different cases. On the face on it, the way to
change the organization to insert distributed leadership is not the same if it is small or large
size, Asian or Latin cultures, low or high level of empowerment. Well, in this part, we gather knowledge to deal with these issues.

4.3.1. Organization Characteristics.

Organizations are defined by characteristics which main ones are its culture and its structure. We present those two aspects and the connection to distributed leadership in the next section.

4.3.1.1. Culture in organizations.

Previously, we talked about the available resources in multicultural organization from potential leaders with specific cultures. The elaborated dimensions of culture enable to provide the basis to elaborate a grid to assess the cultural profile of potential leaders. Moreover, they enable to understand better the factors that impede changes inside an organizational structure across the cultural approach, in order to implement a structure that facilitates the distributed leadership. Thus, an organizational culture based on specific values such as being, theory X, low trust, hierarchical, individualistic, private and past, will suffer great difficulties to maintain the change to create a better environment for distributed leadership. In the opposite, an organisation that embodies the values of doing, Theory Y, high trust, egalitarian, group-oriented, public and future will be likely to lead the change in an easier way.

Therefore, we understand that culture in organizations is composed with various shades and understanding the spheres of influences in an organization enables to highlight the cultural mechanisms that facilitate or impede the change of the organizational structure to implement a suitable environment for distributed leadership.

Some studies already exist to determine the structure of the company according to the culture. One of them is based on the level of hierarchy and the level of certainty avoidance.

- The village market culture, present in Anglo-Saxon and Nordic countries, the organizational structure tends to be low hierarchical and less formalized. That means that the organization is rather decentralized, flexible with more delegation.
- The family or tribe culture, present in Asia, is low formalized but with more hierarchy. So the organization is centralised, based on loyalty and social control.
- The well-oiled machine culture, present in Germany, is highly formalized but with low hierarchy. The organization has decentralized decision making, with top management team, compartmentalized and specialist-oriented tasks.
- The traditional bureaucracy, present in Latin countries, is well centralized with less delegation, elitist and highly specialized.

This model is very useful because it gives information about the flexibility of the structure of organizations and the level of difficulty to adjust the structure in order to develop a proper
environment for distributed leadership. Thus, organizations in Scandinavian countries tend to be easier to adjust the structure to optimize the distributed leadership. Indeed, they are more likely to be decentralized and flexible. Moreover, the delegations are common and well considered in leaders mind and people are considered as free agent. In the opposite, Latin countries tend to be reluctant to change mainly because they prefer centralized system with less delegation and very elitist. That means that managers are not likely to share their power to their subordinates such as decision-making. They want to be considered as bosses with the appearance and the authority required. That’s why this structure is difficult to adjust for implementing shared leadership. However, thanks to this model, specific process according to the specific cultures can be built to facilitate the establishment of distributed leadership.

The culture of the organization can also be related to the theories X, Y and Z. Theory X and Y are models of human motivation developed by Mc Gregor (1960) while the Z theory was developed later on by William Ouchi (1981) among others, in reaction to these theories. Theory X states that workers, by nature, dislike and are avoiding work, thus the task of the organization is to be authoritarian and to control them. The only way for workers to perform their job correctly is to force them or reward them. Theory X also states that humans by nature don't like responsibilities and prefer to be directed. On the other side, theories Y states that employees like their job by nature and that they can be self-motivated and enjoy their job. Theory Y shows that employees are underused because they possess abilities to solve problem or accept responsibility for instance, but they are not in situation to do so. Theory Y is much more participative, and sharing the decisions that affects the employees are part of it as well. In contrast with theory X, there is a shift from control to trust, which can develop a healthier environment, develop the workers' skills and generates profits.

As a result, Theory X is provoking a vicious cycle in organizations in which the high level of control is pushing the workers to act in a passive way with a minimal effort. This authoritarian system is reinforcing the fact that workers dislike their job and thus the vicious cycle is constantly alimented.

On the other side, the theory Y is acting more as a virtuous cycle, in which the climate of trust and self-motivation is leading to a better implication of the workers. This better implication is leading to more initiatives and to seek responsibilities, thus a better involvement and a better well-being. This better involvement is reinforcing the climate of trust and is generating profits for the organization with a better use of its workforce.
Theory Y seems as a much more appropriate organizational model to distribute the lead than theory X. The principles of Theory Y such as trust and involvement are basics when trying to share the lead and it is generating a virtuous cycle source of benefits for both the individuals and the organization. Theory X on the other side is unable to promote distributed leadership because of its lack of trust in individuals leading to control and oppression of their capabilities. Theory X is not using appropriately the resources that constitute the workforce. They are underused and cannot develop and use their potential.

Ouchi's model of Theory Z seems also very appropriate to implement distributed leadership in an organization. Trust is one of the first basic of theory Z: "Trust consists of the understanding that you and I share fundamentally compatible goals in the long run" (Ouchi, 1981, p.9). A type Z organization also has to clearly set his philosophy and act accordingly. It is also important to develop interpersonal skills to perform in cooperative settings. "In a sense, a Type Z Organization succeeds through the flexibility to modify its form as its needs change" (Ouchi, 1981, p11). Ouchi illustrates that by the fact that in a Z Company the one who knows the most should be the one to do, no matter his rank. Z Companies appear therefore as low-hierarchy structures or at least structures with flexible hierarchy. The benefits are illustrated by the following quote: "The second skill is learning to provide leadership in such a group so that the group can quickly identify the important issues, get to the bottom of conflicts, and arrive at high quality, creative solutions that have everyone's support" (Ouchi, 1981, p. 12). Ouchi emphasizes there that empowering a group is bringing lot of benefits. Decision Sharing is also part of the philosophy of the Theory Z: "The more decisions that are shared, the greater will be the benefits of cooperation produced in the management team. Thus, the top manager has an incentive to develop, over time, a trusting relationship that permits a sharing of the decision-making authority with subordinates" (Ouchi, 1981, p.10). To sum up, the Z theory is based on 7 principles: "Long term employment, consensual decision making, individual responsibility, slow evaluation and promotion, implicit and informal control with explicit and formalized measures, moderately specialized career path and holistic concern" (Daft, 2004, p.118).

The parallel between distributed leadership and the Z theory is very close, lot of principles are common. The implementation of distributed leadership can be done in such a way that it is developing the organization as a type Z organization.
4.3.1.2. Organizational structure.

We saw previously the organizational structure through cultural references. But beyond the specificities of each culture, the organizational structure is influenced by functionality, policies, size, level of hierarchy.

Linstead Jed., Fulop & Lilley (2009) developed the dimensions of structure that provide the main structural characteristics that an organization can implement:

- **Job specialization**: the larger the company gets, the more specialized the individual tasks are. The advantage is better efficiency, better control and ease of training. But it increases a lack of motivation, difficulty to replace high skilled employees, lack of organizational flexibility, unresponsiveness to situations of environmental change and lack of appreciation.

- **Departmentalization**: It’s the group building to ease the useful connections between people. Departmentalization can be market-oriented (the needs of user) or Functional-oriented (business functions such as marketing). For market-oriented, are responsive to clients or regional needs but do not develop specialist expertise. For Functional-oriented, it encourages a high level of skill but is rather unresponsive to market needs.

- **Divisionalization**: In a higher level of departmentalization, a division consist to group different department to focus on a same product, location, service or market. The advantages are accountability and focus on outcomes, free corporate headquarters from daily issues, encourages the accumulation of technical and production expertise, minimum disruption from lay off of poorly performing division and better alignment with market characteristics. However, the cost are increased, difficulty to determine the source of poor performance, internal high competition appears between divisions to secure more resources, uniformity and same policy can affect the performance of a division because the constraints that they provide, problem of coordination between divisions and high risk of loss of the vision and strategy of the organization by the divisions.

- **Span of control**: The larger is the organization, the more coordinated the jobs are. It depends on many factors such as complexity of the task, the skills of subordinates and motivation. But according to David Grabber, professor in London school of economy (Le Bonheur au travail, 2014), a high span of control may generate “bullshit jobs” that
do not create value for the organization but only exist to control people. Finally, the more complex is the task the narrower is the span of controls (Child 1984: 69-75)

- **Chain of command:** it refers to the level of hierarchy in an organization. An organization with many levels of hierarchy but narrow span of control is considered as tall structure. But with few levels of hierarchy and wide span of controls, it’s a flat structure (Mullins 1985:88-90)

- **Line and staff functions:** Line-type departments are focused on the primary purpose of the business (Buying/selling, Production/selling). Staff-type departments are also focused on the purpose of the business but indirectly (Accounting/personnel/purchasing).

- **Centralization, decentralization:** if high authority rules the organization, the structure is said centralized. If the decision-making is delegated; the structure is said decentralized. The advantages of centralization are a greater overall control, greater expertise and benefits of economy of scale. The advantages of decentralization are to make better and quicker decisions, it provides opportunities for training and development, the motivation is increased and greater responsiveness to change.

The dimensions of structure provide a map to understand the structural mechanisms that organizations suffer and use. They increase our understanding to develop transition process for distributed leadership according to organizational structure’s cases. Thus, we understand that an organization which is centralized, with high chain of command and with much job specialization make the insertion of distributed leadership more difficult that a decentralized one with low chain of control and with multitask job. The implementation process will be different according to the specificities of the organizational structure.

Moreover, Byrt (1973) determined the advantages and disadvantages of bureaucratic structure. The advantages are the impersonality, the impartiality, professionalism of management, suitability for large organizations and provision of careers. But on the other side, it causes rigidity of behaviour, defensiveness and aggression from employees, much focus on measurable objectives, Dissatisfaction and pessimism from the members, decision takers remote from the work situation, strong resistance to change, concentration of power at the top, development of informal organization, the Parkinson’s law (work expands to fill the time available for its completion) and the peter’s principle (in a hierarchy every employee
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tends to rise to the level of his or her incompetence (Linstead, Fulop & Lilley, 2009, p212-213).

That’s why a bureaucratic structure is not naturally suitable to distributed leadership, mainly because of the hierarchical controls that impede empowerment of several people in a same level. The power is assimilate according to the status and not about the skills and competences of the employees. However, because of the consideration that leadership is not management and our focus on teamwork and local issues, it may be possible to introduce the concept “distributed leadership” in a department scale and not to disrupt so much the bureaucratic structure.

4.3.2. Organizational Change.

Understanding the mechanisms of organizational change enables to develop process to include distributed leadership in organizations. Indeed, change in organizations is often considered as the most difficult challenge that managers have to deal with. That’s why it is necessary to understand the mechanisms and leverages and obstacles.

4.3.2.1. Types of change.

W.Warner Burke (2011) singles out two kinds of changes:

- The revolutionary change: the change occurs radically, mainly in deep structures. It occurs quickly, visible in reports and the needed resources are easily available. However, the resistances are strong and the change may not be accepted in the culture of the company. Moreover, the regard of the employees to the leader may be worsened and the radical change is risky. If it fails, it may cause serious issues for the employees and the organization. The employees may work in the bad way because of the wrong sense making and misinterpretation of the strategy. Finally, other needed changes may be overlooked.

- The evolutionary change: The change occurs incrementally. It can be related to the Japanese vision of Kaizen (continual improvement). 95% of organizational changes are evolutionary, mainly because the change is more easily included in the culture. The incremental changes focus on specific issues in different steps, that is why it can fit the organization and the expectations of the employees. However, because of the
small scale of its influence, the momentum is hard to get. Making evolutionary changes required specific skills, hard to find.

According to Burke (2011), changes occur on 3 levels:

At the individual level, changes affect the mode of recruitment, selection and placement. Indeed, changes modify the tasks of the employees and some of them may not be well prepared and skilled for their new roles. The replacement can be difficult to solve out and displacement can be inevitable. To limit resistance, a strategy is to recruit leader outside the organization because he/ she is not dedicated to the initial organization’s culture. By adjusting the behaviour of the employees, trainings and developments enable to facilitate the transition and to keep performing people. Finally, coaching enables to adapt the employees individually.

At the group level, the focus is on team building. Changes may necessitate a team building because of the introduction of new persons in a team or the merger of several teams. The performance of a team depends on the "chemistry" between teammates, that’s why changing it create new dynamisms that can easily impede the previous performance. Kanter (1982) points out six dilemmas for team building which are the suboptimization (too much team spirit can cause insularity), the turnover (a highly cohesive team has a difficult time accepting new members), problem of fixed decision (norms and ground rules can become rigid), the feeling to be superior, the reluctance to be ruled by others and groups have life cycle and cannot stay performing forever. Another issue is the self-directed groups that appear when the top management decides to flatten the organization’s hierarchy with broader span of control for managers. Thus, the formed groups tend to be self-directed. Because of the need to flexible and adaptable for future issues, self-directed groups are solutions to deal with them. Finally, the intergroup is related to the dynamism between groups, division or department inside a organization. Indeed, conflict may occur between two groups that have to work together but with different focuses and changes easily can cause it.

At the larger-system level, the focus is first on the orders of change. Kimberly and Nielsen (1975) suggested dividing it in three orders of change. The first-order changes focus on specific subsystems of the organization. The second-order change targets on subsystem or process that are not in the initial focus, but linked to it. The third-order change influences some organizational process, dependant on multiple factors. Another field is the change phases and the model of Lewin (1958) in three phases. The first phase is about unfreezing the system through a goal to reach like "creating a sense of urgency", "educating managers to
behave differently” or mergers. The second phase is called "movement" in new directions by adjusting or modifying the available technologies and operating processes. The last phase is the refreezing in which, the changed condition must be reinforced, for example, by implementing a new reward system. In other words, it is to create a link between the new strategy and the tasks of the organization’s members. Finally the focus is also on the change focus (To question about the validity, the reasons and the goals of the change), the change process (to facilitate the change through connections and communications between all the members) and inter-organizational issues in case of mergers and acquisitions.

4.3.2.2. Resistance of change.

Thus, changes can be supervised on three levels with one in another one. But each level suffers various resistances for change from different factors.

In Individual responses, resistance occurs when people are reluctant to lose its habits but also because a lack of choice when they are forced to move on. According to Hambrick and Cannella (1989), there are three kind of resistance. The blind resistance when people are simply intolerant of change some can keep motivated to impede changes but others only need time to get used to. The political resistance when people believe they may lose something valuable if the change is engaged like one’s power or status. In this case negotiations are the core of this resistance. Finally, the Ideological resistance is when people definitely do not believe that the change will succeed because of intellectual differences. Strong persuasion based on data and facts can end this resistance.

In group responses, resistance can take four shapes. First, it can come from the natural instinct of teams to fight for survival. Second is the solidarity and the cohesion in a team that can make the bound between teammates hard to destroy and prefer to stay working together despite the change. Third is becoming a separate entity to avoid having to deal with the organizational change, like leaving the organization to create a separate business or to join another division. The last one is the demand for new leadership in which the team and other groups can collude with each other to demand the replacement of the leader by a new one that may not affect the unity of the team. Making "symbolic funeral" to achieve closure with the past, recomposing a group with new membership or involving people in key decision making can help in dealing with resistance.
In system responses, the initial revolution change can become an evolution change mainly because of the many obstacles and because the deep structure doesn’t change. Another reason could be the lack of motivation and the absence of sense of urgency. Too much change can also incite members to wait. Members can “sabotage” the change by degrading their personal performances together to decrease the result of the organization or by strongly arguing that the timing for the change is not enough. The lack of followership to the CEO can cause collusion and even constipation against the leader and his/her change. Thus, to impede the resistance from system responses, it is necessary that the CEO communicate the reason of the change to the members. Moreover, persuasion of the necessity of the change initiative and proving that it is different than the previous ones enable to combat the apathy in the organization.

Thanks to the concept of levels and types of changes we have a better insight of the specific obstacles and the solution to ease them, usable to implement the distributed leadership. But in which field can we start to implement change and how the change can spread in the organization. Finally which factors influence the structure of an organization?

4.3.2.3. The Burke–Litwin Model.

To understand the leverages that affect change, Burke and Litwin (1992) developed practicable model for organizations. It is based on the premise that the environment influences people. Thus, by manipulating the organization climate, it is possible to facilitate the change. (W.Warner Burke, 2011).
The twelve categories (boxes) are:

- The external environment: forces that are not control by the organization and influence it.
- Mission and strategy: it embodies the vision and the ‘how’ of the implementation.
- Leadership: The behaviors of the Senior executives.
- Culture: Norms and values that frame the operations and activities of the organization.
- Structure: The arrangement of organizational functions.
- Management practices: Specific behaviors of managers to carry out the organization's strategy.
- System: Policies and procedures to help and support organizational members.
- Climate: Collective perceptions of members within the same work unit.
- Task requirements and individual skills/abilities: the match between the requirement of one’s job and the knowledge.
- Individual need and values: which needs are met on one’s job.
- Motivation.
- Individual and organizational performance: the outcome of the open system, it is about the global performance of the organization through individual members performance.

A change in organizational performance influence the external environment and vice-versa.

As an open system way of thinking, the Burke-Litwin Model links the environment with the thinking of the others. The feedbacks connect each box with each other and they all influence and are influenced. The model can be singled out in two parts:

- The transformational factors (top half yellow boxes, mission and strategy, leadership and culture) are part of the larger-system scale. They are likely to implement change because of direct interactions with the external environment. Thus the behaviors of the members are requested to be compatible with the extern environment. Changes in these boxes mean that the total organization is affected and changes are discontinuous and revolutionary.
- The transactional factors (narrow green boxes) are dynamism in individual and group levels. They are likely to be influenced by daily operations. Then the change is continuous, evolutionary and selective. Thus, the changes in these factors don’t directly influence the other boxes but indirectly across their connections with other them.

The Burke-Litwin Model provides an approach to understand and interpret changes in order to analyze and to plan them. It was used in major successful organizational changes and showed its efficiency like the British airways firm change in the eighties that touched the deep structure of the company like its culture. We understand that even the change is applied in a specific unit, it will affect the organization in a larger scale. Moreover, it seems that in our case, the transactional factors seem the more appropriate units to influence in order to implement distributed leadership in teamwork. However, in specific structures such as centralized and high hierarchical organization, it may be possible that change in transformational factors is necessary.
4.3.2.4. Planning the change.

Finally Burke (2011) provides a framework for planning and leading change.

During the prelaunch phase, the CEO must be self-aware and to be able to be tolerant for ambiguity, to understand the emotion intelligence, the implementation of control, or decision-making. The motives must be well highlighted and the values of the company well assimilated to understand the future obstacles that will appear during and after the change. Top leaders must understand the dynamisms and the expectations of the external environment to fit and to forecast the situation of the customers, suppliers and competitors. Moreover they have to pave the way for change by establishing the need for change and providing clarity of vision and direction. People must feel the need for change before it starts because otherwise they may not embrace the idea.

During the launch phase, communicating the need is crucial to keep the organization’s members active and actors of the change. The CEO does the communication during speeches and meetings but the top executives must be enrolled to this task to improve the circulation of the message. But the communication must be complemented by initial activities that provide focus and state the launch of the change process. The resistance will naturally appear for various reasons (that we explained above) and managers must deal with it. Thus, according to the kind of resistance (blind, ideological and political) there are specific resolutions for each scale (individual level, group level and larger system level).

During the post launch, the goal is to “freeze” the change by reinforcing the new structure with further implementation. For that, the top managers must have access to multiple leverage that enable to handle the organizational instability from different field like supply chain management or training and development. Moreover, the decisions and actions of top leaders must stay consistent. Indeed, the followers scrutinize the change leaders’ behavior and if they don’t respect the restrictions of the change that followers suffer, the organization’s members will increase resistance. Furthermore, top leaders must strive and trust the vision of the change, despite the obstacles. Repeating the message is necessary to maintain the sense giving of the change to the members. Finally, to maintain the momentum, the change leader must stay focus on the organization’s external environment by being alert of any variations to adapt for survival if necessary.
In this section about organizational change, we gather knowledge to prepare the process of transition of organizational structure in order to insert distributed leadership in a team scale. Even if we plan not to change the global structure but some departments, we understand that the change we plan to do, affects all the organization at different scale. Therefore, this change will cause resistance in different levels. But we understand better mechanisms that influence resistance and therefore, we are more likely to develop a more viable process for implementing distributed leadership.

In order to implement distributed leadership, the organization has to operate changes. We presented elements in order to conduct those changes with theoretical elements regarding the types of change, the resistance or the planning of change. This background is essential to implement such a deep change as distributed leadership. This section also presented the organizational culture and structure which are obviously elements to take into account when developing a new way of leading. Besides these organizational elements, there are also concepts related to our research that are intertwined between an individual and an organizational perspective. Empowerment and the self-managed teams are key concepts that we develop in the next section.

4.4. Taking the lead

This section aims at presenting the key notion of empowerment which is intertwined between organizational and individual requirements. Then, it develops the operation of self-managed teams which are an efficient way of distributing the lead and to practice empowerment.

4.4.1. Empowerment.

Implementing the distributed leadership is based on the principle of empowerment. "An empowered team is one that has both the responsibility and authority to carry out its mission and exercises its ownership and control over its task and resources” (Parker.G, 2003 quoted in Parker;G, 2010, p1). In this field, we focus on the evolution of the ties between the managers and the empowered ‘potential leader’ in teamwork to understand how to ease the change.

Khan and Sharafat (1997) studied the meaning of empowerment for managers:

- On average, they consider it as a tool to be more responsive to the customer’s need, to trust employees to make the right choice, having less pressure about the control of
one’s work, to make decision faster without the need of the constant hierarchy’s agreement.

- To empower employees, it is necessary to make them understand that they have support for decision making, to encourage innovation and creativity, to communicate and share goal, to lead by the example through good behavior from the top management. Confident and well-informed people are more likely to be ready to be empowered.

- Empowering employees enables to make decision making faster and beyond, customer and employee’s confidence will increase and it improves the company’s performance. Employees are more enthusiasts and involved to do their work right. Finally, the company gains in quality and productivity,

- The risks in empowering are to lose the vision of the market and then the customers, to empower misfit employees. Moreover, the employee may take the bad decision. Finally if the guidance and the direction of the empowered employee are not sufficient, choices can negatively affect the company.

- Empowered employees will be efficient if they are confident that management will support them. For that, managers must demonstrate trust, reward of positive actions, communication and support.

Therefore, the manager that empowers the team is essential to provide the momentum. That’s why the implementation of the distributed leadership must well focus on the relationship between the manager and the empowered leader and her/his team.

In a similar way but more concerned with the organization itself, Kanter (1993) singles out six conditions to implement empowerment, which are:

- Opportunity for advancement
- Access to information
- Access to support
- Access to resources
- Formal Power (power distributed according to the organization chart).
- Informal Power (power perceived among employees, it appears naturally without official title).

Bowen and Lawler (1992) define empowerment as "sharing with front-line employees four
organization ingredients: information about the organization's performance, knowledge that enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance, rewards based on the organization's performance and power to make decisions that influence organizational direction and performance” (Bowen & Lawler, 1992, p.32). The authors note that if one of these four ingredients is not considered, empowerment cannot work. Thus empowerment must be developed through four fields according to Choudhury & Giri (2013), which are:

- **Information sharing**: To optimize the performance of the empowered employee, she/he needs all information that enables to understand and manage the issue to deal. The shared information must not only be about their specific tasks but also about how the organization works, its environment, the value individuals bring to the business.

- **Knowledge development**: to develop creativity and make the empowered employee comfortable to her/his new tasks, developing knowledge through training and job-embedded learning.

- **Autonomy**: It provides motivation, increase performance and reduce absenteeism and turnover.

- **Rewards**: Challenging tasks require high reward and empowerment is one of them. Rewards can obviously be financial and their positive effects on the performances are proved in every field of business and public sector. However, reward can be non-monetary, depending on the of the organization’s culture.

Thus, empowerment must be sparked off with organizational leverage. But how to coordinate this leverage?

Tuuli and Rowlinson (2009) single out structural empowerment in three levels. The first one is the empowerment climate, connected to the work environment, influenced by the average perceptions organizational components of the organizational conditions that promote feelings of empowerment. Empowerment climate constantly affects the change by easing it or impeding it. The second one is the individual empowerment (psychological empowerment). At this level, empowerment develop **sense of meaning** (affinity with the project), **competence** (The conviction that work activities can be carried out skilfully and successfully), **self determination** (freedom to choose how to perform work) and **impact** (capacity to influence the organization). The third level is the team empowerment. It relates to the team members’ collective belief, based on **potency** (Collective belief of a group),
meaningfulness (collective belief of the importance of their task), autonomy (degree of freedom according to schedule and procedures).

Finally in Delta Faucet Company, the empowerment is assessed in a scale of six levels (Parker & Glenn, 2010):

- Level 1: The manager decides.
- Level 2: The team has increasing input
- Level 3: The team recommends, the manager decide
- Level 4: The team decide and inform the manager prior to taking action.
- Level 5: The team decides and implements the decision, then informs the manager.
- Level 6: The team decides; no further action is required.

Implementing empowerment means less usual control (monitoring and certifications) and the risk to stimulate discordance between the actions of the employees and the performance of the company. However, according to Mills and Undson (2003), the trust and the organizational constitution are used to maintain a control on the empowered employees.

In this section, we develop our knowledge to understand the best approaches to deal with empowerment, its potential and drawbacks and the necessity to focus on the connection between the empowered leader and her/his manager.

4.4.2. Self-Managed Teams.

Our research brought us to the concept of self-managed teams. Indeed it seems an excellent vector of distributed leadership and along the years, it proved many times its potential for this kind of organizations.

During the 80’s/90’s, the USA suffered a decline of productivity, quality and competitiveness. To deal with that, many companies like General Electric or Procter and Gamble implemented self managed work teams (SMWTs) and the change done, they experienced great success with better quality, service and productivity.

“Self-managed teams are formal and permanent organizational units. They typically consist of 5-30 members working together on an on-going, day-to-day basis. Team members are empowered to produce an entire product or service with little or no supervision.” (Yang &
Implementing SMWT:

Training is necessary to shape the employees to their new tasks, to create cohesion teams and to provide the organization’s vision (Frankforter & Christensen, 2005).

In the case of Jostens Company (Yeatts & Hipskin 1994), the implementation started with training for all the organization members about how to conduct effectively team meetings and problem solving. Moreover, the training focused on quality awareness. Finally managers were informed about the advantages of implementing SMWT.

The second step was a seminar in which employees were shared the vision of the company and further defines the concept of SMWT and its advantages. Finally, employees were trained to the use of new technologies.

Then, two SMWTs were built and their numbers quickly increased with until 10 team members a team. The top management kept control on the SWWTs with individual performances and quota records

Finally, when Jostens needed further workforce, it trained the new employees with a training based on the Josten’s policies, specific job training, transition skills, quality awareness and team development. Beside, empowered employees attended workshops to improve their skills on communication, feedbacks, team leadership roles and team development.

To be efficient, self-managed teams must be multi-skilled and get additional skills and knowledge in both leadership and management fields. The leadership functions shift from upper management to the team members themselves. However, the autonomy is not fully achieved because of the perseverant control from the top hierarchy. But this control is based on the result and not on procedures and relations (Proença, 2010). The former supervisor becomes less useful in the model of SMWTs mainly because of the decrease of the control on procedures. However, the supervisor becomes a resource to the SMWTs by providing advices, and helping teams in need. Thus to implement SMWTs, the management team must be ready to lose some controls and to become coaches and employees must be team oriented (Frankforter & Christensen, 2005).

The implementation of SMWTs can be impeded by the dimensions of organizational structure (Tata & Prasad, 2004).
Centralization/decentralization: Centralized structure makes difficult the problem recognition because of the limited understanding to the overall process. Moreover, teams need management approval to apply decisions. Finally, managers and supervisors are not likely to share their power and control and this is one of the recurrent reasons of the failure of SMWTs. However in decentralized structure, the previous obstacles don't exist and the implementations of SMWTs are optimal.

Level of formalization: Large organizations tend to be highly formalized to keep control on a complex structure with norms, rules, procedures and communications. It restricts teams to multitask and their authority. Thus, it impede flexibility and generates frustration and decrease of team effectiveness. On the contrary, less formalized organizational structures give a large framework to release the potential of SMWTs.

Control variables: the performance of team SMWTs can be influenced from others factors like the organizational resources, reward for team performance, team missions, size of the team and team leader experience.

Advantages:

It increases job satisfaction, efforts, sense of responsibility and ownership by being multitask. The absenteeism and turnover is reduced until 20% as well as task complexity. The responsiveness and communications is improved by the rapprochement of the decision making to the level of operational problems, as well as the employee self-esteem because involved in the team survival. For organizations, it enables cost control with less managers and supervisors needed to keep control. They can respond faster to changes in input and output as well as changes in product lines and customers needs because of flexibility and innovation. Finally, the quality is enhanced with teams focus on specific products or services. (Frankforter & Christensen, 2005; Yeatts & Hipkind., 1994; Tata & Prasad 2004).

Team life cycle:

Tuckman (1977) developed a five-stage model that provides explanations about the team development.

The first step is forming: The leader is crucial to provide direction and guidance and is constantly assed by the team members. The leader directs.
The second step is storming: the ties between team members are being formed. Some clashes may appear like power struggles or working styles and compromise can help to reduce conflicts. The team has to be focused on the aims to prevent emotional and relational distractions. The leader coaches.

The third step is norming: Agreement and consensus appear, decisions are mainly made among the team. The culture of the team is formed depending on its working style and its processes. The leader and the team leaders start to get respect for each other. The leader facilitates and enables.

The fourth step is performing: The team has a shared vision, everybody knows her/his role in the team and they are autonomous. The cohesion between team members is strong and they can help each other. The leader delegates.

The last step is adjourning: When the task is completed, the team members tend to aspire new things and the team is disaggregated. It is the break out.

Through the five phases of team life cycle we understand the difficulty of building teams and the obstacles that may appear during the team building. Moreover, none teams are eternal and it is necessary to plan the team break out to keep the self managed work team dynamic and performing by controlling the turnover in each team.

This section presented the theoretical data collected through an extensive literature review. It presented the challenges of implementation of distributed leadership on an individual perspective, an organizational perspective as well as the concepts of empowerment and self-managed teams. Besides this secondary data, we also collected a solid amount of empirical data through case studies conducted through interviews that we will develop in the next section.

5. Analysis of Primary Data

Alongside our literature review that brought understanding around our theoretical frameworks, we conducted four case studies through interviews. We selected participants of these interviews regarding their experiences and the structure in which they were working. Those structures were selected because of their implementation of principles of Distributed Leadership: A small Law firm, Gore, the Belgian Social Security as well as a big international
bank. We will present in the following part the results of this empirical data collection and link it to the theoretical data we presented beforehand. Those case studies represent more practical and empirical data covering different aspect of our research, in order to get a more complete coverage of our topic.


A.M. was the first one of our interviewees. He is a partner in a small law firm in New-York in which he is practicing several types of law such as corporate law. He is working with two other partners which are specialized in specific areas as well. There are a number of associates and attorneys that worked for them, and he gives a big importance about sharing the lead with them and empowering them. That is the main reason of our desire to exchange with him. A.M. graduated from Business Administration and Management before becoming a lawyer, and that is why he is much focused on concepts related to management and leadership. He was also working in the NY Stock Exchange for 30 years and also teaches in the St Peter University in New Jersey.

This interview provides us good empirical data about specific aspects related to successful implementation of Distributed Leadership. As this interview was the first one we conducted, we referred as shared leadership but this term can be substituted to distributed leadership.

5.1.1. Empowerment

The main focus on this interview was about the notion of empowerment. The focus on this concept was not only because of the orientation we gave through our questions but also because of the answer of A.M. The sharing of the lead in his structure was done mainly through empowerment of the employees, and we often came back to this notion during the interview. We analyzed the meaning of his answers by looking into his many examples and analogies.

A.M. is illustrating how to empower people with an example of a situation he encountered and how he managed to solve it through empowerment. Few years ago, he was put in charge of a department which was not functioning well at all, with the mission to fix the situation. He "evaluated the area" during a few weeks and noticed the main problem, which was that the toxic climate between the managers and the employees. They were not performing well because they were told what to do by the managers who did not know much about the job
itself. However, despite the fact that he identified the problem, he did not say it. He asked individuals within this division to reflect about what is going wrong and to come up with answers. He asked them to reflect about how to regain their respect. "When you appeal to someone's professionalism and respect and you ask how do you want to get out of it, you are empowering them as well as motivating them". The results were very quick and very positive. As he developed further, empowering can be succeeded by avoiding making statements and "turning statements into a question". By letting people coming up with the answer they take ownership of it and embrace it. The following quote is capturing a lot about this notion of empowerment: "The leader cannot benefit himself unless he benefits others". According to him, empowerment is a good way to make the people around you develop and improve their creative thinking. He gave another example showing that by letting an employee find a solution on her own to a problem, he is making him or her grows and develops. In this example it is more about sharing the power of leadership rather than sharing the position, as we discussed before. Furthermore, this example is emphasizing several of the condition of empowerment according to Kanter (1993) among which access to support and informal power.

If we relate the empowerment in this law firm to the Delta Faucet Company's scale of empowerment, we can assume that it is a level 3 or 4 of empowerment (Parker & Glenn, 2010). It means that the team recommends to the leader who decides or the team decides but informs the leader before taking actions. It is a middle level of empowerment on this 6-levels scale.

A.M. also demonstrated his view of shared leadership and the importance to value the diversity of the toolbox through a sport analogy. In his experience, he has been coaching lot of teams in different sports. For him the most important thing for the leader that he is as a coach is to "Understand the abilities of what you have". He emphasizes this with the example of people with different heights in a basketball field. The strategy has to adapt to these differences and the leader has to adapt his strategy considering what abilities he possesses. Both tall and short players have their specific part to play according to their abilities. A small player under the basket will be misused and a tall player as a small forward needing speed will also be underused. This analogy extended to represent the essence of Empowerment and shared leadership with this quote: "Every player on the court has to be a leader, to work together and to share that". If we replace this sport analogy in an organizational situation, we can relate it to our research. An organization has to understand abilities of its workforce and
make the best use out of them. These abilities are not related to height or speed but related to
gender, culture, authenticity, leading style and so on.

This analogy is coming back later on in the interview when discussing the need for people to
be able to act as leader, through the example of Phil Jackson, the coach of the Chicago Bulls
in the Michael Jordan era. He says about Phil Jackson that "He realized that what he needed to
do was to empower the players that he had on that court playing. Each one was a leader
because they knew that they were accountable, they had their roles to play and they knew they
had chemistry working together" This is illustrating the essence of empowerment for us,
which is taking ownership of what you are doing. He also relates to the need to have passion
to be able to act as a leader. According to him, it is the organization that has to make this
empowerment possible. The organization has to provide conditions in which individuals can
develop chemistry and trust, which are key notions for him.

5.1.2. Requirements of Shared Leadership.

The analysis of the language of A.M. during the interview enabled us to identify recurring
words. Those words that always came back were clearly things to emphasize in our analysis.
Most of them are representing requirements of shared leadership in his experiences.

The word "Trust" is said 9 times by A.M. during the interview, while no questions were asked
about this specific notion. The word "Authentic" is coming back 6 times while no questions
were mentioning this word either. He often connected those two notions: "You are not going
to get anything in shared leadership if the people do not trust the leader. In order to have trust,
you have to be authentic". Authenticity as a requirement for shared leadership was presented
in the same way before, with the view of Avolio & Gardner (2005). The word "Chemistry" is
coming back 8 times during the interview while no references to this notion were made on our
part. He presented this need for chemistry as a basic for the trust: "[...] so they can develop
this chemistry among themselves so that they can trust themselves in the journey they are
about to engage". "Respect" is cited 9 times by A.M. on his own initiative again. He
emphasizes the basic need to have "mutual respect".

Authenticity, respect, trust and chemistry seem to be four big requirements for sharing the
lead in an organization and empower people. They are all influencing each others, if there is
no authenticity, there is no trust, and vice versa. If there is no trust or respect, they can't be
chemistry etc., as illustrated in the diagram below.
This chemistry has to be made possible also by the organization itself: "The organization has to establish the environment to facilitate the chemistry among leaders who can grow". It is therefore important to foster an environment of trust in which people can act and try to take responsibilities: "Give the possibility to people to act is necessary to know if shared leadership can work".

5.1.3. Obstacles and Benefits of Shared Leadership.

According to A.M., one of the biggest challenges when sharing the leadership is the need to have a collective vision. He refers to it as "one of the keys of shared leadership". This comes from the fact that "As humans, we have different visions of what they want to accomplish".

Another possible obstacle developed is the incompatibility between shared leadership and the measuring of personal performances. He explained that his firm built an individual productivity quota, but they soon realized that it was not developing a sense of collective. They suppressed this quota and put the focus on the company's profitability.

Shared leadership is requiring a lot of communication and it can be an obstacle if it is not made efficiently. A.M. presents 3 main aspects of communication: "Making sure that what you are conveying is being understood exactly as he or she means it". In order to get this common understanding, he explains one of his habits, which is to ask after a meeting to people what they understood and to see if everyone agrees. This common understanding is necessary when sharing the lead to have a common basis for action. The second thing related to communication is to be authentic regarding the fact that even when you are empowering your employees, you cannot tell them everything. "They have to understand, and you have to be truthful with that: I can't tell you everything and they will respect that". Solution in this
case is to say as much as it is possible in order to share the maximum amount of information. This is another condition of empowerment as we presented before: Access to information (Kanter, 1993). The last important thing to communicate in a good way is to be sensitive and respectful regarding the way to communicate, especially because "communication is the media by which you recognize the achievement of other". If not done correctly, communication can represent a big obstacle to the implementation of shared leadership, because it is a transactional activity.

According to him, culture is the main obstacle when developing shared leadership. He states that "You cannot change people, but you can change a behavior". This can be done by listening to the people's needs and interests. He gives again a sport analogy by showing how Dennis Rodman, the most individualistic player, changed his behavior to be part of the team and work together with the other players because his desire was to win the championship. This example is illustrating how developing the desire to lead of individualistic people can help them to get their place in a collective.

Concerning the benefits of shared leadership, he mentioned cost reductions and opportunity to train future leaders by empowering people. He also explained that it is providing a better quality of services because people are adding value to it because of their commitment. Finally, he said that "the driving force for shared leadership is creativity", and shows how creativity is enhanced by shared leadership: "Creativity results from people working together, and little groups of subordinates can be the forming ground for leadership". These benefits are suiting the meaning of empowerment for manager according to Khan & Sharafat (1997) with for instance empowerment as a tool to be more responsive to the customer's needs or encourage innovation and creativity.

This interview was interesting in order to have empirical data about how the leadership can be shared and distributed in a rather small organization. This interview illustrated specific requirements for sharing the leadership as well as the benefits and obstacles. Most of all, this interview provided great illustration of empowerment through analogies as well as examples of business situations. We can add a final note from this interview with this quote from A.M. illustrating that Shared Leadership is possible to be implemented in any structure if it is appropriate: "I believe that shared leadership can be conducted in any organization. The issue for the organization is to seize what fits best for what they are trying to accomplish".
5.2. Gore: Distributed Leadership through Small Teams.

We conducted an interview with G. C., who is working for more than 30 years in W.L. Gore & Associates. Gore is an American manufacturing company composed of more than 10,000 employees worldwide, well known for developing the Gore-Tex product. Gore is also recognized for its deeply rooted humanistic culture. It is ranked in the "100 Best Companies to Work For". Bill Gore referred to Gore as a "Lattice Organization", and the hierarchy is very flat. They are operating with "small teams" which are covering a lot of principles of distributed leadership and empowerment as well. That is what captured our interest in this company. We interviewed G.C. because of his big experience within Gore and his deep awareness of Gore's unique culture. He participated to the development of Gore in the Nordic Countries in Europe. He went through various positions including Sales Leadership or Brand Leadership for instance. He is also part of the formal leadership in Scandinavia, which means that he is in the board of directors.

5.2.1. Operating with Small Teams.

This idea of operating with small team is very much connected to the Gore culture. Gore is very culture driven, as explained by G.C. "The entire organization is very much directed and based on the basic Gore culture". As culture, we refer here as the corporate culture (Schneider, Barsoux & Stahl, 2014). The Gore culture as presented above as a "lattice organization" with low hierarchy is the starting point of operating with small and relatively autonomous teams. Gore is a company which tries to value its workforce at a maximum and those small teams are the way to do it by providing autonomy and responsibility. The culture in Gore can be assimilated to the "village market culture", with low hierarchy and low formalization with a decentralized and flexible structure (Schneider, Barsoux, Stahl, 2014). Coordination of the organization is much influenced by its culture "This deeply rooted culture is influencing the practices, policies, internal and external behaviors and how we work". The common understanding of the culture is also what is enabling Gore to operate with those small teams, because this culture can substitute the structural layers of hierarchy: "If you have a deeply rooted and well understood culture, you need less of the structure obviously". This small teams are a good example of a functional or market-oriented departmentalization (Linsteajed., Fulop, Lilley, 2009, or even Divisionalisation.
G.C. is referring to Gore as a Networking Organization. This network is composed of all the small teams, connected to a bigger unit. This implies that those teams are never totally independent, because they are always part of a bigger unit. For instance, you can be part of the e-Marketing which is part of a bigger segment which is Marketing. These teams can also be part of a bigger unit regarding the functional area. The fact that these teams are not totally independent implies also that they are not 100% autonomous. "We are trying to break down the organization as much as we can, but there is always the connection". However, operating with small teams and decentralizing the power seems like a good way to distribute the leadership in some extent. Advantages of such decentralizations according to Linsteajejed, Fulop and Lilley (2009) are better and quicker decisions, opportunity for personal development, increased motivation and better responsiveness to change. As we illustrated before, a decentralized structure is more likely to perform in distributed leadership.

Another specificity in Gore is that they do not refer as positions but as "Commitments". This term is more action oriented and is illustrating quite well the nature of their low hierarchy and "lattice organization". The analysis of the language shows that this term is coming back 12 times during the interview, and his recurring pattern shows the importance of it in the Gore culture. G.C. shows how Gore is in opposition with the classical hierarchy in which people are directed and told what to do and how to do. These commitments are the way to empower people in Gore: "We talk about self-Commitment and that is one way to empower". They refer to "self-commitments" because people are acknowledging what they have to do, and they are thus committed to it and take ownership. In Gore, empowerment seems to reach a high level on the Delta Faucet Scale (Parker & Glenn, 2010) than the law firm. Teams can decide and implement a decision, and then inform the greater unit, which is a level 5 of empowerment.

Operating with those small teams is bringing lot of benefits: "The small team obviously has an opportunity to be more creative, faster and gave much more focus on what they have to deliver". The creativity come from the fact that these teams are very dynamic and are therefore developing a creative environment in which people can grow and learn. These teams which are focused on skills are enabling people to develop: "We believe that small teams which are very focused on specific things are competent and develop better knowledge". All this advantages are connected to empowerment. Those small teams are able to realize these benefits because they are empowered, by a relative autonomy. The commitment of this empowered people with these teams is developed by G.C.:"You get very dedicated people
with a high degree of ownership of their tasks and commitments". These advantages are the
same that the ones presented by Khan and Sharafat (1997) earlier. Furthermore, an important
opportunity of small teams is that people have more opportunity to take on leadership in this
kind of settings.

Regarding the drawbacks, the main one cited by G.C. is that it is sacrificing benefits in terms
of efficiency of scale. He illustrated this by the fact that these small units are separated in a lot
of different buildings while other corporations can concentrate all their employees in one big
place. Another risk while operating with small teams is to have process inefficiency with
teams being individualistic. Those advantages and disadvantages are similar to the ones of
divisionalisation according to Linsteajed, Fulop and Lilley (2009).

5.2.2. Leadership in Gore.

In Gore, they refer to leadership as Natural Leadership: "We define leader as the ones who
gained followership from other associates and other leaders". Getting followership can be
accomplished by being very skilled and/or by being appreciated by people around you for
instance. It is important obviously to be good in your area and to "build your own track
record". Thus, leaders are not appointed in Gore expect rare cases of crises. The organization
is supporting the emergence of those natural leaders: "We try to support so people who have
followership have an opportunity to develop". A lot of internal trainings are possible within
Gore to assist those natural leaders in their progress. Another key aspect to be a leader in Gore
is that "You have to be a good role model from the cultural aspect to lead by example". It is
necessary for this culturally driven organization that the leaders promote this culture.

This natural leadership is thus not attached to one single person and can move from one
person to another: "In operational state within Gore, you can always see that leadership
maybe shifts in certain situations with discussions". He goes further by explaining that the
lead is connected to the appropriate skills, by illustrating that for instance in a question about
finance someone with abilities in this area can take the lead in the discussion. This is a great
example of empowering the toolbox and making a good use of the competencies at hand in an
organization. As G.C. says: "We use the network within Gore and the leadership may come
from more people, that is why there is no hierarchy from that perspective". Suppressing
hierarchical barriers in order to value the skills of the network is the essence of distributed leadership as we see it.

One of the basic philosophies of the founder Bill Gore is that: "We can grow further that we think we can". Thus, the organization should provide "advanced trust" to their employees as referred by G.C. This advanced trust should push people to have the confidence to try on new things, for instance taking the lead: "There is an opportunity within Gore to take on new commitments, try new things, even things that are not likely the closest to you". As developed before, developing a nourishing environment can improve the will to lead of individuals. And this advanced trust in the employees is a source of personal development for them: "That is one of the traditional ways to grow and develop into the company: to try new things".

The study of the Gore culture illustrated that operating with self-managed teams can be a good way to empower people and implement distributed leadership. The natural leadership can enable anyone who has the required abilities to take the lead at any given time and bring his personal expertise. This combination of small teams and natural leadership value and empower the toolbox and optimize the use of the workforce. This low hierarchy structure comes with benefits and drawbacks, but the way that this company is prospering for more than 30 years on this principles seems to prove that the benefits fairly outweigh the drawbacks.

5.3. SPF: Implementation of team empowerment in a public service.

N. K. is an executive in the Belgian Social Security. She works for Frank Van Massenhove, the chairman of the SPF, who decided to empower the employees and has changed the structure of the hierarchy from a classical one based on controls and rigidity to a dynamic one based on flexibility and transparency. This interview enabled us to understand better the mechanisms that impede and ease the empowerment of employees in a public organization. Moreover, this case is very close to what we tend to develop.

5.3.1. The implementation process of the empowerment and distributed leadership.

First, in 2002, Frank Van Massenhove noticed that the organization was much supervised; people were not involved into the organization. Functional stupidity was present for many people with a lack of reflexivity and without sense making of the meaning of their roles. The
organization shifted from a dusty unstable «house of cards» without risk control to a
dynamic «Lego construction» with strong foundations.

Then the second change occurred in 2005. This time, the challenge was to attract skilled
people to work in the organization. Despite the guarantee to have one’s job safe and the
government pension fund, few people applied for a job in the organization. Therefore, they
decided to restructure the organizational culture. The change influenced the culture itself but
beyond, the type of leadership, the dynamic office, the way to work and the tools. After
implementation, the members were empowered with flexibility in their works and less
supervision. The change lasted 4 years.

Finally, the third change was focused on extending the change occurred in the organization to
its environment and more precisely, to the partners. Nowadays, the top management works
with a self-manage team system. People choose their role with no more team executive.
Tasks are not anymore provided from the top management but from the team itself.

If we analyze the tree steps of change, we notice that the first one was structural, the second
one cultural and the third one environmental. They implemented the first change in an
incremental way on several years. That means that the changes were not sudden and forced
but softly integrated in the culture of the organization to let the time to the members to get
used to it. Moreover, we see that the changes occurred in the individual level by providing
the possibility to work in one’s home with more flexibility and better work environment.
Moreover, in the group level, the classical hierarchy has been replaced by self-managed team
in which the time is not the work unity but the projects. Finally in the larger-system level, the
culture changed to make the organization more attractive to the applicants.

Moreover, the Burke-Litwin Model provides better understanding of these three changes.
Indeed the first one as a structural change, a transactional factor, focus on individual and
group levels, implemented through continuous and incremental changes. The second change
is about the culture. This one is a transformational factor that requests all the organization be
affected with revolutionary and discontinuous adjustments. The last change can be
considered as a consequence of the second change. Indeed, according to the Burke-Litwin
model, the organizational culture directly influences the external environment. Thus, the
cultural change of the federal health service of Belgium pushed its partner to adapt themselves
to their new way of work.
5.3.2. Autonomy.

Empowerment is related to autonomy, and in order to reach it, the change was focused on the team executive themselves, mainly because they were assigned to control their subordinates. The difficulty was to shift from a supervision based on control to a supervision based on trust, which became a pillar of the organizational culture. To ease the transition, the needed tools were implemented in their work environment but also the possibility to follow the files in process but without interventions and controls. Finally the implementation of new ERP devices enabled new opportunities such as teleworking.

Furthermore, the leadership skills of the executives have been developed. Indeed, with the new structure, executives were fewer managers but more leaders and needed to be trained in a different way to stay efficient in the new structure. To develop the leadership skills, team executives attended various 12-people subgroup sessions, distributed in a one year plan. During the sessions, the themes were remote feedback, remote relationship and the team management. But the rest of the themes came from the group itself. These sessions still exist in the organization because of the long time process necessary to implement the change. Alongside the subgroup sessions, some team executive who were used to work as managers didn’t felt comfortable to become leaders, role based on trust. Indeed, the main reason was their role of expert in the former hierarchical structure in which they were asked to work in specific tasks. But in the new structure, leading people means to be multitask and some team executive didn’t feel ready to take the lead because of the complexity of their new roles. To deal with this issue, the top management assessed the reason of this reluctance. If it was caused by a lack of confidence, the team executive was supported and pushed to gain confidence by promoting the fact that the organization needs their expertise alongside with the management and leadership. If the reluctance was caused by a real lack of competences, than the expert was granted to keep her/his role and was guided.

By analyzing the implementation of autonomy, we noticed that it follows the planning of Burke (2011). Indeed, during the prelaunch, the difficulties, the constraints and the expectations of the members were listened and considered to adapt the change. The need for change was well expressed mainly because of the lack of attraction of the organization, a lack of creativity and motivation. During the launch phase, the communication between the top management, the team executives and the employees was improved. Moreover, workshops were included in the change plan to ease the understanding. Finally, during the post launch,
the organization tries to expand their model to their partners and alongside they harden the new structure with new components like the self-manage team strategy. Finally, as proposed Mills and Undson (2003), the direct control from hierarchical structure was replaced by the trust and organization constitution in order to maintain a consistency.

However, the autonomy has its own drawbacks. The main one suffered by the organization is the possibility of the employees to work outside the common workplace through teleworking. Thus, privacy and professional life are difficult to single out and may push the employees to work beyond their limits. In case of sickness, an employee may teleworking and that reduces the rate of absenteeism. But the role is not to have the sick employees work. Then the team executive has to deal with issue, as a team leader, by granting some rest. Moreover, some teleworking employees may go in holidays during their work time. However, free time cannot be merged with work time. The employer must maintain this limit. However, to deal with these autonomy issues, the control is not applied like said previously but it is human-oriented. Indeed, the leader can notice if the employee is logged on the intranet. If the employee is often connected beyond the work period, the leader can naturally try to understand the reason and to adjust the employee’s tasks to make it more bearable. If the employee seems not active, the leader can try to solve out if the employee is sick or abuses the teleworking by using it for her/his privacy purposes. However, in case of infringement, the leader can still punish the abusive employee. Therefore, the control is replaced by a worry of the employees and partners.

5.3.3. Transparency.

Empowerment needs more transparency, mainly in order to provide necessary information to execute the tasks by the empowered employee, and like N. K. said “the transparency is not to lie on the real goal that we pursue”. In the federal health service (SPF) of Belgium, the policy is to provide the result of the organization to the public. Many companies asked them the savings that SPF managed to do because the main reason to implement an empowerment strategy is to reduce the cost of supervision and innovation.

Moreover, transparency is efficient while authenticity is a cultural value that members hold. Without authenticity, the transparency may disclose hidden information and cause serious damage to the reputation of the organization.
However, the communication through transparency must stay controlled. Indeed, unclear and not decided decisions must not be disclose because of the risk to change the provided information. But in case of private organizations with competitors, crucial data must stay confidential to survive. That’s why there is a level of transparency. In case of public service, the transparency can be high with information publicly provided because there is not competition. But in case of private organization, in order to implement empowerment, the transparency must be encased in the internal structure and to be kept confidential to the public, only the members can have access to the information. Thus the members can have a better sense making of the strategy and the context of the organization.

5.3.4. Resistance.

The resistance appears in every change. SPF didn’t make exception. The implementation of the dynamic office during the second change, with the replacement of individual offices for managers to an open space for everyone, the visible status of the managers disappeared. From the beginning, the implementation of the dynamic office was communicated and considered as irreversible. However all the members of the organization were fully involved to the change by participating to the decisions of the dynamic office from the beginning. Finally the resistance was weak and the shift a success.

By analyzing it, we notice that the resolution to deal with the individual resistance was the participation of the members on the project, developed by W. Warner Burke (2011):

In the individual level, we can single out the three kind of resistance of Hambrick and Cannella (1989). The political resistance from manager might have been the more relevant risk mainly because of the lost of status. In the case of SPF, members were afraid of the lost of visible status, the depersonalization and the clean desk of one’s workplace in the dynamic office. Because of the involvement of the members to the dynamic office implementation, some complements in the plan occurred such as personal pictures on the screensaver or setting up plants, kept by the employees themselves. The second one would be the ideological resistance with the fear that the dynamic office would not be as efficient as the former structure. Finally, the blind resistance in which the members naturally resist until they get used to the new change. Well, despite minor issues, the three resistances have been limited mainly because of the trust in Frank Van Massenhove, the chairman of the SPF as well as the strong persuasion based on the success of the first change and the culture of the organization.
to relate the merit to one’s effort and not to one’s status. Two people decided to resign because they didn’t feel comfortable to the new one.

To the group level, Because of the previously centralized structure, members of the organization didn’t feel connected in a group. Moreover, the top managers of SPF without dissident also supported Frank Van Massenhove. Finally, the authenticity of Frank Van Massenhove, his policy of transparency and the involvement of the members of SPF developed trust in the work environment. Thus, in this level, the resistance was quite inexistent. However after the implementation of the change, the empowerment of teams enabled to create new group cohesion between employees in one teamwork. These new team cohesion made the transition of the teleworking further easy because of some trained specialist of VPN in each group to help the understanding and the implementation this new way of work to their teammates. Finally, the celebration of team goal achievements was a factor to achieve closure of the past with “symbolic funeral”.

Finally, in the larger-system level, resistance came mainly from the trade union but also with the top managers of the government of Belgium mainly because of the originality of the change proposed by Frank Van Massenhove. To deal with it, transparency, facts and continuous dialogues were the ingredient to impede the reluctance.

5.3.5. Summary.

The biggest advantage of this change is the global motivation happiness and pride of the employees to work in SPF. It implies a better productivity and attractiveness for the organization, less turnover and absenteeism, and less structural cost.

The drawbacks are the difficulty to separate the privacy from the professional life. Moreover, the social life in the organization are different because of the teleworking even if many employees like to work in the organization’s work place to meet their counterparts and the facts that they must be in the workplace three days a week and to attend meetings.

The vision of this change came from Frank Van Massenhove and it appeared when he noticed the difficulties of his employees. The leadership team was also a part but only the strategies to implement was negotiable. By using the leadership styles of Goleman (1998), we notice that Frank Van Massenhove is a democratic leader, listening everyone and understanding their
concerns to undertake change. Moreover he is also a transformational leader because he acts according to the context. Finally he is authentic with the will to develop transparency.

Finally, according to N.K, the occurred change in SPF can be also implemented in private sectors. The public sectors are not more flexible as many people think and the change is possible only because of resources and will.

5.4. Obstacles to Distributed Leadership: Example of the Bank sector.

The last interview we conducted was with P.G. who is a manager in a big international private Bank. P.G. has more than 25 years of experience in the bank sector, with 11 years as a private senior banker. He is now working in Wealth Management. This interview aimed at illustrating some structural limits and obstacles of Distributed Leadership in some sectors with specific characteristics. The structure of this bank is very hierarchical with many layers and many control (arrows), as the following diagram is illustrating:

5.4.1. Structural limits to distributed leadership.

The bank sector is a sector of high risk. Every operation has high stack and every mistake can cause serious damage to the organization. This "operational risk" is the main reason of the adoption of this very hierarchical structure with high degree of control. This structure is supposed to control the operational risk. Trading is a good example of this operational risk, in
which a single mistake can cause a gigantic loss for the company, as illustrated by the Jerôme Kerviel case, a French trader who was judged responsible for a 4.8 billion € lost in an autonomous trading operation.

This need for control was reinforced since a few years because of the economic crises that hit the banks. The centralization is reinforced by the rise of regulation imposed on banks after the crises: "Now Banks implemented more control because of the legislation. The states are forcing banks to make more control and checking". This centralization and this impossibility to develop autonomy is making implementation of distributed leadership impossible. No empowerment is possible in such conditions, because control is overcoming trust.

Thus, following the model of Burke-Litwin model (1992), the external environment of insurance, bank and finance has a huge influence on the mission and strategy, leadership, organizational culture, individual and organizational performance. That influence is so high that changes in the organization cannot be implemented without high risk of failure.

5.4.2. Disadvantages of this centralization.

In this structure, the power is attached to the level of hierarchy, the more you raise in the hierarchy the more power you have to "validate operations". When you are in the bottom of the hierarchy, you have no actual power of decision and your actions have to be validated by a superior. This is a level 1 of empowerment as we saw before (Parker & Glenn, 2010), the manager decides, which means basically almost no empowerment at all.

This hierarchical structure is suffering from the lack of flexibility and of the lack of empowerment. As explained by P.G., the chain of control is very important and thus it is lowering the performance. If every operation has to be validated by a high level of hierarchy, it is created a less fluid process. As he said, "If the person is busy, the chain is broken". And if the chain is broken, an action cannot be validated and operated. This lack of flexibility is also causing issues regarding negotiation with clients. The agents at the bottom of the hierarchy are the ones in contact with the clients, and if they have to constantly check with a supervisor they cannot be responsive during the negotiation.

Another drawback stated by P.G. is that this centralization is affecting the performance of the manager which is responsible: "By centralizing in one person, he/she is overwhelmed and less focused on the qualitative control but more on the quantitative control." This can affect the
operational risk and suppress the advantages of this structure; this person can overlook important things.

5.4.3. A supervised Empowerment as a solution?

P.G. believes that because of these drawbacks explained above, the current extreme centralization should be lightened. He is suggesting a system with more delegation but supervised by punctual control such as audits. He thinks that the actual control became too important: "We must find a good balance between delegation and control". According to Mills and Undson (2003), trust can substitute control in a context of empowerment without creating discordance between the actions of the employees and the performance of the organization. Considering the operational risk, total delegation seems not likely to be possible, but a system with this kind of punctual control could be a good compromise. Furthermore, it could substantially enhance the performance of the company by simplifying the processes and bring benefit from the advantages of empowerment. P.G. states that: "Overall, employees try to make a good job, and thus you should make them responsible". This statement is similar to the Theory Y of Mc Gregor (1960) stating that workers do not dislike their job and that giving trust over control can create benefits because they are self-motivated.

As a final note, P.G. explains that distributed leadership seems very complicated to implement in the current situation but will be necessary to insert in the development: "We came from a lax state to an excess of hyper-vigilance. But when the bank digests all this constraints, they will have to let the individuals involved into the development of the establishment". Despite the structural constraints of this sector, this interview illustrated that shifting from control to trust (Mc Gregor, 1960; Mills & Undson, 2003) in order to promote responsabilization can substantially benefit to the bank sector.

Those four case studies enriched our research with empirical data from very different perspectives and different structures. Those interviews were a good way to complete the theoretical data collected in the previous parts. Having feedback from people who have experienced this phenomenon of distributed leadership highlighted key points to look upon. These interviews also illustrated advantages as well as limits and obstacles of empowerment and gave us a lot of insight about the process of implementation of distributed leadership.
6. Integration.

In this section, we will formalize or model of implementation of self-managed team with an emerging leader from this group according to her/his profile. When the project is completed, a new one is introduced to the team according to the characteristic of the project to deal; the most suitable leadership profile among the member’s team takes the lead of this team to achieve the new project. To ease the emergence of the new team leader, the organization can get access to the profile of the team members thanks to a «leadership tool» that assess the leadership profile of the team members. However, this system can work only if the members of the team are all ready to become leader with their own specificities. That means that they need a preparation to take the lead.

Our model of distributed leadership is operating through self-managed teams, are illustrated by the graph below. The orange box shows that although these teams are self-managed, they are still in contact with a bigger unit and there is still a superior authority coordinating those teams and the projects. The emergence of the leader can be assessed by the toolbox, validating the matching between the profile of the leader and the project's requirements. The lead is distributed in the organization on two levels: first among the emerged leaders, and then among the team members. After the emergence of the leader, this leader will empower his team in (short black arrows) in order to distribute the lead in a second level.
To develop our model, we defined three approaches:

The first approach is **Implementing distributed leadership.** This part focuses on the change process on the organizational structure to implement the developed concept. However, we don’t plan to change all the organization because we understand the advantages that all structures can bring in a specific environment. Rather our focus is on specific areas such as department or division of an organization. The cases of Gore Company and the Federal Health Service of Belgium, described in our interviews, showed the success to self-managed teams in public and private sectors and the many positive aftermaths of this change at individual and system levels.

The second approach is **developing good potential leader.** This section is not focusing on the organizational level but on the individual level. It is firstly developing how the leaders should emerge in these settings and how to make this emerging process possible. Then, we develop the individuals’ requirements regarding distributed leadership and empowerment. Finally, we summarize the benefits of the implementation of our model.

---

Figure 1: Concept of Self-managed Teams
The third approach is **Assessing the profile of the potential leader**. This part is focus on the elaboration of the “leadership toolbox” to assess the profile of the potential leaders in the team to lead the group.

### 6.1. Implementing distributed leadership.

As we found out previously, the implementation of self-managed team can be impede from two main dimensions of structure, the level of hierarchy and the level of formalization.

Therefore, we chose to elaborate the process on the emerging cultural profile:

**Emerging cultural profile (Schneider, Barsoux & Stahl.G, 2014 p 97)**

This cultural profile is used as an illustration of the four type of organization according to hierarchy and formalization. The advantage of this concept is the involvement of the most relevant variables of organizations. Indeed, it is elaborated with the level of hierarchy and the
uncertainty avoidance. The characteristics of the four cases are depicted through the dimensions of structure developed by Linstaiejed, Fulop & Lilley (2009) such as the centralization/ decentralization, the span of control or departmentalization. In another word, the emerging cultural profile is an interesting concept that covers most characteristics that define organizations in a smart way. Moreover, we noticed that beyond the cultural orientation, all the four cases can be present in each country.

Thus, the Village market represents organizations that are decentralized, flexible with many delegations and low hierarchy. This case can be seen in many small organizations that need to use all the human potentials to survive and being innovative. About the implementation of the self-managed team, the shock is limited because the delegation is already high with informal communication, flexibility, generalist and low level of hierarchy. Thus, this structure respects the value of lean management. In this case, the control is already weak, more trust-oriented and employees are already empowered.

At the opposite is the traditional bureaucracy, nowadays big companies are still likely to use this structure mainly because it eases the coordination and controls in a large scale. Moreover, organizations that need to work in a risky environment such as the finance, insurance or banking feel comfortable in this structure to control the risk. Implementing distributed leadership is difficult in a bureaucratic structure because of its originality and the lack of evidences about performances. About the implementation of the self-managed team, the traditional bureaucratic structure is well-centralized, high hierarchy based on controls with few delegations. In this case the implementation is tough and need many adjustments and reforms.

Between the both structures, there are the well-oiled machine, decentralized but with high formalization and the family structure, centralized but with low formalization. The well-oiled machine can represent organizations that are in fast growth market and implemented empowerment to improve innovation and flexibility of the responsiveness. The familial structure can be found in organizations connected with a group that share common values with a specific successor. About the implementation of the self-managed team, the Well-oiled machine and the family structures can be considered as transitional status. The issue to deal with the well-oiled machine is the control orientation whereas the main obstacle in the family structure is the power centralization.
Therefore, according to the obstacles to implement the self-managed team, we noticed that the number of reforms necessary to implement the change are the same but increase when the formalization and the hierarchy is high like presented in the following scheme:

![Figure 2. Number of reforms needed according to the type of structure](image)

Thus, by dealing with the traditional bureaucracy, the process to implement the self-managed team can be applied to the other structure styles. Therefore, the following sections are dealing with the bureaucratic structure in which we face the biggest obstacles to implement the expected change.

6.1.1. The environmental context.

Implementing distributed leadership is influenced by the external environment that organizations influence and are influenced. Thus, PESTLE and PORTER analysis enable to determine major external factors that can ease or harden the change. Moreover, the interview with P.G about the difficulty to implement empowerment in market such as insurance and finance enabled us to highlight further external factors that influence the organizational change like the operational risk and financial risk. Therefore, we managed to develop a table to identify external factors that influence the empowerment change through distributed leadership.

**Table: External factors and their effects on implementing distributed leadership.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry growth</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The higher the industry growth is, the more competitors want to innovate to grasp market share.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementing empowerment to improve creativity becomes interesting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service-oriented</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>The higher is the marker service-oriented, the better is the customisation. Implementing self-managed team enable to customize the service to the customers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The higher is the education level, the better is the implementation of empowerment to release the human potential of the employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control legislation</td>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>The tougher is the control legislation, the more difficult is to implement a structure with less control like empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource availability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The lower is the expected human resource in the job market; the better is the consideration of the employee’s comfort and the susceptibility to implement empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market competition</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The higher is the competition level, the higher is the necessity to improve performance toward customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business cycle/Product cycle</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>The shorter is the cycle, the higher is the necessity to develop responsiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of expertise</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The higher is the level of expertise in the industry; the better is to empower people on the field to deal with issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational risk</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The Higher is the operational risk, the more is the organization risk averse and the less is the organization likely to decrease control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External factors have influence on the missions and strategy, leadership, organizational culture and individual performance (W. Warner Burke, 2011). Thus, in our project to implement self-managed teams, negative external factors can impede its implementation. In the case of P.G’s interview, the control legislation and the operational risk were so huge that they affect the transformational factors (missions and strategy, leadership, organizational culture and individual performance)
culture) and indirectly the policies and procedures of the bank. Every change, even focused, influences the different levels of the organization (W. Warner Burke, 2011) and if one of them is limited, the change may be impeded.

6.1.2. The Cultural context.

The culture of the organization can be a great facilitator or an obstacle to implement change. With a strong culture, the change must respect the pillars on which the organization is built. Otherwise, the resistance may be unbearable.

6.1.2.1. The theories X, Y, Z.

One aspect of the culture that influences the implementation of self-managed team is the theories X, Y, Z. If a value of the organization is to believe that workers are lazy and are trying to work fewer they can, according to the theory X, then the control is regarded as the best solution to supervise the employees. The trust is considered as not efficient. The implementation of self-managed team is impossible because against the organizational belief. However if the workers are considered as involved and motivated to their work, according to the theory Y, the trust can be rooted in the work environment and so the implementation of self-managed team. Finally when the organization considers the trust, the flexible hierarchy, the learning and decision sharing as a part of its culture, such as theory Z, implementing self-managed team his more natural. Therefore, theory Z is seen as what organization should aim for and they should develop its principles if they want to implement distributed leadership.
6.1.2.2. Other cultural factors.

Beyond the concept of the theory X,Y,Z, other cultural factors can ease or impede the implementation of the self-managed team. The next table relate to the couples of antagonist cultural traits and their influence on our research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impeding cultural Factors</th>
<th>Facilitating cultural factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>Uncertainty tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascription</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low trust</td>
<td>High trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularist</td>
<td>Universalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Group-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-oriented</td>
<td>Future-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private space oriented</td>
<td>Public space oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating a direct change in the culture of the organization is impossible. The culture is too deeply rooted in the nature of the organization to be change unilaterally. However, by acting
on specific components of the culture, you can operate a transition and make the culture evolve in order to fit the requirements of distributed leadership.

### 6.1.2. Implementing the change.

Previously, we highlighted the external factors and the organizational culture that are difficult and even impossible to influence by the organization. This time, we focus on the organizational internal mechanisms. In this field, we explain the different steps of the plan by considering the obstacles, the specificities from the emerging cultural profiles and the empowerment.

To describe the processes following the four cases, we follow the Burke’s three steps of change (2011).

#### 6.1.2.1. The pre launch.

During the pre launch, top management must constantly communicate with the employees and make the change official. During this period, members must be informed about the advantages that the self-managed teams provide to the organization and to the empowered members. Finally, it is necessary to elaborate feedback to keep a constant overview to the change.

But beyond the communication and issue, it is crucial to already train enrolled employees to empowerment. For that, it is necessary to implement training process to rise up the individual styles, but also to provide them essential values like authenticity in order to root their leadership skills in solid and personal basis. This idea is further developed in the section "developing good potential leader".

#### 6.1.2.2. The launch.

As we said previously, the implementation of self-managed team is focused on a specific part of the organization like department or division. Therefore, the change is evolutionary and focused on transactional factors. Changing the transformational factors with a revolutionary change like the organization’s culture is not necessary and above all very risky. Thus, our focus is on the structure, the management practice, the policies and procedures, work climate unit, task and individual skills, motivation, individual needs and values.

A) The empowerment.

Giovagnoli & Vandekerckhove
One of the pillars to implement self-managed team is the empowerment itself. The implementation of the empowerment should be based on the scale of six levels (Parker, Glenn M, 2010). This step-oriented implementation would enable to connect the implementation give the time to the empowered employees to be trained (see section developing good potential leader) and to get used to their new tasks:

In the step 1, the manager still decides. The teams are formed according to the profile of each team member and their diversity. If necessary, the teams can be changed in case of lack of chemistry, respect, trust and authenticity between the members of one team. Preparation like workshops between the team members could reinforce the unity to develop their own rules and training to rise up their skills to lead. The goal is to reinforce the cohesion and to develop a collective vision in the team. The empowerment climate is implemented with the top managers by officialising the change, to support it and being tolerant to mistakes that may occur.

In the step 2, the department/division manager still decides but already provides to its subordinate the information he/she gets, in order to make them close to this new data, necessary for decision making. The preparation can this time focus on dealing with this data.

In the step 3, the manager starts to provide a project for each team and they advise their manager about how to deal with it. The manager still takes the decision by its subordinates. In this step, the transparency must be completed. Alongside, the training is this time focused on empowerment based on two approaches:

- The individual approach with improved sense of meaning (affinity with the project), sense of competence, self-determination and sense of impact (capacity to influence the organization)
- The team approach with improved sense of potency (collective belief of a group), sense of meaningfulness and sense of autonomy.

In the step 4, the team finally decides and then informs the manager. In this step, the trust between the manager and the teams is strengthened. The measuring of personal performance is replaced by the measuring of team performance. Specific rewards are created to the teams in order to provide further motivation and to arouse performance.

In the step 5, the team is fully responsible with its project. They implement and control the process. However, some feedbacks are given to their manager. The autonomy is almost completed.
In the step 6, when the teams complete their project with success, they receive a new one, but this time, they are fully empowered without necessity to provide regular feedbacks. The self-managed team is completely implemented. The relation between the manager and the formed teams are based on control anymore but on trust. About the manager, he or she can become a department/division coordinator of the teams. The organizational chart must integrate the new department/division structure of self-managed teams in order to upload the formal power. The manager is not considered as a boss anymore but as a partner, the informal power is modified in the new department/division.

During the different steps, the manager provides constant support and momentum to the subordinates in order to make them confident to their new tasks. She/he leads by example and ensures the transparency of the information through communication, in order to keep the vision of the market, the direction in the mind of the empowered employees. From the beginning, the feedbacks enable to assess the profile of each member of the teams, in order to improve the accuracy of the “leadership toolbox”. This toolbox enables to provide further information about the right leader in a team to lead the project. Of course, a leader can naturally emerge among the members of a team. However, this “leadership toolbox” is helpful in case of indecisiveness. Finally, if the replacement of the control by the trust doesn’t seem enough to control the risk, it is still possible to employ audit in order to keep supervision through punctual control. Thus, there is a balance between empowerment and risk control. Even though, we provide a global process to implement self-managed team in department or division. Finally, in order to prevent the disaggregation of the team, it is important to plan the shift to keep the self managed team dynamic and performing by controlling the turnover in each team.

The schemes below sums up the implementation of the self-managed teams:
Figure 4: Steps of implementation of self-managed teams
Figure 5: Continuous Change through the 6 steps.

B) The resistance.

The implementation of self-managed team is likely to cause resistance from managers. Indeed, their power must be distributed to their subordinates and therefore, their visible status may be weakened. In this case, we are dealing with political resistance according to Hambrick and Cannella (1989). Moreover in a bureaucracy, the power is based on control and losing control on one’s subordinate can consider one’s position in the hierarchy downgraded.

Some solutions appear to face this issue. Implementing a unique dashboard to the manager and the subordinates of the department or division that bear the change, enable to create a feeling of unity and the performance of the empowered employees becomes an interest to the manager. Moreover, the flexible salary and rewards of the manager can be correlated to the new dashboard. Of course, communicating the necessity to make the change is an essential process, to convince the managers. Finally, employee-oriented organization can highlight this value to show that this change respects the organizational culture.

If the managers are united and form a group, they may work together to impede the change that threaten their status in the hierarchy. They may decide to leave the organization, to request a new CEO. Some solutions exist to deal with this issue like making “symbolic
funeral”, recomposing the group to scatter managers or making the managers involved to the decision making of the change process.

Functional stupidity is an ambiguous phenomenon because it enables to ease the change in organization but it also keeps the employees encased in their own task. Moreover, it often appears in bureaucratic structure with few delegation and many controls. Indeed, the employees are likely to be encased in their own task and not to be motivated to be empowered. Thus, in our case to implement self-managed teams, functional stupidity is an obstacle to deal with. The empowerment must be done on different steps in order to give the time to get used to become a leader. Moreover, training can be necessary to start the momentum to take the lead, explained further in the section developing good potential leader.

Implementing self-managed team in a department or division means that all the employees in this structure have to be empowered. But giving access to the lead is not possible for everybody. Some people don’t feel prepared to take the lead and prefer to stay in the field of expertise. Then, it is always possible to include in the self-managed team, employees that don’t want to be leaders. Thus, they are still in project but their roll is more to bring internal support. They don't emerge as leader of the team, but they keep their expertise position and are empowered for decision making or solving problems for instance.

The schemes below sums up the resistance that may appear during the implementation of the self-managed teams:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>Solution(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager resistance (individual level) with the loss of power and visible status.</td>
<td>Creation of a unique dashboard that considers the performance of the department/division. New flexible salary and reward system is implemented, correlated to the new dashboard. Communication about the necessity to implement the change to the organization’s performance. Employee-oriented organization can use its culture to legitimate the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers resistance (group level)</td>
<td>Recomposing the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision to leave the company.</td>
<td>“Symbolic funeral”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Request of a new CEO</td>
<td>To involve the managers to the change process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional stupidity:</th>
<th>To follow the 6 steps of empowerment implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of momentum from the employees.</td>
<td>Preparation (Training, workshop) to trigger the momentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unwilling employees to take the lead.                  | Included in the self-managed team but as an expert and internal support. |

6.1.2.3. The post-launch.

After the change completed, the new structure must be reinforced. The formal power can be upgraded by replacing the concept of position in the hierarchy by the concept of "commitments".

If the implementation of the self-managed team is a success, the success and facts must be highlighted to confirm this new management. Beyond, the new goal would be to spread this new structure to the others division and department of the organization. In the long term perspective, the entire organization may be affected with a change on transformational factors with a culture and mission more employee-oriented and a flattening of the organizational structure. It is based on a networking organization in which self-managed groups are interdependent with all small teams connected to a bigger unit. The process developed above is illustrated by the following figure.
6.2. Developing good potential leaders.

This section will focus on a more individual perspective, illustrating the human requirements of distributed leadership. The emergence of leaders in distributed leadership will be presented, with solution in order to develop the desire for individuals to take on leadership responsibilities in team settings. The next step we will present in this model is the requirements expected from individuals in distributed leadership as well as the values and abilities for them to develop. Finally, we will illustrate the main benefits of such distributed leadership on a human perspective and the positive outcome it creates for the organization.

6.2.1. The emergence of leaders.

Distributed Leadership is providing settings in which every actor within the organization can take on a leadership position in a team at some point and for some time. Thus, every actor is a potential leader. We will formalize the conditions in which leaders should emerge and also how to face the reticence of individuals to embrace such responsibilities. Moreover, above this possibility to take on a leadership position, our model of distributed leadership is also
developing empowerment in the team. Therefore, even though you don't actually take a leadership position, empowerment in the structure and the team is providing the possibility to be autonomous, take decisions and so on.

The example of functional stupidity presented before is illustrated how both the organization and the individuals can satisfy of a situation in which they are passive and not using their reflective capabilities. In this situation, individuals do not want to take on leadership responsibilities even if they have abilities for it. It is obviously incompatible with the practice of distributed leadership based on involvement and empowerment. They are a few key points to solve this issue.

First, it is important to develop implication and motivation. This can be achieved by connecting individuals to the purpose of their organization. Taking ownership of their task and of the vision of their organization will lead to self-motivation and implication from their part. It is a reciprocal process, because by feeling involved you take ownership and vice versa. It is important to develop the awareness that individuals a part of a bigger plan than just their specific task, and that they can identify the outcome of their actions. They should not consider themselves as professionals for a specific task but as a valuable part of the organization enabling it to fulfill its mission. This implication and involvement is reached through empowerment, by giving power to solve problem, take decisions autonomously or by deleting excessive control. In these conditions, they will be likely and even enthusiastic to take on leadership responsibilities because they will engage in the purpose of their organization by taking ownership of it.

Secondly, it is important to develop a nourishing environment in order to facilitate the desire for people to take on responsibilities. Our case study provided a great overview of what should be this nourishing environment enabling people to take a lead. There are several requirements that were highlighted such as a need for respect and trust. Respect is important to deal with the emotional state of individuals and avoid phenomena of anxiety for instance, that unable people to lead. Trust is capital in this process of emergence of leaders. They have to be given the right to try on new things and to make mistakes. If they are not provided with such conditions, refer in Gore as "Advanced Trust", people will be reluctant to take on responsibilities because they will fear the consequences that comes with it. This environment of trust is also pushing people to develop their ability to think critically because they are empowered.
In a practical matter, coaching and training are necessary in this kind of setting in which everyone is a potential leader. The training has various shapes like workshop, seminar, coaching or audit and is planned in several years. It must be developed in several fields which are quality, awareness, shared vision of the company, specific job training, transition skills, quality awareness, leadership and team development. Leadership has very specific requirements regarding communication and so on, which can be taught through training programs. For instance, the SPF is providing mandatory one-year "road" training for every team responsible. This kind of coaching can for instance be oriented toward the crucibles or individuals in order to capture and develop their will to lead. These programs are enabling individuals to develop leadership skills and also to gain confidence and legitimacy. The figure below summarizes how to enhance the desire for individuals to take the lead.

Figure 7: Developing the will to lead
However, our interviews illustrated the fact that taking a leadership position should not be an absolute necessity. If people are reluctant because they just don't have the abilities for it, they can remain and blossom in a position of expert in which they will be empowered. That is also a reason why leading and empowering are a good combination, it enable people unwilling to take leadership position to be empowered and still gain some power and autonomy, and thus still take ownership of the company's purpose.

The concept of "natural leadership" emerged during our interview. In this natural leadership, leaders emerged because they gain followership because of their skills or attitudes. This is the way to emerge in a context of distributed leadership, to be recognized and accepted by your peers as the one to lead in the best way. In the team and project settings, this is the reason why the lead can shift regarding the nature of the project and task at hand. The natural leadership is attached to the skills and the context's requirements. A leader can emerge naturally because of his knowledge about the project, or because of his leading style suiting a particular context. If those elements are changing, then the leader will probably change to another individual with a profile suiting best the new settings.

6.2.2. Expectations from individuals in Distributed Leadership.

The essential requirement in Distributed Leadership might be to develop one's own leadership style. One unique leader cannot possess all the skills to lead any team or project without regards for the specificities and the context. Thus, as team project expects different characteristics from leaders, those leaders should develop their own leader style to difference themselves from own another and enrich the toolbox with different assets. We developed earlier what could be the different leadership styles and how can they fit specific situations. Coaching and training are good tools to identify and develop your own leadership style. It is also important to empower them and let them try to take the lead in order for them to develop their leadership style. Besides leadership style, other particular characteristics are attached to individuals regarding their culture or gender, and it is important to be aware of them and to act regarding your own set of characteristics. This "mix" of characteristic is what is making someone a natural leader at some point, more effective than the others because of his very specific attributes matching a leadership demand. This can be done if individuals are developing self-awareness and self-expression. That is why authenticity is crucial in this process. If the organization is promoting and valuing diversity like it should in distributed leadership, it requires leaders and followers to be authentic to their true self. As presented
before, authenticity is a reciprocal process between leaders and followers, and should start at the top with authentic leadership leading to authentic followership. Authenticity and self-awareness is something less complicated to develop through training and coaching because it is very personal. A good way to develop those aspects in individuals is to give them freedom to express themselves by fostering an environment in which they have no constraints regarding their attitudes. The figure below summarizes those points.

**Figure 8: Expressing one's leadership**

Distributed leadership is very transactional, and requires good processes of knowledge management in order to share effectively information. To ease the empowerment, the experience and knowledge from managers can be shared to the empowered employees through the SECI Model. Thus, the cycle is turning a private knowledge into a public knowledge, and then this public knowledge is assimilated by the employees and is becoming their own personal knowledge. This cycle enables to share knowledge within the organization. Moreover, knowledge can have various forms, as illustrated by Brackler (1995), which is embrained, encoded, encultured and embedded, and all these different kind of knowledge should be shared. Distributed leadership is often practiced in decentralized structure in which communication canals are less formalized. Thus, knowledge can be transmitted in a more informal way. Empowerment is requiring to share knowledge in some extent with the employees. In order for them to make decision for instance, they have to be aware of the stakes and implication of such a decision. If the knowledge is shared by the organization, the next step is for this knowledge to be assimilated by actors. Knowledge has to be perceptor
and processed according to one's specific learning style. Those differences to deal with knowledge are also enriching the toolbox by bringing more diversity. It is thus important to develop transparency of information as much as possible.

Regarding its transactional nature, distributed leadership expects positive attitudes from individuals, often illustrated in our interviews. As said before, trust and respect are absolute requirements fostering chemistry enabling people to act collectively with efficiency. The emerging leader in the team has to act as a multiplier (Wiseman & McKeown, 2010) to develop a healthy ground for empowerment. Acting as a multiplier is enabling empowerment by fostering a positive climate and a nourishing environment with followers. It requires sharing the decisions, active listening, sharing the ownership by sharing benefits of good results for instance. Moreover, it is capital to be able to make the best use out of the empowered followers' abilities. Furthermore, good communication skills are expected from people working in a structure distributing the lead. Firstly, this communication should be effective and accurate, meaning that messages should be appropriately conveyed. Secondly, communication should be authentic, for instance regarding the fact that transparency cannot be totally operated. Finally, communication should be respectful and done in a sensitive way in order to foster a healthy climate and not to alter chemistry. Coaching and training are necessary to develop these abilities.

6.2.3. Benefits from Distributed Leadership and Empowerment.

On an individual level, implementing distributed leadership is generating significant benefits, as summarized in the diagram below.
Figure 9: Benefits of Distributed Leadership

First of all, Distributed Leadership is developing an organization structure suiting the demands of the workforce. As illustrated before, the Generation Y is taking over the organizations and its specific characteristics are calling for an adaptation from the organization. By developing such kind of distributive leadership, organizations can adapt and provide an environment suiting the expectations of this generation. It is generating better wellness, better performance and also solving problems regarding staff selection. Indeed, it represents a great leverage in negotiation because the Y'ers value this kind of structure in which they are involved. Furthermore, this wellness is reducing problems of turnover and absenteeism.

Second of all, involvement and empowerment are encouraging the personal development of the empowered individuals. By having their reflective capacities stimulated, they are developing their critical thinking, their ability to solve problem or their creative thinking. The advanced trust provided by the organization enabling them to try on new things is also source of creative thinking and personal development. This is obviously creating benefits for the organization as well, because with their commitment individuals are creating value. Creativity is bringing innovation and developing critical thinking can enhance problem identification.
and resolution. Furthermore, operating the shift from control to trust can save a lot of money to the organization because control is expensive.

Third of all, Distributed leadership as we presented is valuing the diversity of the organization by encouraging self-expression and authenticity. This diversity of profiles are feeding the toolbox providing the organization an extensive set of skills, leadership styles and so on to deal with the issues it can face. Moreover, it is optimizing the use of the workforce, by targeting efficiently its skills.

In our model, distributed leadership is operated through small teams. The structure is divided and is functioning with smaller units. Operating with such self-managed teams is also creating gains for the organization. Creativity is also a product of these small teams, because this micro-environment is much more dynamic. These small teams are also promoting self-development because of their focus on specific tasks, and thus can improve in term of skills faster. Finally, those teams are faster and more responsive thanks to their size.

6.3. The Toolbox: Assessing the profile of the potential leader.

As we said previously, one of the principal goals of our model is to develop a way to optimize the use of the workforce through a toolbox. The toolbox, as we referred before in this thesis, is an advanced profiling tool composed of many variables. This toolbox is not conceived to appoint a leader and replace the emergence of a natural leader. It is rather a complement tool to assist this process of emergence. For instance, it can be used to validate the match between a leadership profile and the expected requirements of the project.

We will present what are the interests of developing such a toolbox as well as its components.

6.3.1. The "raison d'être" of the toolbox.

The toolbox is an individual oriented tool aiming at optimizing the potential of those individuals by targeting their skills or attributes. After this targeting, it is possible to match a leader with a suitable project.

First of all, this toolbox is enabling the organization to identify the diversity of the organization. This diversity is composed of a multitude of facets that we will develop in the next section, such as gender characteristics, leadership style or culture specificities. Identifying this mix is giving the organization an overview of the workforce potential in order
to make a good use out of it. This identification can then enable to optimize the use of the individual's potential by matching their skills with the requirements of a project to lead. This matching can be done regarding the competencies, for instance by appointing a judicial expert to lead a team project focused on a juridical issue. This matching can also concern a context related situation. If there is a need to lead a team for a crisis situation, the demand of leadership will be specific, calling for instance for a commanding/coercive leader. The toolbox can also identify and fix a situation in which a leader would not be optimal because he or she would not possess the abilities for his task.

Furthermore, this tool will facilitate the emergence of a leader within the team. By providing access to this tool, this profiling will improve the self-awareness and every individual will have a better insight of his or her strengths. The result would be an easier process for people to take on a leadership position in a team thanks to this increased self-awareness.

Another asset of this toolbox is to legitimize the emerging leader by providing, if needed, a validation of his position. This profiling tool can be used as a guarantee that the leadership positions are optimized.

Finally, this toolbox can be used further than on assessing the leader's selection for a team. On the team level, it can also be used by the leader to proceed to the selection of the team members regarding specific expectations. He or she can then compose a team precisely by picking into the toolbox the individuals suiting his needs.
6.3.2. The components of the toolbox

The “leadership toolbox” is built according to 8 fields:

- The leadership style: The traits of the leader can be assessed according to Cameron's (2008) or Goleman’s (1998) model.

- The Conflict solving profile: Conflicts in negotiations and in the team can appear. According to the kind of issue to solve out, the profile of the counterpart in a negotiation, there is a right way to process. Thus, it is possible to assess the conflict solving profile of the team members according to the resolving conflict model of Gladwin and Walter (1979).

- Learning style preference: The personality and the trend to deal with issues can be assessed with the Kolb’s learning style model (1976). According to the specificities of the project, the focus can be on making decision or rather to develop a process. Thus, by profiling the team members about their preferences and methods to deal with issues, it makes the leadership toolbox further.

- Gender leadership profile: In this field, the profile is assessed according to the brain type of the team member, according to the work of Gurian with Annis (2008).
Therefore, a team member with a female brain is likely to lead social project. At the opposite, a male brain is more likely to be effective with specific task project.

- **Cultural profile**: In international organizations, the human potential is further diversified because of the various cultural horizons of the employees. Therefore by using the cultural dimensions model of Schneide, Barsoux and Stahl (2014), a profile culture-oriented is assessed and provide further information about the sense making process and the favorite approach to deal with the issues to solve out.

- **Expertise profile**: More common, the assessment of the background of the team members enables to assess the individual as a follower. Indeed, the leader is efficient only if her/his followers have expertise on specific fields. For instance, a team leader who needs to implement a business plan needs followers with expertise in marketing, finance and legislation.

- **Team relationship**: The focus is on the dynamism of the team. The goal is to assess the level of “chemistry” in a team to value its cohesion and shared vision. The assessment is based on the number and quality of disagreements in the team, the individual expectations and the team responsiveness. The valuation is operated through periodic survey.

**Personal attributes**: Personal attributes linked to the core personality can be measured with profiling, identifying tendencies and preferences of individuals regarding specific categories. The Garuda Profile is a good example of a profiling tool targeting personal attributes.
This section formalized our model answering our research question. This model was presenting key aspects emerging from our data collection and analysis. This model is composed of three stages. First of all, it develops a guideline regarding the implementation of Distributed Leadership on an organizational level. The environmental and cultural issues to deal with are presented as well as solutions. The process of change is developed with 3 steps: pre-launch, launch and post-launch, specifying implementation of empowerment and how to deal with change resistance. Secondly, we developed the individual perspective summing up findings about the emergence of leader, the expectations of individuals as well as presenting the benefits of such distributed leadership. The last part of our model was the formalization of our concept of toolbox by justifying its existence and developing its components. Those three steps combined can provide an overall view of all the requirements and operation of distributed leadership with insights about how to implement it. The diagrams and schemes provided are illustrating the relations between the various components. This model can be

**Figure 11: Components of the Leadership Toolbox**
seen as an operational model of distributed leadership, with recommendations that then need to be applied and adapted to the specificities of the structure operating these changes.
Conclusion

By writing about Distributed Leadership, we wrote about what could be for us the possible evolution of leadership. We had our mind and eyes turned to the future. As future leaders, we were less concern about what is leadership now than what will be leadership in a few years when we will be practicing it. We have the belief that the actual top-down nature of leadership will not be sustainable in a middle-term. Thus, we started to look for alternative ways of leading individuals. To start our quest, we looked upon the limits of the actual nature of leadership in order to come up with suitable solutions and alternatives. Our view was that the top-down leadership as it is mainly practiced nowadays in organizations was disregarding the changes of both its external and internal environments. The external environment is suffering a growing complexification and competition as well as a continuous globalization. These changes are expecting a lot more from leaders and are calling for a more collective effort to deal with these extended demands on leadership. The internal environment of organizations is also significantly shifting. The main factor is the changes in individuals, with a new generation taking over with very different attitudes and expectations. Therefore, demands on leadership are evolving and leadership has to adapt to the evolutions of its environment.

Distributed Leadership appears to us as a viable and efficient alternative to solve these issues. Distributing the lead as we presented in this thesis is can be an accurate way to adapt to the changes of the external and internal environment. It can be a solution to the growing complexity of the external environment and can also fit the new expectations of the internal workforce. From these observations, we decided to go further and to develop a process of implementation of such kind of distributed leadership. We wanted to be part not only of the problem but also of the solution, which is why we focused on implementation. As our understanding grew, we developed our perception of distributed leadership and realized that it was connected to the notion of empowerment. We incorporate these reflections into our model.

During our research, we observed that distributed leadership was efficient when operating through self-managed teams. The study of many successful organizations implementing principles of distributed leadership such as Chronoflex, Gore, Poult or the SPF were operating through self-managed teams. We incorporate this observation in our model. In this model, those teams are operating with some sort of roving leadership (De Pree, 1987) in which the lead is shifting regarding the task at hand. In these teams, the leader is emerges because his
attributes are matching the requirements of the task. Within these teams, in which the lead is shifting, the emerged leader is empowering the whole team by sharing his power and providing trust and autonomy. These teams are referred as self-managed because the emerged leader is leading it as a division of the global structure. They are empowered because every individual within these teams are involved in decision making, problem solving and so forth and take ownership of the purpose of their work. These teams are source of many benefits for the organization. We consider the development of self-managed team as a balanced solution to deal with our research question, and we consider that its implementation in a department or division is limiting the risk of resistance and the conflict with the organization culture. The various advantages that this structure brings would enable to spread it in other section of the organization and beyond, its competitors, by following an incremental process. Moreover, the current post-modernism era tends to foster this structure and we notice that because of the globalization and the high competition, more and more organizations tend to adopt the empowerment spirit in order to further release the human potential that they hold.

At the beginning of our thesis, our goal was to implement the distributed leadership by adjusting the organization structure and the individual’s behavior. The reasons were multiple and based on the organization’s performance and the common welfare of the employees. After gathering data from researches and interviews, the shape of the implementation appeared. From our individual interest of the empowerment to the final result, we considered that our work can provide support to the organization that desire to implement a concept that already showed great results and seem to be the trend to the next few years. The first organizations which are already operating with these settings can take a decisive advantage by being precursors.

Our model represents a formalization summing up of our findings, and can be used as a guideline to implement distributed leadership. It is important to note that his model has to be used with concerns regarding the specificities of the organization we specified, such as its external environment. The implementation is dependent on those factors and there is no universal process. That is why we refer to our model as a guideline, because it can be used with flexibility. All along our research, we came to realize that the constraints and prerequisites of the implementation of distributed leadership are significantly outweighed by the benefits it begets. Those benefits are in a first level for individuals and are then creating a positive outcome for their organization.
Limitation

As our research is qualitative, there is no quantification regarding for instance the cost of implementation of distributed leadership or its benefits. Therefore, it can be difficult to have a precise evaluation of the cost and outcome of the model. We presented the positive outcome of distributed leadership through case studies on a long time trend, but without precise quantification.

Furthermore, it is important to be aware that this model was conceived to fit a big range of organizations; it is thus a generalist model that needs to be adapted. The principles we formulated, the process of change and so on are to be seen as a guideline to be used in an adapted way regarding specific contextual aspects.

Finally, our model was not tested on a big or small scale; therefore its efficiency cannot be totally assured.

Further Researches

From our thesis, further researches can be conducted on fields such as the psychological approach in order to understand the interaction between the leader and the followers, or the facilitation process to make the bureaucracy-formatted generation X more favorable with empowerment.

Furthermore, case studies on a bigger scale can be conducted in order to have a bigger picture of the different ways of operating according to principles of distributed leadership. A test of the model in various organizations can also be implemented in order to verify the model, and if needed, to adapt it.

Finally, it would be interesting to look upon the way to spread the self-managed team in a department to the entire organization.
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