

Organizational Leadership Roles as a Source of Self-esteem:
A Terror Management Theory

by

THOMAS ROBERT PAUL MORIN

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

Royal Roads University
Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

Supervisor: GUY NASMYTH, PhD



THOMAS MORIN, 2015

COMMITTEE APPROVAL

The members of Thomas Morin's Thesis Committee certify that they have read the thesis titled *Organizational Leadership Roles as a Source of Self-esteem: A Terror Management Theory* and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES:

GUY NASMYTH, PHD [signature on file]

SIOMONN PULLA, PHD [signature on file]

Final approval and acceptance of this thesis is contingent upon submission of the final copy of the thesis to Royal Roads University. The thesis supervisor confirms to have read this thesis and recommends that it be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirements:

GUY NASMYTH, PHD [signature on file]

Creative Commons Statement



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 Canada License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/ca/>.

Some material in this work is not being made available under the terms of this licence:

- Third-Party material that is being used under fair dealing or with permission.
- Any photographs where individuals are easily identifiable.

Abstract

This thesis presents research undertaken in order to construct a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem within the context of terror management theory (TMT). It begins with a review of TMT literature, complementary theories, and literature discussing the correlations between suicide and job loss, and ill health and job loss. This is followed by a description of philosophical underpinnings and methodology. Intensive interviewing and grounded theory methodology was employed. Leaders from healthcare, energy and not-for-profit organizations were asked to discuss the leadership expectations of their organization and how they experienced their roles. Theory construction proceeded on a tripartite basis, in that it was constructed from collected data, and informed by TMT literature and the researcher's philosophical underpinnings. Recommendations for the incorporation of attention to self-esteem into leader performance management, leadership development, and one's personal leadership practice, as well as recommendations for future research, are provided.

Table of Contents

Creative Commons Statement	3
Abstract	4
Chapter 1: Introduction	10
Research Question.....	10
Rationale for Research.....	10
Application.	11
Scholarly perspective.....	11
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	13
Ernest Becker and the Emergence of Terror Management Theory.....	14
Death.....	17
A Two-component Theory of Self-esteem as Anxiety-buffer	19
The origin of the human need for self-esteem.	21
Culture and its role as anxiety-buffer.	22
Defining culture and immortality.	24
Empirical Evidence for TMT	27
Complementary Theories	31
Organizational-based self-esteem.....	31
Social identity theory.....	33
Microcultures	33
TMT Research on Leadership and Organizational Behaviour	34
Suicide, Ill Health and Job Loss.....	36
Chapter 3: Research Design.....	38
Theoretical Framework	38
Philosophical Underpinnings	39
Ontological perspective.	39
Epistemological perspective.	40
Axiology.	42
Methodology	43
Grounded theory.	44
Participant selection.....	46
Interviews.	47
Interview questions.....	49
Content analysis.....	50

Coding	53
Construction of grounded theory.....	59
Sources of error and threats to validity.....	63
Ethics	68
Chapter 4: Results.....	71
All Participants.....	71
Leadership expectations.	71
Enjoyable leadership tasks and behaviours.	72
Unenjoyable leadership tasks and behaviours.	74
Regular leadership tasks and behaviours.....	74
Benefits realized from leadership success.....	75
Consequences resulting from unsuccessful leadership behaviours.	76
Healthcare Participants	78
Leadership role attributes.	78
Benefits of success and consequences of failure.	79
Energy Industry Participants.....	80
Leadership role attributes.	80
Benefits of success and consequences of failure.	80
Not-for-profit Participants	81
Leadership role attributes.	81
Benefits of success and consequences of failure.	82
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	84
Constructing Theory Grounded in the Interview Content	84
A theory of self-esteem.....	84
A theory of organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture.....	84
A theory of valued membership.	87
Tripartite Construction of a Theory of Self-esteem.....	90
Application.....	91
Performance management.	91
Leadership development and personal leadership practice.	94
Recommendations for Future Research.....	97
Conclusion	100
References.....	101
Appendix A: Tabulated Data.....	110
Appendix B: Coding Manual.....	118

Organizational Leadership Attributes (OLA)	118
Demonstrate transparency (OLA001).	118
Demonstrate accountability (OLA002).	119
Demonstrate collaboration (OLA003).	120
Be ethical, equitable or of good character (OLA004).	120
Demonstrate results-orientation (OLA007).	121
Maintain ideological discipline (OLA008).	122
Demonstrate interpersonal and communication skills (OLA012).	123
Build capacity in others (OLA015).	124
Be independent (OLA016).	125
Be strategic (OLA018).	126
Derive personal satisfaction / alignment (OLA024).	127
In-discipline competency (OLA025).	128
Benefits of Successful Leadership (BSL)	129
Advancement (BSL002).	129
Influence (BSL003).	130
Participate externally (BSL006).	131
Professional development (BSL010).	132
Recognition (BSL013).	133
Autonomy (BSL015).	134
Tolerance for mistakes (BSL016).	135
Financial compensation (BSL019).	136
Employment continuance (BSL020).	136
Positive affect (BSL021).	137
Valued inclusion (BSL022).	138
Contribute to society (BSL025).	139
Consequences of Unsuccessful Leadership (CUL)	140
Increased workload (CUL001).	140
Motivation to improve (CUL004).	141
Negative affect (CUL006).	142
Negative impact on compensation (CUL009).	142
Loss of career opportunity (CUL010).	143
Negative impact on performance rating (CUL011).	144
Termination of employment (CUL012).	145
Reduced trust (CUL015).	146
Enjoyable Leadership Tasks (ELT)	147
Contribute in technical discipline or on project (ELT001).	147

Advance careers of others (ELT002).....	147
Build capacity in others (ELT003).....	148
Being strategic (ELT004).....	149
Collaborating (ELT005).....	150
Facilitating implementation (ELT006).....	151
Interaction / inclusion with other leaders (ELT009).....	152
Management or administration (ELT011).....	153
Engage or promote externally (ELT012).....	154
Unenjoyable Leadership Tasks (ULT).....	155
Dealing with ambiguity (ULT001).....	155
Being politically savvy (ULT002).....	155
Administration or management (ULT005).....	156
Managing problem performance (ULT006).....	157
Providing excessive direction (ULT008).....	158
Managing external conflict (ULT009).....	159
Managing internal conflict (ULT010).....	160
Regular Leadership Tasks (RLT).....	161
Attending meetings (RLT001).....	161
Facilitating implementation (RLT006).....	162
Being strategic (RLT007).....	163
Contribute in technical discipline or on project (RLT008).....	163
Helping others be successful (RLT009).....	164
Engage or promote externally (RLT012).....	165
Appendix C: Interview Transcripts	167
Participant 001; Not-for-profit	167
Participant 003; Not-for-profit	176
Participant 005; Not-for-profit	181
Participant 008; Energy.....	189
Participant 009; Energy.....	196
Participant 010; Energy.....	204
Participant 011; Healthcare	210
Participant 012; Healthcare	222
Participant 014; Healthcare	228
Participant 015; Healthcare	233

List of figures

Table 1: Development of thematic codes.....51

Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Question

This research describes organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture (McCurdy, 2006, p. 3) that provides for valued membership (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986, p. 198). Research in terror management theory (TMT) has shown that valued membership in a culture of meaning provides a buffer against existential terror and is a source of self-esteem (Greenberg et al., 1986, pp. 196-205). Thus, my research question is: Are organizational leadership roles a source of self-esteem for the leader within the context of terror management theory? To answer this question, this study describes the leadership attributes and abilities valued by a leader's organization, and how a leader feels when she both displays and fails to display these attributes and abilities. Once this is understood, a theory of organizational leadership roles as a cultural system that provides for valued membership is constructed. Within the context of TMT, such a system would be a source of self-esteem.

Rationale for Research

This study creates new knowledge specific to organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem and, potentially, adds to existing knowledge of TMT. In this regard, the problem that this study addresses is a lack of knowledge on this subject, rather than address a specific, practical problem in a manner typical of applied research. However, a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem is significant from both an applied and scholarly perspective.

Application.

With respect to the practical application of the knowledge created in this study, an understanding of how organizational leadership roles contribute to a leader's self-esteem may be integrated into performance management practice, leadership development program content and program delivery, and into a leader's personal leadership practice. Addressing practical problems, such as how to keep leaders engaged in their roles while their performance is being managed and helping leaders understand their psychological relationship to their role may be facilitated by understanding how their role may be a source of self-esteem. If such a fundamental understanding of how leaders experience their organizational leadership roles is integrated into these practices, then it is conceivable that the work satisfaction of millions of people could be improved. Sharf (2010) discussed how dissatisfaction with the nearly half of our lives spent working can impact satisfaction with our entire existence: "Being satisfied with one's career is one of the most important aspects of an individual's personal happiness" (p. 1). Potential policy implications would be organization-specific and likely relate to performance management and leadership development practices.

Scholarly perspective.

From a scholarly perspective, the primary significance of this research is that it describes a previously unarticulated subject and provides a seed for subsequent inquiry. This study provides a description, creates an understanding, and provides recommendations for the application of a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem within the context of TMT. This is not currently represented in the literature, even though the construct of

self-esteem is represented in nearly every personality theory; it may be called self-regard or otherwise (see Feist & Feist, 2009).

Psychology researchers may apply the findings in this study to their own investigations into self-esteem and job satisfaction. Sociology, anthropology and other social science researchers may include these findings in their studies of the world of work. Lastly, TMT researchers may test the mortality salience and anxiety-buffer hypotheses (Harmon-Jones et al., 1997, pp. 24-25) on the leadership behaviour of people in organizational leadership roles. Such experiments would provide a mechanism for the falsification necessary to more fully establish a theory of organizational leadership roles as a culture that provides for valued membership and, thus, serve to associate the theory with established, quantitative TMT research (Greenberg, Koole, & Pyszczynski, 2004).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The data collected in this study describes the leadership attributes and abilities that are expected of twelve leaders across several organizations, what leadership tasks they find enjoyable and unenjoyable, what tasks they tend to do most often, and how they experience their roles when they are perceived as successful or unsuccessful. However, without the context provided by the literature, readers may be drawn toward data analysis; for example, what expectations are common across industry sectors, what can we learn from the experience of leaders in not-for-profit organizations that can inform employee engagement strategies in the energy sector, what might support the expectation of transparency being related to the expectation to maintain ideological discipline in both healthcare and not-for-profit? Such analysis is not the intent of this study. The intent is to determine if the discovery or construction of a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem for the participants is achievable with respect to the researcher's theoretical framework and the employed methodology.

The work of Ernest Becker (1997) and the work of subsequent terror management theorists (see Greenberg et al., 1986) have provided the theoretical foundation for this study. Additionally, literature regarding social identity theory (see Castano, Yzerbyt, & Paladino, 2004; Castano, Yzerbyt, Paladino, & Sacchi, 2002) and organizational-based self-esteem (see Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989) support the argument that organizational leadership roles can be a source of self-esteem. Lastly, studies regarding the correlation between suicide and job loss (see Classen & Dunn, 2012) and ill health and job loss

(see Catalano, 1991; Eliason & Storrie, 2009) have been considered in order to illustrate how the consequences of threats to participation in organizational roles—threats to this source of self-esteem—can manifest.

Ernest Becker and the Emergence of Terror Management Theory

Becker's (1997) ideas are not equivalent to a bucket of cold water in your face; they are acid. His ideas burn away any illusions, helpful or otherwise, regarding the nature of human existence. Although we are capable of doing many admirable things—great works of art, scientific discovery, and acts of deep compassion—and are also capable of perpetuating so much evil in the world, Becker showed us that it is our relationship with our creaturely nature that is at the core of all human striving. He described us as what we are: teeth at one end snapping and biting at all creation, then chewing and grinding the contents of the orifice into pulp before we digest its essence, and finally, from the other end, extrude the remnants in heaps of fuming, toxic waste (p. 282). We do know, for sure, that humans are a biological hazard. Like all animals, our feces and decaying corpses carry disease. The most recent outbreak of the Ebola virus (see Gatherer, 2014) should serve as a reminder of what we are. To believe that we are no more than skin-bags filled with bone, tissue, blood, urine and feces, to believe that the only control most of us have over the duration of our existence is to enact its termination, to believe that any literal or symbolic immortality (Greenberg et al., 1995, pp. 418-419) is a fantastic ruse perpetuated by a few to control the many, is far more than our spacious brains can handle. Becker (1997), however, showed us how we exist within this existence.

Becker (1997) argued that “The prison of one’s character is painstakingly built to deny

one thing and one thing alone: one's creatureliness" (p. 87); this includes the denial of our creaturely death. In order to transcend this existence, we live on "borrowed powers" (p. 89) obtained by propping ourselves up with the people, institutions and the panoply of cultural hero systems available in society (pp. 89-90). In this study, I show that organizational leadership roles may be considered as such a system.

On March 6, 1974, two months before receiving the Pulitzer Prize for his book, *The Denial of Death*, Ernest Becker, a cultural anthropologist by formal education and a quintessential interdisciplinarian in practice, died of cancer (Martin, 2012, p. 131). He was 49 years old. Sam Keen, a writer for *Psychology Today* at the time, visited Becker as he lay dying in a Burnaby, British Columbia hospital (Keen, 1997, p. xi). In his Forward to *The Denial of Death* (1997), and after Becker had said, "You are catching me in extremis. This is a test of everything I've written about death," (p. xi), Keen wrote, "It is a privilege to have witnessed such a man in the heroic agony of his dying" (p. xi).

Keen (1997) provided a brief summary of Becker's ideas found in *The Denial of Death*; however, two of his comments strike directly at the substance of this study. Firstly, Keen stated that Becker helped us see that corporations "may be driven by unconscious motives that have little to do with their stated goals" (p. xii). Corporations, like all organizations, are composed of individual actors or agents (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, p. 4). Therefore, when extending Keen's (1997) proposition, one can propose that individual actors may be driven by unconscious motives that have little to do with their—the actors'—stated goals. This study describes organizational leadership roles as providing a source of self-esteem and as a cultural anxiety-

buffer—a buffer against the terror of absolute annihilation. Applying Keen’s observation helps us understand how some leaders may execute their role in accord with motives other than their stated leadership or organizational goals: how they are motivated to maintain their faith in their organizational role as cultural anxiety-buffer by bolstering their self-esteem through the performance of the role. Secondly, Keen (1997) wrote “that the bitter medicine he [Becker] prescribes—contemplation of the horror of our inevitable death—is, paradoxically, the tincture that adds sweetness to mortality” (p. xii). Thus, I propose that understanding how leaders may derive self-esteem from their role serves to enrich the theory and practice of performance management, leadership development and, of course, one’s own leadership practice.

Lastly, as Keen (1997) noted, Becker’s greatest contribution to humanity was that he articulated a science of evil (p. viii). Becker (1997) proposed that since our basic need is to control our anxiety regarding our inevitable annihilation, we turn to the hero systems available in society to achieve an ersatz immortality (pp. xii-xiii). Becker helped us understand that all human conflict can be characterized as a battle between immortality projects: my religion against your religion, my historical right against yours, my interpretation of data against yours, my campaign for justice against yours, my west against your east, my leadership behaviour against yours. Every culture provides its members with such symbolic systems (p. xiii). However, “Our heroic projects that are aimed at destroying evil have the paradoxical effect of bringing more evil into the world” (p. xiii). Human agency exercised for good is often the cause of the worst (p. xiii).

We can surely point to some present battle of immortality projects and characterize it as

evil. However, the necessary battle of immortality projects, “is neither inherently bad nor inherently good; it depends on the values of the individual’s worldview and the paths to self-esteem it prescribes” (Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2004, p. 27). Characterizing the sources of human suffering as battles between immortality projects should not serve as a path toward apathetic acceptance, but as one toward understanding. “Only by recognizing the terror-assuaging function of cultural illusions can we understand why peaceful coexistence is difficult for those who do not share the same worldviews” (Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 1991, p. 132).

Becker, no doubt, was a great student of human striving (Martin, 2012, p. 132). Unfortunately, his ideas never achieved their current status while he was alive, and are still largely ignored by the majority of psychologists (p. 131). He showed us, graphic as it is, our very creatureliness and shamed us “with the knowledge of how easily we will shed blood to purchase the assurance of our own righteousness” (Keen, 1997, p. xiv). He was pragmatic (Martin, 2012, pp. 131-132) and often found himself in conflict with his academic employers (“Ernest Becker,” n.d.). However, with the advent of terror management theory (TMT) a decade after his death, Becker’s work has found a new audience. Now, after nearly thirty years of TMT research, we see that Becker may have laid the foundation for a “basic paradigm or central organizing principal” of human behaviour (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 94).

Death

Symbolic interactionism (Franzoi, 2007, pp. 961-963; also see Kanter, 1969) supports the assertion that, while alive, most humans do not experience death directly. Although this

statement might appear somewhat ridiculous, even humorous, my point is that our understanding of, and behaviour toward, death and dying are mediated by social constructions of death; we interact with the symbols of death. “Symbols in their various forms are the basis for social life because they create a shared meaning” (Franzoi, 2007, p. 961). A full treatment of this topic is beyond the scope of this literature review, however, the topic is referenced in TMT literature. Greenberg (2008, p. 51) discussed the cultural concealment of many of our creaturely characteristics, such as legitimizing sex with romantic love and eating with fine dining. Most people’s interaction with death is that of contemplating some spiritual or religious process or significance, and not interacting with a decaying corpse. When someone close to us dies, we are busy with the business of death: notifications of friends and family, funeral arrangements, and management of the estate. Outside of these usually rare events, humans fill their lives with “worries about rather circumscribed problems of living, such as whether they will get the job they desire, whether their romantic relationships will work out, and so on” (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 102).

Greenberg et al. (1995) noted, “It is remarkable that a species that is so clearly invested in self-perpetuation seems to be able to ponder its ultimate death with such apparent equanimity” (p. 430). In 1943, Zilboorg provided a similar perspective, in that “Such constant expenditure of psychological energy on the business of preserving life would be impossible if the fear of death were not as constant” (as cited by Solomon et al., 1991, p. 101). However, when Becker and TMT theorists discussed the motivation provided by the fear of death, they referred to death as absolute annihilation (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 96). Societies, ergo culture, must provide for

some legitimization of death that enables individuals in society to go on living after knowledge of the death of others and to “anticipate his [*sic*] own death with, at the very least, terror sufficiently mitigated so as not to paralyze the performance of the routines of everyday life” (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 97). Contemplation of absolute annihilation offers no such comfort. Castano et al. (2002) contrasted the literal fear of death with that of absolute annihilation. Specifically, it is the annihilation of our identity that our efforts to root our social identity in the in-group seeks to protect (p. 140).

When most of us contemplate our own death, it is the prospect of being remembered, and not of the absolute annihilation of our identity, that is often top of mind. The power of this one facet of symbolic immortality (Greenberg et al., 1995, pp. 418-419) to guide our behaviour cannot be denied. Ultimately, however, it is this very legitimization of death, and immersion in constructions that distance us from contemplation of absolute annihilation, that reveals the terror assuaging power of culture; work, or more specifically an organizational leadership role, being the construction examined in this study. The power of culture was evident to Becker, and it forms the basis for TMT’s two-component theory of anxiety buffering.

A Two-component Theory of Self-esteem as Anxiety-buffer

In 1986, Greenberg, Pyszczynski and Solomon published *The Causes and Consequences of a Need for Self-Esteem: A Terror Management Theory*. Here, Greenberg et al. first proposed terror management theory: a theory that explains why humans need self-esteem and how the self-esteem need is satisfied. Although Greenberg et al. (1986) provided a comprehensive treatment of TMT, in 1991, Solomon, Greenberg and Pyszczynski provided even greater detail in a sixty-

page article. With these two publications, the foundation for research into TMT was firmly set and the seeds for the field of experimental existential psychology were sewn.

Up until 1986, the focus of social psychology had been on how, not why, a particular behaviour occurs (Solomon et al., 1991, pp. 93-94). There were many mini-theories that addressed “a relatively narrow and circumscribed component of social behavior” (p. 93). Additionally, Solomon et al. (1991) noted that the “very basic question of why people need self-esteem has been all but ignored” (p. 107). Scheff, in his 1990 review of over 10,000 empirical studies regarding self-esteem, argued that research in the area of self-esteem will see little progress until a theory of self-esteem is developed (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 107). Scheff noted that one failing of all the studies was that “they did not test a hypothesis derived from a general theory” (as cited by Solomon et al., 1991, p. 107).

What was necessary was an overarching theory of the determinants of social behaviour (Solomon et al., 1991, p. 94), in that a theoretical vacuum existed with respect to why people needed self-esteem (Greenberg, 2008, p. 48). Greenberg et al. (1986) found this theory in Becker’s work and from it they developed a two-component theory of anxiety-buffering (pp. 197-205). The first component is faith in a cultural drama or worldview that “portrays life as meaningful, important, and enduring” (p. 198). The second component is the belief that one is a valued member of that worldview and that one “plays an important part in that drama” (p. 198). Human striving in accordance with this two-component theory serves to elevate us above the nature of our creaturely existence by “providing a view of the world as orderly, predictable, meaningful and permanent” (p. 198). This elevation, or distraction, “provides the possibility of

leading a meaningful and enduring existence” (p. 206). In this study, I propose that organizational leadership roles are a cultural drama or worldview, and that leaders in organizations may derive self-esteem from the belief that they are valued members of this micro-culture (McCurdy, 2006, p. 3).

The origin of the human need for self-esteem.

A human’s need for self-esteem begins when a parent’s love toward the child becomes increasingly conditional. As infants, children are completely dependent on their parents for survival (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 197). In the first stages of human life, most infants are nourished and protected without having to meet any conditions of worth, that is without having to be good infants in the eyes of their parents. Infants acquire a sense of self-consciousness as they begin to develop, and at this same time, “the warmth and care of the parents becomes increasingly conditional” (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 197). Children begin to understand that, if they want to enjoy good outcomes, they must behave in accordance with the conditions set by the all-powerful parents. Bad outcomes, be they denial of affection, isolation or some measure of fear or pain, create anxiety and, at worst, may be perceived as leading to annihilation of the child by the parent (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 197). When the child meets the parents’ conditions, they enjoy feelings of warmth and security and, thus, develop a positive self-concept (p. 197): I am of value in this parent-child system and worthy of my parents’ affection and protection by way of my good characteristics and behaviour. When the child contravenes the conditions set by the parents, they experience negative affect and develop a negative self-concept (p. 197): I am of little or no value in this system because of my bad characteristics and behaviour.

As the child develops, she realizes that “her parents are vulnerable creatures that will eventually die and cannot protect the child from a variety of aversive experiences, including their own death” (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 197). Thus, the child’s parental system, in which she can enjoy protection by meeting certain conditions, is jeopardized. Looking outside of the parent-child system, the culture provides a superior system of value and protection by providing roles, values, standards of behaviour and achievement, a conception of the world as just (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 197) and the prospect of literal and symbolic immortality (Greenberg et al., 1995, pp. 418-419).

Culture and its role as anxiety-buffer.

The characteristics of a modern human’s journey from infancy’s creaturely existence—squealing to be fed, suckling at a teat¹, defecating without discrimination—to that of a child who perceives her parental system vulnerable to the point that it can no longer provide protection against the prospect of absolute annihilation and causing the child to seek security in the broader culture of humanity, is a product of the evolution of human consciousness or self-awareness. Specifically, Solomon et al. (2004) stated that

The complex cognitive demands of social interaction in large groups in turn led to the gradual emergence of self-reflective consciousness (Humphrey, 1984). In the process of trying to figure out what others were thinking and feeling in order to better predict and control their behavior, our forbearers became aware of their

¹ The breadth of TMT research is note-worthy. Specifically, Cox, Goldenberg, Arndt and Pyszczynski (2007) examined the hypothesis that women who breast-feed in public represent an existential threat, with respect to TMT, in that observing the act of breast-feeding may serve as a reminder of our creatureliness and thus cause negative reactions (p. 110).

own existence and, consequently, the inevitability of death. (p. 18)

Castano, Yzerbyt and Paladino (2004), in their discussion of social identity theory, self-esteem and cultural worldviews, agreed that self-awareness and the associated death anxiety may have been a consequence of humans' evolving cognitive complexity (p. 317). At that point in human evolution, culture emerged as the mechanism by which the human "encumbered with the awareness of mortality" and who would otherwise be "overwhelmed by debilitating terror to the point of cognitive and behavioral paralysis" could salvage the evolutionary advantages provided by consciousness (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 18). Faith in these new symbolic cultural constructions that portrayed "human life as meaningful, important and enduring" and "belief that one plays a significant part" in the construction (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 198), provided early humans with protection from the anxiety created by their new awareness of inevitable annihilation and is the two-component theory posited by TMT.

Archeological evidence, theory and research from evolutionary psychologists, anthropology, and cognitive neuroscience converge in support of the assertion that humans "solved" the problems associated with the realization of their mortality by the creation of uniquely human cultural affectations, including art, language, religion, agriculture, and economics. (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 19)

In the absence of the self-worth available through participation in the parental system, the child, and soon the adult, transfers the focus of her self-esteem striving to the cultural systems available to her. With respect to the evolutionary origin of culture, Jaynes (2000) is often quoted in TMT literature and is worthy of inclusion here for emphasis.

The intellectual life of man [*sic*], his culture and history and religion and science, is different from anything else we know of in the universe. That is fact. It is as if all life evolved to a certain point, and then in ourselves turned at a right angle and simply exploded in a different direction (p. 9).

Defining culture and immortality.

Do you care about being a good person, a good daughter or son, a good romantic partner, a good parent, and a good friend? Do you want to make valuable contributions to your profession? Do you want to behave morally or competently in the domains of your life? These are all concerns stemming from a desire for self-esteem. (Greenberg, 2008, p. 48)

In TMT literature, the term *cultural worldview* is defined as a symbolic representation of reality (Harmon-Jones, Greenberg, Solomon, & Simon, 1996, p. 678). The handful of domains listed by Greenberg (2008) at the beginning of this section, are some of the cultural constructs within which we may construct a worldview. Specifically, the source is culture, and the system of value or meaning within culture is the worldview. For example, this study proposes the discovery of a cultural worldview of organizational leadership roles by describing the characteristics of the worldview (role expectations and what participants in the role do), and by further describing how participants are valued when they both display and fail to display the valued attributes and abilities of the worldview. Cultural worldviews are akin to Keen's (1997) *immortality project*.

Each culture provides its participants with these relatively benign worldviews; benign

only in the sense that they allow for the denial of our ultimate vulnerability and mortality (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 196). This is precisely why Greenberg et al. (1986) stated that humans are unique in nature, not because we are social animals, but because we are cultural animals (p. 196). This is also why TMT asserts that self-esteem is entirely a cultural creation (p. 201). However, how can an organizational leadership role be at all considered in the same context, with respect to being a cultural worldview and source of self-esteem, as, for example, the feelings of pride and accomplishment that come from parenting a child? While one can understand that sources of self-esteem vary with regard to the “strength and durability of the sense of personal value” that each confers (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 203), one must also appreciate that the “attributes, values and roles that are promoted as basis of self-worth” vary between cultures (Greenberg, 2008, p. 52) and within a culture (McCurdy, 2006, p. 3).

Humans need to believe that life has meaning, however, meaning is only derived by being, “valuable participants in the cultural drama [cultural worldview] to which they subscribe” (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 17). The variable in this statement is not the comparative social value of the worldview within the greater culture, but the act of subscription. Therefore, with respect to the example of parenting and self-esteem, it is the child’s favorable behaviour that bolsters the parent’s self-esteem; “Any value one’s child has (from being cute to winning a Nobel Prize) imparts value to the parent” (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 120). One can imagine that North American parents would have their need for self-esteem met by children who excel in sports, achieve good grades in school, establish prestigious careers, or, perhaps, achieve celebrity. So durable is parenting as a source of self-esteem, that many parents cannot conceive how childless

adults—those who do not subscribe to the cultural worldview of parenting—can create adequate meaning in life (see Park, 2005; Scott, 2009). Additionally, when one considers the resources expended on fertility enhancement and adoption, it is reasonable to conclude, especially within the context of TMT, that many childless adults themselves see parenting as their primary hope for a meaningful life.

The presence of childless, and otherwise sane and productive, members of society illustrates culture's capacity to provide a diverse menu of worldviews for the consumption of its participants. Again, as long as an individual is able to, first, establish faith in a cultural worldview that, regardless of what it is, and in the opinion of the individual, portrays life as meaningful, important and enduring, and second, to then establish oneself as an object of value within the worldview, the terror of human existence is kept a bay (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 198). As a child-free adult (Scott, 2009, p. 18), the terror of my own existence is currently kept a bay through my valued membership in the relationship with my wife, as a son in good standing, friendships, the ability to derive financial benefit through participation in the world of work, and through my academic pursuit of understanding the nature of human existence. The meaning provided by other worldviews faded as I aged. At one time, climbing increasingly more difficult and dangerous mountains was a robust worldview—sometimes referred to as *mountain culture*—within which I sought valued membership. In this regard, Solomon et al. (1991) so wisely noted that some of our bases of self-worth, chosen in youth, erode over time with the “inevitable onset of disillusioning experiences (e.g., death, disease, knowledge of corruption in cherished institutions and [in] heroes)” (p. 115); of course, outright failure and humiliation merit inclusion

here, as well.

In order to transcend the terror of human existence—the terror described by Becker (1997)—societal standards of value also serve as the requirements for death transcendence through literal and symbolic immortality (Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, Rosenblatt, Burling et al., 1992, p. 914). Literal immortality provided by religions—death denying ideologies—have persisted for millennia; from the Epic of Gilgamesh in 2000 B.C. to the practice of Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Hinduism (Solomon, Greenberg, Schimel, Arndt, & Pyszczynski, 2004, p. 30). Symbolic immortality can be achieved through “children, accumulated wealth, estates, socially valued accomplishments, awards, memorials and so forth” (Greenberg et al., 1992, p. 914); and, perhaps, success in an organizational leadership role. Symbolic immortality is our defense against the annihilation of identity described by Castano et al. (2002, p. 140).

Empirical Evidence for TMT

Most people, at first, are unwilling to accept that their behaviour, and their very existence, is sustained by a fear of death. If fear of death were only a conscious fear, then such a theory would have likely been fully vetted 150 years ago at the dawn of modern psychology inquiry. TMT research is focused on understanding how we enact defenses regarding our unconscious fear of death. TMT asserts that our defenses against our conscious reminders of death are dealt with more rationally and are termed proximal defenses. These may include thoughts regarding one’s genetically endowed longevity or of one’s excellent health. Becker’s (1997) terror, however, enacts distal defenses that are evidenced by behaviour—largely unconscious—aimed at maintaining worldviews and bolstering self-esteem (Burke, Martens, &

Faucher, 2010, p. 156).

TMT has generated two hypotheses: the anxiety-buffer hypothesis and the mortality salience hypothesis² (Harmon-Jones et al., 1997, pp. 24-25). The anxiety-buffer hypothesis states that if the cultural worldview or self-esteem provides protection against anxiety or anxiety-related behaviour, then one would be less prone to exhibit such behaviour if the cultural worldview or self-esteem were strengthened. Conversely, weakening or threatening these psychological structures should make a person more prone to exhibit such behaviour (p. 24). The mortality salience hypothesis states that reminders of mortality should increase a person's need for the protection provided by faith in the cultural worldview, and, therefore, "affect evaluation of people whose behavior, beliefs, or mere existence impinges on that worldview" (p. 25). Thus, enhanced positive and negative evaluations due to, respectively, perceiving support or opposition to our worldview, serves to help us increase or maintain faith in our worldview (p. 25).

When Burke et al. (2010) published a quantitative, meta-analysis of mortality salience research, they noted that 83% of TMT research had been directed at testing the mortality salience hypothesis. Burke et al. (2010) analyzed 164 articles that included 238 experiments that tested mortality salience. Such a comprehensive analysis is not available regarding research testing the anxiety-buffer hypothesis. Discussions of studies that tested the anxiety-buffer hypothesis are

² Although Stein and Cropanzano (2011) discussed mortality salience in the workplace and called for further study regarding death awareness at work and its integration into organizational behaviour theory, their discussion did not address distal defenses developed from TMT. As with Grant and Wade-Benzoni (2009), Stein and Cropanzano (2001) discussed our conscious awareness of death and its proximal effects. I have included this comment on Stein and Cropanzano (2011) and Grant and Wade-Benzoni (2009) because they discuss, as does this study, the workplace and organizational behaviour.

largely qualitative or descriptive.

In most studies that test the mortality salience hypothesis, participants were told that the researchers were investigating the relationship between interpersonal judgments and personality attributes. The mortality salience group was then guided through an exercise that required them to consider their own death, such as having to write a detailed account of what they think will happen to them when they die, or were exposed to death-related imagery. The control group would be asked to complete some non-death related exercise, such as writing about eating a meal or watching television (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 21). After the treatments, both groups were assessed with respect to attitudinal and behaviour effects.

Burke et al. (2010) summarized their meta-analysis of the 238 experiments that tested mortality salience as follows: “the MS [mortality salience] hypothesis of TMT—that death affects us without our conscious realization—is robust and produces moderate to large effects across a wide variety of MS manipulations” (p. 187). Solomon et al. (2004) offered a sampling of experimental findings. For example, Christian participants who had received the mortality salience treatment evaluated Christian targets more favorably and Jewish targets more adversely. This finding was not present in the Christian control group. In another study, American participants receiving the mortality salience treatment increased their affection for a pro-American author and concurrently increased their distain for an anti-American author. Along with attitudinal effects, TMT has also shown that people will behave differently after receiving the mortality salience treatment. For example, participants who had received mortality salience were more uncomfortable and took longer to use a cherished cultural icon in a blasphemous

fashion. Specifically, Christians were reluctant to use a crucifix as a hammer, and Americans were hesitant to sift coloured dye through a small American flag, when in both cases doing so was necessary to solve a problem. In one experiment, it was found that mortality salience participants acted more aggressively toward those who attacked their political orientation by prescribing the attackers more hot sauce (Solomon et al., 2004, pp. 21-22).

When testing the anxiety-buffer hypothesis, Harmon-Jones et al. (1997) cited research showing that experimentally increasing self-esteem reduced self-report anxiety in response to viewing a graphic, death-related video. In the same study, high self-esteem participants showed reduced skin conductance (a measure of sympathetic nervous system activity) in response to the anticipation of a painful electric shock (pp. 24-25). An experiment by Harmon-Jones et al. (1997) showed that participants with higher self-esteem engaged in more worldview defense than participants with moderate levels of self-esteem. Here we see that people with high self-esteem may be more invested in their worldview than people with lower self-esteem (pp. 28-29). Reflecting on this finding, one might propose that leaders with high self-esteem may be more resistant to changing their position on important issues or to modifying a deeply held perspective on what constitutes appropriate leadership behaviour.

Another study found that encouraging Americans to write arguments in support of U.S. involvement in the Gulf War resulted in the participants reporting less anxiety and being less likely to exhibit increased skin conductance in response to questions about death (Harmon-Jones et al., 1997, pp. 24-25). These experiments support our experience that we usually respond unfavorably to those who disagree with us and favorably to those who support our worldview.

However, TMT tells us why we respond in this manner: because supporters strengthen our cultural anxiety-buffer and dissenters serve to weaken it (Harmon-Jones, et al., 1996, p. 678).

The University of Missouri maintains a list of publications related to TMT (<http://www.tmt.missouri.edu/publications.html>). As of February 2015, the website listed 585 publications. 2004 saw the publication of the first text dedicated to TMT: *The Handbook of Experimental Existential Psychology*, edited by Greenberg, Koole and Pyszczynski. In this volume, contributors stated that

A substantial body of empirical evidence now supports the basic tenets of TMT.

TMT has attracted the interests and engaged the efforts of scholars in a variety of disciplines throughout the world and has generated research on a range of topics far beyond the original scope of the theory. We are gratified by the cumulative progress to date. (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 28).

Complementary Theories

Organizational-based self-esteem.

Organizational-based self-esteem (OBSE) is a sense of self-worth that is primarily determined by a person's experiences of working in organizations (Pierce & Gardner, 2004, p. 592), and it is the degree to which "an individual believes him/herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organizational member" (p. 593). OBSE hypothesizes a positive relationship between an organizational member's OBSE and organizational member's perception of the degree to which she is respected by the organization's managers (Pierce et al., 1989, p. 629). Pierce and Gardner (2004) proposed that people with high OBSE harbor beliefs like "I count

around here,” “I make a difference around here,” and “I am an important part of this place” (p. 593). OBSE complements TMT, in that it proposes that a person’s self-esteem is derived from a cultural construction: the organization. Also, and with respect to this study of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem, many of the benefits of successful leadership (BSL) described by participants are similar to the antecedents of OBSE listed by Pierce and Gardner (2004). For example, there was a positive relationship between OBSE and a worker having more control over their work (p. 601). Work control may correlate to the benefit of successful leadership coded here as autonomy: BSL015. Additionally, Pierce and Gardner (2004) discussed supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships between organizational leaders and members, and how this increased the members’ OBSE (p. 601). This may correlate to increased trust relationships; originally coded here as BSL018 and then aggregated into BSL003 as *influence*. See my description of the thematic coding method used in this study for an explanation of code aggregation.

Lastly, one could propose that the self-esteem exhibited by participants in this study is OBSE, as defined by Pierce and Gardner (2004, pp. 592-593). However, I have chosen to be more specific by identifying and describing the participation in a specific organizational role as the potential source of self-esteem. OBSE provides a detailed description of the worldview of organizational membership and how members derive value from the construct. In this regard, OBSE theory in no way conflicts with TMT. Remember that TMT provides a theory of *why* humans need self-esteem; OBSE is a *what*. TMT then describes how the need is met by our subscribing to a cultural worldview, and by our striving to be a valued member within that

worldview in order to meet its standards of valued behaviour or conduct.

Social identity theory.

Social identity theory explains how a person's behaviour, self-concept, and self-esteem are associated with group membership and group behaviour (Hogg, 2007, p. 901). Castano et al. (2004) argued that social identity—affiliation with a group (p. 306)—could meet a person's need for symbolic immortality (p. 317). Here, we see the association between social identity theory and TMT. For example, Castano et al. (2004) described achieving collective immortality through participation in a nation state (p. 314). Castano et al. (2002) stated that, “through identification with social groups, the individual can project themselves in space and time, beyond their personal death” (p. 137). They went on to discuss how we identify with the social group in order to focus on that part of us that will not perish (p. 140). There are elements of TMT in social identity literature: Castano et al. (2002, p. 140) refers to Solomon et al.'s (1991, p. 96) fear of absolute annihilation, and defines it as the complete annihilation of our social identity. In summary, both social identity theory and TMT define sources of self-esteem as external to the individual; group identification and cultural worldviews, respectively. Furthermore, both theories posit that symbolic immortality may be achieved through valued membership in these social constructions.

Microcultures.

This study proposes that organizational leadership roles may be considered a sub-culture or worldview within organizations. McCurdy (2006) stated that complex societies are composed of thousands of groups that may be termed microcultures: “companies are normally divided into

subgroups, each with its own microculture” (p. 3). McCurdy (2006) explained that human behaviour varies between groups within a culture (p. 3). Anyone who has worked in organizations will have observed that certain behaviours are required of leaders that are not required by individual contributors. Both the leader and the individual contributor may each derive self-esteem from their roles. Therefore, can self-esteem derived from an organizational leadership role be termed OBSE? Yes, however, it may also be further specified as organizational-based leadership-role self-esteem. To avoid being pedantic, I do not dwell on such specification of nomenclature in this paper. However, I do apply McCurdy’s (2006) definition of a microculture in order to support my description of organizational leadership roles as a worldview within the context of TMT.

TMT Research on Leadership and Organizational Behaviour

TMT research has provided insight into the effects of mortality salience on leadership evaluations and preferences. This began with Cohen, Solomon, Maxfield, Pyszczynski and Greenberg (2004) studying the effects mortality salience on evaluations of political candidates. Specifically, Cohen et al. (2004) found that people would exhibit an increased preference for a charismatic political candidate and a corresponding decreased preference for a more relationship-oriented candidate as a consequence of the mortality salience treatment (p. 846). Gordijn and Stapel (2008) extended this research by investigating charismatic leadership acceptance in times of terror. They argued that in times of terror, for example after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, people have a need for the vision provided by charismatic leaders. Allison, Eylon, Beggan and Bachelder (2009) investigated evaluations of dead leaders and found that individuals

who died while engaged in moral, altruistic endeavors receive the most veneration after their death (p. 126).

Hoyt led two studies that investigated preferences for masculine and feminine leaders. Hoyt, Simon and Reid (2009) showed that, under mortality salience, females prefer female leaders and males prefer male leaders. Furthermore, they found that mortality salience increased the preference for agentic leaders (p. 233). In another study, Hoyt, Simon and Innella (2011) found that mortality salience caused participants to shift their implicit leadership theories to that of a gender stereotype; specifically, effective leaders were believed to be more masculine or agentic (p. 374).

Lastly, Jonas, Kauffeld, Sullivan and Fritsche (2011) completed the first empirical study that tested the mortality salience hypothesis within an organizational behaviour context. In the first experiment, Jonas et al. (2011) found that employees who received the mortality salience treatment had more negative assessments of an essay that was critical of their corporate culture, and had more favorable assessments of a company-praising essay. This preference was not seen in the control group. In the second experiment, they found students at a university were more likely to endorse the university's culture after the mortality salience treatment (p. 2858). Jonas et al.'s (2011) work regarding organizational culture, supports this study's assertion that organizational leadership roles provide a source of self-esteem, in that "For many employees, corporate culture is not only connected to earning a salary, but also to a sense of security and even personal transcendence" (p. 2858).

Suicide, Ill Health and Job Loss

Our work, be it called a job, career, occupation or vocation, is an important part of our life. Miller and Rahe (1997) in their updated scaling of life change events, ranked being fired as the fifth highest in the range of forty-three events. This means that being fired was considered a bigger change in one's life than having a major illness, serving a jail term, experiencing the death of a close friend, or pregnancy; respectively ranked sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth. The only events in life considered to be more disruptive than being fired, were marital separation, death of a close family member, divorce, and death of a spouse; respectively ranked fourth, third, second and first (p. 282).

Catalano (1991) critiqued several studies that drew correlations between job loss and health and found that job loss is a significant risk factor for reporting and seeking help for psychological problems (pp. 1149-1150). He also stated that the "evidence supporting the effect of economic insecurity on suicide is characterized as strong" (p. 1150). Eliason and Storrie (2009) examined the impact of job loss on overall, cause-specific mortality for all plant closures in Sweden in 1987 and 1988. They found that the overall mortality rate for men increased by 44% in the first four years following job loss, and that both men and women experienced a twofold increase in suicide and alcoholism in the short-term (p. 277). Suicide and alcohol abuse was highest in the 25-34 and 55-64 age groups (p. 296). Thus, they concluded, "that an association between job loss, or unemployment, and ill health exists is unquestionable" (p. 295).

Evidence for the correlation between job loss and suicide in the United States was presented by Classen and Dunn (2012). Their study specified unemployment duration as the

strongest force in the relationship between suicide and job loss (p. 338). The weighted average suicide rate in the general population was 1.9 persons in 100,000 people, however, this spiked to an average of 102 in 100,000, with one state showing a peak of 903 in 100,000, in the years following mass layoffs (p. 348). This literature serves to underscore the strength and durability (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 203) of work as a cultural worldview.

With respect to a Canadian context, Navaneelan (2012) stated that, “suicide results from the interaction of many factors,” including financial hardship or a major loss (p. 3). In 2009, 45% of all suicides were in the 40-59 year old age group, followed by 35% in the 15-39 group (p. 5). When this data is correlated to Statistics Canada’s study of 2012 economic security, which showed that those under the age of 35 had the highest debt load and that those in the 35-44 group showed the highest incremental increase in debt (Statistics Canada, 2014), one begins to recognize a convergence of risk factors that may indicate how vigorously a person in these age groups might defend threats to cultural worldviews associated with work. In my recommendations for future research, I discuss how a threat to one’s worldview associated with work, in itself and with consideration to this literature, may be considered as a source of mortality salience similarly to the overt, experimental mortality salience treatment described by Solomon et al. (2004, p. 21).

Chapter 3: Research Design

I believe this to be the first study that describes organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem within the context of terror management theory. I accept that I may be opening the gates to, what may become, well-contested terrain. The round-about way that I travelled to arrive at my conclusions would cause me considerable angst if I did not provide a robust explanation of the research design that includes full disclosure of my beliefs, assumptions and paradigms. Denscombe (2010), said that the research choices made by explorers of such contested terrain, “need defending against criticism from those who advocate a different approach,” and that a competent defense is unlikely to satisfy everyone (p. 116). This section provides such an explanation; a fullness, however, that is bounded by my conscious awareness.

Theoretical Framework

Klenke (2008), in her thorough volume of qualitative methods in leadership research, said that, “Phenomena can only be understood within the context within which they are studied” (p. 21). The phenomenon in this study is organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem for the leader. The context, however, is constituted by three interactive and interdependent contexts: the stated, lived experience of the twelve participants; my own lived experience; and, the literature review. Here, a theoretical framework can serve to anchor the reader (Charmaz, 2006, p. 168).

In explaining the construct of a theoretical framework, Charmaz (2006) stated that, “Your argument tells how you want readers to think about your analysis. The theoretical framework locates the specific argument that you make” (p. 169). Therefore, I locate my argument in my

philosophical underpinnings and literature review. These elements form the theoretical framework for this study. A theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem is constructed from an analysis of the collected data that is both directly and indirectly informed by the theoretical framework.

Philosophical Underpinnings

The philosophical underpinnings of this study are comprised of my ontological and epistemological positions and my axiology. Scholarship within the social sciences requires that researchers demonstrate both critical assessment and transparency with respect to their philosophical underpinnings (Denscombe, 2010, p. 116; Klenke, 2008, p. 14). Qualitative analysis is a cognitive process (Heath, 2004, p. 149) and researchers' observations are filtered through their expectations and predispositions (Denscombe, 2010, pp. 122-123).

With respect to ontology and epistemology, it is less important to dwell on taxonomy, and more important to understand and identify specific assumptions or positions. For example, to Denscombe (2010), interpretivism is an epistemology (p. 118), whereas it is a paradigm to Klenke (2008, p. 20); constructivism is a paradigm to Klenke (p. 20), but constructionism is an ontology to Denscombe (p. 118). For clarity, I have attempted to minimize reliance on taxonomy when explaining how my ontological and epistemological assumptions, along with my axiology, formed the philosophical underpinnings that, then, informed my methodological decisions.

Ontological perspective.

Ontology is the belief that we hold regarding the nature of social reality (Denscombe, 2010, p. 118). I perceive a bipolar nature of ontology with realism at one end and an individual

construction of social reality at the other. Social construction is non-realism and non-realists “variously call themselves ‘interpretivists,’ ‘social constructionists/constructivists,’ ‘post-structuralists,’ or ‘discourse theorists’” (Watson, 2012, p. 25).

The realist believes that “social reality exists independently of how people observe and make sense of it” (Watson, 2012, p. 25). Conversely, the non-realist believes “that the social world only exists in so far as it is ‘constituted’ by the process of interpretation and linguistic practice” (p. 25). My ontological beliefs are usually that of a non-realist. I believe that reality itself “has no inherent properties, no order, no structure” (Denscombe, 2012, p. 119). Klenke (2008) stated that, “Qualitative researchers assume multiple dynamic realities that are context-dependent and embrace an ontology that denies the existence of an external reality,” and that individual interpretations of these realities are “deeply embedded in a rich contextual web that cannot be readily generalized to other settings” (pp. 15-16). Thus, and from my ontological perspective, social reality does not exist *out there*, but is a dynamic, context-dependent interpretation unique to the individual.

Epistemological perspective.

Epistemology is concerned with how we create and claim knowledge of the social world (Denscombe, 2010, p. 119). It is “the theory of what we can know” (Kalof, Dan & Dietz, 2008, p. 19). Denscombe noted that, “For the postmodernists [non-realists], social reality is a shifting and contradictory thing that only lends itself to short-lived, small-scale partial accounts by researchers” (p. 123). Klenke (2008) stated that constructivists see the world as “complex and interconnected,” (p. 21) and they argue that, “knowledge and truth are created, not discovered”

(p. 22). A positivist epistemology “regards the observation and measurement of the properties of objects as crucial to the way we find out about social reality” (Denscombe, 2010, p. 119). This fits well with the ontological assumption that social reality is something that is *out there*, with “properties that lend themselves to be objectively measured” (p. 119). Thus, a positivist epistemology is congruent with realist ontology and incongruent with my ontology of an individual construction of social reality.

Once a researcher denies a positivist-only epistemology, a theory of social reality rests on a full or partial construction—versus measurement—of social reality. Here we can introduce pragmatism. Pragmatism is “based on the premise that knowledge is an instrument for organizing experience” (Klenke, 2008, p. 26). A pragmatist would adopt the epistemological position that best supports the inquiry. Thus, she could cover the spectrum of epistemology from the purely positivistic where only what can be scientifically and objectively measured can be known, to the unfettered construction of knowledge that might espouse absolute relativism: that “anything goes” (Denscombe, 2010, p. 123). Pragmatism can traverse some slippery epistemological and methodological ground. Denscombe has cautioned that, “a pragmatic approach is not an excuse to ignore the articulation of ontological and epistemological perspectives” (2010, p. 130). Criticisms of non-positivist epistemologies are that of relativism, uncertainty and lack of rigor. Because of this, most researchers adopt a modified form of positivism (Denscombe, 2010, pp. 123-126).

As I have articulated my ontology as non-realism and largely that of an individual construction of social reality, I state my epistemological stance for this study as follows: I

believe that knowledge of the lived experience of the participants in this study can be constructed from an analysis of their statements; I believe that when this analysis is further informed by the literature review—interpreted—a valid theory of their social reality may be constructed; and, I believe that such a theory developed through the qualitative methods used in this study may provide testable hypotheses that may be falsifiable through the use of more quantitative approaches. Thus, I believe a valid characterization of my epistemological perspective is that of a non-positivistic, pragmatic construction of knowledge.

Axiology.

From a non-realist ontology and a non-positivist epistemology, one can begin to understand how value-free data cannot be obtained (Klenke, 2008, p. 23-24). Axiology refers to the role that ethics and values play in research (p. 17). Klenke (2008) stated that, “the axiology question deals with values of being, about what human states are to be valued simply by virtue of what they are” (p. 18) and that it is important to “report the values and biases of the researcher as well as the value nature of the data gathered” (p. 17). Blustein (2006) provides an excellent example of full disclosure of a researcher’s values and moral position (p. 209). Although he provided this within the context of employing an emancipatory communitarian perspective in the development of a new psychology of working, I will attempt to follow his example here.

My beliefs and values that I believe merit disclosure due to their potential influence on this research are: I believe that terror management theory approaches, although not completely, that of a grand or unifying theory of human behaviour; I believe that working is a fundamental and defining characteristic of humanity; I believe that organizations, although comprised of

individual actors, may be characterized as an entity (Hamilton & Crump, 2007, pp. 300-302) with its own behaviour that acts upon its constituent actors; I believe that successful participation within an organization requires the individual participant to modify her behaviour and that this modification may not always be conscious, although it is a product of the socializing influence of the organization; and, although I abhor the presence of evil in the world that is the cause of so much suffering and despair, like Keen (1997, p. xiii), I believe that much of our efforts to do good, results in the creation of more evil, therefore, I am reluctant to employ the dichotomies of good-evil and right-wrong. Lastly, I value scholarship that provides flexible explanations of human behaviour grounded in existential and humanistic theories in the social sciences and humanities.

Methodology

Ontological and epistemological assumptions and perspectives are translated into methodology (Klenke, 2008, p. 18). The qualitative methods employed in this study are consistent with constructivist and interpretivist—non-realist and non-positivist—perspectives (Denscombe, 2010, p. 133; Klenke, 2008, p. 14). In *Qualitative Research in the Study of Leadership*, Klenke (2008) emphasized that the study of leadership in particular is well suited for qualitative methods because of the “multidisciplinary nature of the field which has to be more open about pragmatic assumptions, methodological preferences, and ideological commitments than many other disciplines. Moreover, the study of leadership is context-dependent” (p. 4).

In this study, I employ a grounded theory methodology in order to discover if organizational leadership roles can be described as a micro-culture (McCurdy, 2006, p. 3) or

worldview that provides for valued membership (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 198). Once this is achieved, I complete the cognitive process of theorizing that “cuts to the core of studied life and poses new questions about it” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 135) in order to present how organizational leadership roles may be a source of self-esteem for the leader. In the following sections, I describe the steps I followed to develop grounded theory and the process of theory construction, which is critically influenced by the literature review. This integration and application of the literature review is a deviation from accepted grounded theory practice (Klenke, 2008, p. 188). It is a decision, however, that is aligned with acceptable, transparent modification of qualitative methods in order to “match the dynamics of the evolving research process” (Klenke, 2008, p. 11).

Grounded theory.

In his critique of grounded theory, Suddaby (2006) observed that new discoveries are often the result of “high-risk expeditions into unknown territory” (p. 633). Suddaby said this, not to discourage the use of grounded theory, but to caution researchers with respect to ensuring that they are explicit in their descriptions of how they employ the methodology since it can occupy ground “between some slippery epistemological boundaries” (p. 638). That said, Suddaby (2006) recognized that good grounded theory incorporates a measure of creativity (p. 638), that the personality and experiences of the researcher contributes to theory construction (p. 640), and that researchers must be both patient with and tolerant of ambiguity (p. 638). The methodology employs an interpretive process, as opposed to a logico-deductive one (Suddaby, 2006, p. 638), and “seeks to achieve a subjective understanding of the lived world of the subjects” (Sheppard,

2004, p. 181).

Grounded theory was developed in response to extreme positivism (Suddaby, 2006, p. 633). In grounded theory, theory is said to be discovered—constructed—or grounded in the collected data (Charmaz, 2006, p. 2). Upon its introduction, grounded theory became known for its usefulness, but, ironically, also for its positivist assumptions (Charmaz, 2006, p. 11). There is considerable debate regarding what constitutes proper grounded theory methodology (see Locke, 1996). Although its founders appeared to initially agree on its canons (see Glaser & Strauss, 2008), there was soon a divergence that has been subject to ongoing debate (see Glaser, 1992). One difference, for example, between the founders is Glaser’s argument for the elimination of a priori knowledge and the need for “disciplined restraint so as to maintain the integrity and neutrality of the method,” versus Strauss’ advocacy for researchers to “actively engage what they study and to systematically explore the full possibilities of their data” (Locke, 1996, p. 243). Observers of the debate, however, have noted little difference in the basics of both approaches (p. 241). Although a comprehensive description of grounded theory methodology is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is critical that the methods of data collection, coding and theory construction be made apparent to the reader (Suddaby, 2006, p. 637). It should also be noted that tensions between what constitutes *forcing* in data collection remain unresolved among grounded theory theorists (Charmaz, 2006, p. 20).

Corbin and Strauss (1990, pp. 6-12) described a number of canons and procedures for grounded theory practice. Some have been employed without material modification in this study. For example, and with respect to simultaneous data collection and analysis, they stated that,

“analysis is necessary from the start because it is used to direct the next interview and observations” (p. 6). This procedure was employed within and between interviews and is often described as a process of constant comparison (Suddaby, 2006, p. 634). Also, they emphasized that the theorist “works with conceptualizations of the data, not the actual data per se” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p. 7). This concept will be discussed with respect to successive abstraction and the coding of latent content. Similarly, and with respect to the coding of interview content, data categories are “higher level and more abstract than the concepts they represent” (p. 7).

Two other key elements of grounded theory are theoretical sampling and theoretical sensitivity. Theoretical sampling is a complex construct, critical to grounded theory that proceeds on a number of levels. It can be present, for example, in participant selection, interview question development and data collection. It is decisions made by the researcher in all these domains that continually guides which data are collected (Glaser, 1992, p. 102) in order to develop the theory as it emerges throughout the research project (Glaser & Strauss, 2008, pp. 45-77). Theoretical sensitivity refers to the researcher’s ability to “conceptualize and formalize a theory as it emerges from the data” (p. 46). The forthcoming descriptions of interview content analysis and theory construction will serve to clarify the grounded theory employed in this study.

Participant selection.

Sampling proceeded in accordance with a number of methods. Consistent with a grounded theory methodology, sampling proceeded on a theoretical basis, in that my understanding of the area of research, the research question and objectives, determined the phenomenon studied (Corbin & Strauss 1990, p. 8). This is consistent with Sheppard (2004), in

that an element of theoretical sampling is the determination of who should be interviewed (p. 189). Theoretical sampling is also used to ensure that researchers “sample those settings or individuals that will maximize our opportunity to focus on particular themes emerging from the data” (p. 189). I used convenience sampling (Sheppard, 2004, p. 94), in that I attempted to obtain participants whose primary work location was in Calgary, Alberta, and who were employed in industry sectors within which I had colleagues who could solicit prospective participants. The location would facilitate in-person access to participants.

I also employed purposive sampling (Sheppard, 2004, p. 94), in that I required participants be leaders of leaders, in contrast to leaders of individual contributors, in order to ensure that their organizational role would involve a greater proportion of leadership tasks versus management tasks. This decision is informed by Kotter (1999), in that the role of leaders of individual contributors is more likely to be occupied with a greater proportion of management or technical tasks, whereas leaders of leaders are more likely to spend more of their time immersed in behaviours that Kotter (1999) differentiates as *leadership*. With respect to the foregoing discussion of grounded theory, one could argue that the decision to select leaders of leaders was informed by my experience as an organizational leader and by my scholarly pursuit of leadership studies, and is, therefore, representative of both theoretical sampling and theoretical sensitivity. There were no gender requirements, nor is the gender of the participants disclosed.

Interviews.

Twelve participants were interviewed individually for a maximum of sixty minutes. Ten of the twelve interviews were conducted at the participants' place of work, in either meeting

rooms or the participants' offices, where only participant and myself were present. Two of the twelve interviews were conducted by telephone. All interviews were recorded using two digital voice recorders. Although some interviews were transcribed earlier, most interviews were transcribed from the audio recorder once all the interviews were completed.

Sheppard (2004) said that qualitative interviews are “conversations with a purpose” and social situations that, both, have their own meaning and are used to create meaning (p. 138). The interviews in this study were conducted with attention to what Charmaz (2006) defined as *intensive interviews*. In these directed conversations (Charmaz, 2006, p. 25), “an interviewer assumes more direct control over the construction of the data than most other methods” (p. 28). The technique incorporates a narrowing of the range of interview topics in order to gather specific data (p. 29). When doing so, Charmaz suggested that grounded theory researchers reduce the number of interview questions to as few as possible (p. 29), but also cautioned against “forcing interview data into preconceived categories” (p. 32). Effectively, the interview is “contextual and negotiated” and the result is “a construction—or reconstruction—of reality” (p. 27).

Sheppard (2004) recognized that, sometimes, a key element of successful research is membership or acceptance into the group being interviewed (p. 151). In order to contribute to this acceptance, at the beginning of the interviews I provided a short, and somewhat benign, description of my own organizational leadership experience. I did not do this with each participant, as I tried to remain conscious of any barrier to rapport that might be created. I used my own biography only to demonstrate an understanding of the context of organizational

leadership. This approach is supported by Sheppard's (2004) comment that it is important for the participants to know that the researcher likely understands how they feel and is empathetic to the situation (p. 151).

Interview questions.

Interviews began with a review of a consent form, my own brief introduction, and an opportunity for the participant to voice any concerns. It then proceeded in a semi-standardized manner, in that many of the thematic questions were usually the same for each participant (Sheppard, 2004, p. 145); for example, what are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by your organization?

Grounded theory is an iterative process (Kalof et al., 2008, p. 90) that recommends only introductory and general questions be formulated in advance of the first interview. Responses to general questions inform the development of subsequent questions. This iterative process is performed both in real-time during the interviews, and between interviews. Thus, Kalof et al.'s (2008) statement that, in grounded theory, "the relationship between data collection and theoretical development is more reciprocal than strictly linear" (p. 86) is supported by this iterative process.

A semi-standardized approach encourages the development of themes through the use of probing questions (Sheppard, 2004, pp. 145-148). The interviewer is permitted to explore. In fact "they are expected to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared and standardized questions" (p. 147). Suddaby (2006) stated that the determination of follow-up questions should be guided by theoretical sampling, in that "decisions about which data should be collected next are

determined by the theory that is being constructed” (p. 634). I attempted to keep most questions open-ended and resisted any language that might be perceived as evaluative or judgmental in order to permit “unanticipated statements and stories to emerge” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 26). Often, in order to develop rapport by delaying potentially uncomfortable questions, I refrained from asking questions about the participant’s own experience, and would, instead, begin the interview by asking questions about what participant expected of her/his staff and how they, the staff, are evaluated. Interview transcripts, where participants consented to the secondary use of data, are provided in Appendix C and illustrate the fluid and spontaneous nature of semi-standardized interviewing.

Content analysis.

Essential concepts in grounded theory are the of simultaneous data collection and analysis, and concurrent constant comparison (see Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Kalof et al., 2008; Klenke, 2008; Sheppard, 2007; Suddaby, 2006). Corbin and Strauss (1990) stated that if one waits to analyze data only until after all collection—interviews—is completed, then “there will be gaps in the theory, because analysis does not direct what one focuses upon during interviews and observations,” (p. 13). Sheppard (2004) stated that, “What we are doing when we conduct content analysis is making a judgment about key themes that emerge from the data” (p. 179). The formal coding process, described below, is, of course, content analysis. However, the process of constant comparison that precedes coding, driven by the researcher’s theoretical sensitivity that results in the generation of categories of data and the renaming of categories, is also captured under the broader process of content analysis.

Although content analysis proceeded on theoretical grounds in order to inform question and theme development for subsequent interviews, once interviews were completed, analysis proceeded based on a series of well defined steps in order to construct the final interpretation of the data (Klenke, 2008, p. 90). Constant comparison continued to be employed throughout the analysis; specifically, data were constantly compared to categories in order to ensure that they were organized, and reorganized, in a meaningful way (p. 189). Although the following description of content analysis appears more rigid than might be expected given the previous description of grounded theory methodology, content analysis can be a versatile and flexible process (p. 114).

The first step in content analysis is to define the sampling unit and the unit of analysis (Kalof et al., 2008, p. 105). In this study, the sampling unit is the interview. Within the interview, the unit of analysis is any individual word, phrase or number of phrases that, with respect to its explicit or implicit meaning (p. 106), and with respect to my own theoretical sensitivity (for a comprehensive treatment of theoretical sensitivity see Glaser, 1978), adequately answers the interview question or provides expanded, complimentary detail regarding the topic being discussed in the interview. For example, the first question to Participant 001 was: When it's known to you that you are doing well in your leadership role, what benefits do you enjoy? Participant 001 answered: It's mostly intrinsic. Here, within the sampling unit of the interview, the unit of analysis is *intrinsic*. The participant goes on to describe how she/he is beginning to see the impact of a program that she/he developed, and adds that, "It's good to see that moving." This last statement provides a unit of analysis that thematically supports the participant's

previous assertion of intrinsic benefit.

I performed content analysis on five occasions during this study. The first analysis was the less structured process of reviewing preceding interview content before a subsequent interview by reading my notes taken during the interview and, sometimes, listening to the audio recording. This process proceeded on theoretical grounds: based on my theoretical sensitivity, I would analyze the efficacy of my questions and technique, along with the participant's response, in order to develop more effective probing questions for subsequent interviews. This technique is one example of theoretical sampling (see Glaser, 1992; Sheppard, 2004; Suddaby, 2006), in that my decisions regarding the most effective follow-up or probing questions were determined by the theory I hoped to construct (Suddaby, 2006, p. 634).

The second instance of content analysis occurred during interview transcription. As I transcribed the audio recording to text (this was completed via keyboarding: without the use of speech-to-text software) I underlined the unit of analysis and inserted my own, bracketed comments throughout the text. This is referred to as memo-writing in grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2006 pp. 72-95). Memos were edited a number of times through the process of constant comparison. The result of the evolution of the memos was the creation of the initial conceptual ordering of the data (Sheppard, 2004, pp. 182-183); discussed under the coding section in this thesis.

The next two instances of content analysis were the first and second codings that preceded the development of the coding manual. During this analysis, data categories at all levels were modified, aggregated or eliminated. For example, nine participants expressed the

organizational leadership expectation to demonstrate a results orientation. Some participants expressed this expectation directly: “it’s about results” (Participant 001). However, several participants expressed this orientation indirectly, without using the word *results*: “I’m also a barrier remover” (Participant 002); “I need to make sure that the work quality is there and that it’s credible” (Participant 008); and, “Our boys need the basic understanding that it’s the pedal to the metal” (Participant 009). Each of these statements was eventually coded as being representative of a results-orientation. A final analysis was conducted upon completion of the coding manual in order to provide a final validation of the coded of data.

Coding.

Manifest and latent content coding.

Coding adds information to the text, “through the process of interpretation that simultaneously breaks down the text into meaningful chunks or segments” (Klenke, 2008, p. 92). Grounded theory does not attempt to replicate the voice of participants. Rather, it searches for patterns of meaning that the participants are, likely, unaware of through a “method of successive abstractions” (p. 190). Klenke (2008) restated Glaser’s perspective on coding, in that it is a process that combines “the analyst’s scholarly knowledge and his research knowledge of the substantive field”, and added that coding is “often conducted on the basis of a more or less implicit theoretical background knowledge” (p. 191). Applying the concept of successive abstraction and permitting the pragmatic influence of theoretical knowledge can contribute to the mitigation of Suddaby’s (2006) observation that, “A common characteristic of most efforts to use grounded theory is a neurotic overemphasis on coding” (p. 638).

Also material to the coding process is the decision to code manifest and latent content. Manifest content is the “visible aspects of the text, without considering the connotation of the text” (Kalof et al., 2008, p. 106); it is the apparent content (Klenke, 2008, p. 95). Latent content is the implicit meaning (Kalof et al., 2008, p. 106) where the researcher is looking for the “underlying aspects of the phenomenon” (Klenke, 2008, p. 95). Objectivity, of course, is more difficult to achieve when coding latent content, since the researcher is proposing a subjective interpretation of the data based on her own mental schemata (Klenke, 2008, pp. 95-96). In this study, I coded manifest and latent content. With respect to the examples discussed earlier, the organizational leadership expectation of demonstrating a results-orientation, Participant 001’s response included the word *results*: “it’s all about results.” This is manifest content. Participants 002, 008 and 009’s responses provided examples of latent content that expressed a results-orientation: “I’m also a barrier remover,” “I need to make sure that the work quality is there and that it’s credible,” and “Our boys need the basic understanding that it’s the pedal to the metal.” The context within which both manifest and latent content was coded, however, is best described from the perspective of thematic coding (see Klenke, 2008, pp. 94-96; Sheppard, 2004, pp. 178-196).

Thematic coding.

A theme is “a pattern found in the information that at a minimum describes and organizes the possible observations” and may be identified within latent or manifest content (Klenke, 2008, p. 95). The concept of coding themes can also facilitate the researcher’s movement from manifest content to latent content (Klenke, 2008, p. 90). Kalof et al. (2008) also supports

thematic coding in grounded theory and stated that, “the research goal is to analyze broader patterns or themes” (p. 95). Klenke (2008) described Boyatzis’ five-step procedure for thematic coding, in that a good code should have: a label; a definition of what the theme concerns; a description of how to know when the theme occurs; a description of any qualifications or exclusions to the identification of the theme; and, examples to eliminate possible confusion when looking for the theme (pp. 94-95). The coding manual appended to this thesis adheres closely to the Boyatzis method. However, coding of thematic content using this method is best illustrated by example. Table 1 provides such an explanation by defining the elements that constitute codes found in the coding manual.

Table 1

Development of thematic codes based on Boyatzis (Klenke, 2008, pp. 94-96)

Development question	Answer
What am I going to call the theme?	Professional Development
How am I going to define the theme?	It is the opportunity to attend training, study a topic, or complete an academic program at the organization's expense.
How am I going to recognize the theme in the data? Provide an example(s).	Participant states or describes opportunities to attend leadership training, professional development courses, or be sponsored by the organization to complete courses of study at academic institutions. This may take place during normal working hours and will be partially or fully funded by the organization. Examples: "I get tickets to events where influential speakers talk about business and leadership" or "The company paid for my MBA."
What thematic content (data) will I exclude? Provide an example(s).	Participant states or describes any compensation or participation in an activity, at the organization's expense, that is not dedicated to, or intended for, technical or professional development. Examples: "I get invited to events where I'm able to network with other leaders in my organization" or "When I'm successful, I enjoy a deepened relationship with the board of directors."

Codes and the coding manual.

Coding began with open-coding, in that I tentatively identified, named and labeled a large number of themes in the data (Sheppard, 2004, p. 190). This coding was implemented by underlining and then appending a word, phrase or sentence in a participant's transcript with my own word or phrase, in brackets, that I believed represented the manifest or latent theme expressed by the participant. For example, Participant 001, "I wouldn't have the credibility"

(credibility); Participant 008, “I can build-up some good will where people step-in and help me out on the things that I struggle with” (increased trust-relationships); Participant 010, “I am in a place where my team can come and I can help them through their challenges” (building capacity in others); and, Participant 012, “When you’re successful, and when you feel that success, you get the buy-in and willingness for people to try things that they are uncomfortable with” (secure the engagement of others).

I then moved to a process of conceptual ordering where data was organized into “discrete categories according to their characteristics” (Sheppard, 2004, pp. 182-183). These categories were developed based on repetition or patterns identified in my bracketed, open-coding text. Conceptual ordering produced three categories of coded themes: organizational leadership attributes valued by the participant’s organization (OLA); the benefits of successful leadership and consequences of unsuccessful leadership realized or experienced by the participant (BSL and CUL, respectively); and enjoyable, unenjoyable and regularly performed leadership tasks (ELT, ULT and RLT, respectively).

Next, I associated the words or phrases I used to identify themes through open-coding with the categories developed through conceptual ordering. For example, all of the open-coding examples in brackets above, with respect to the question that elicited the responses, were identified as benefits of successful leadership (BSL). Then, each BSL was numbered: BSL005 Credibility; BSL018 Increased trust-relationships; BSL023 Building capacity in others; and, BSL003 Secure the engagement of others, respectively.

Lastly, all category-code pairs were transcribed into the coding manual in order to

facilitate the aggregation of similar codes. For example, BSLs 005, 018, 023 and 003 were aggregated into a renamed benefit of successful leadership number 003: BSL003 Influence. However, without an understanding of the constructs of theoretical sensitivity and theoretical sampling, this process would, no doubt, appear controversial at best, and indefensible at worst. Therefore, the process of aggregation merits explanation.

Some aggregation of codes, I believe, will be obvious to the reader. For example, the aggregation of ELT003 Development of others and ELT007 Mentor or coach, into a renamed ELT003 Build capacity in others. However, other aggregation may not be as apparent. For example, the aggregation of BSL001 Opportunity for a different role, BSL003 Secure the engagement of others, BSL005 Credibility, BSL008 Contribute in new context, BSL009 Mentor others, BSL014 Status, BSL017 Preferential allocation of resources, BSL018 Increased trust-relationships, BSL023 Building capacity in others, all into a single, renamed, BSL003 Influence. Firstly, all of the aforementioned BSLs, by definition, are realized as a consequence of the leaders being perceived as successful by their own leaders. Their success has enabled them to be perceived as possessing specific character or personality attributes, such as credibility, status or trustworthiness. Secondly, their success has enabled them to exercise agency in new domains, such as contributing within the organization in a new role or context, securing engagement of others, mentoring or somehow building capacity in others, or realizing the preferential allocation of organizational resources. Being perceived as credible, trustworthy or having higher status contributes to the participants' ability to influence the organization. Lastly, the other benefits—contributing in a new context, securing the engagement of others, etc.—are examples of the

participants realizing their ability to influence the organization. Thus, all of these benefits were aggregated into one code: BSL003 Influence. Although this and other aggregation was informed by my own theoretical sensitivity developed over thirty-years of organizational life, which included several years in leadership roles, and by my scholarly pursuit of leadership studies, it is a subjective endeavor. As such, conceptual ordering, code development and aggregation are identified as potential sources of error in this study.

A test of the validity of this process can be one of semantic validity: “the extent to which the categories of an analysis of texts corresponds to the meanings these texts have within the chosen context” (Klenke, 2008, p. 103). With respect to semantic validity, I propose that the categories developed through conceptual ordering and the codes developed through open-coding, and refined through the process of aggregation, correspond to the meanings expressed by the participants with respect to the context of this study; a context defined by the theoretical framework. Thus, as Klenke (2008) noted, and as should be apparent after reading the foregoing treatment of the research design of this study, “this is not a neutral or value-free phase of the research process” (p. 104).

Construction of grounded theory.

From an interpretivist ontology, the construction of theory calls for, “the imaginative understanding of the studied phenomenon. This type of theory assumes emergent, multiple realities; intermediacy; facts and values are inexorably linked; truth is provisional; and, social life is processual” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126). Knowledge and theory, is a co-creation of the researcher and participants (Klenke, 2008, pp. 20-12). To underscore the contextual nature of

theory in grounded theory, Heath (2004) stated that the goal of grounded theory is the construction of “*a* theory, not *the* theory” (p. 149). Again, however, the openness, flexibility and contextually-bounded nature of grounded theory is not an excuse for haphazard technique, since, as Charmaz (2006) reminded readers, “Theory is what you remember” (p. 128).

As the interviews proceeded, I realized that any assertion of the discovery, in the collected data, of a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem would not be defensible. However, more importantly, and based on the literature review, it wasn't necessary for the theory to be present in the data in order to posit such a theory. The interview data only needed to show that organizational leadership roles are a culture that provides for valued membership (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 198). This was achieved through a thematic analysis of the participants' stated role attributes and leadership expectations transmitted by the organization. TMT provided the link to self-esteem. Therefore, a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem, within this context-bounded study, can only be posited as a synthesis of the collected data and the literature review. In this regard, one may consider the literature review as data; Charmaz (2006) stated that the literature review can “serve as an opportunity to set the stage” (p. 166). However, Klenke (2008) stated that grounded theory researchers should refrain from a pre-research literature review (p. 188). This was not possible, since I had already spent several years studying TMT prior to undertaking this study. Therefore, my strategy for the mitigation of any bias or for the unconscious influence of TMT is to include TMT literature as a data source. Although not specifically, this is alluded to by Charmaz (2006), in that the “constructivist approach places priority on the phenomenon of study and sees both

data and analysis as created from shared experiences and relationships with the participants and other sources of data” (p. 130). She also stated that, in constructivist grounded theory, “theory depends on the researcher’s view; it does not and cannot stand outside of it” (p. 130). Therefore, when one also considers the influence of philosophical underpinnings, theory construction in this study proceeds on a tripartite basis: the collected data and literature review, all informed by philosophical underpinnings. In the remainder of this section I provide support for a tripartite construction of grounded theory.

Corbin and Strauss (1990) stated that the success of research should be judged by its product (p. 16). Klenke (2008) cited Glaser, in that a theory that “fits, that works and that can be easily modified engenders trust in the method” (p. 193). These comments provide support for the assertions that, in grounded theory, “the criteria of credibility and authenticity may be substituted for internal validity,” and that the question to be asked of grounded theory is, “Do all the parts of the theory fit with each other and do they appear to explain the data?” (p. 192). These perspectives prompt discussion of the justifiable application of pragmatism and abstraction in the construction of grounded theory.

Pragmatism allows for the mixing of methods and strategies (Denscombe, 2010, p. 130) to achieve its overriding output criterion of usefulness (Klenke, 2008, p. 27). The influence of pragmatism in this study is evident in my tripartite theory construction: I am aware of the influence of my multi-year study of TMT and, thus, mitigate any bias by including the literature review as a source of data. With respect to the impact of this decision on the usefulness of the constructed theory, I submit that the theory could not be constructed without the literature

review's inclusion. Klenke (2008) stated that pragmatists "do not assess their conclusions by their proximity to the truth per se but rather their utilitarian function and their ability to promote social action" (p. 27). Although the analysis of interview content supports my conclusion that the participants' organizational leadership roles are a construct that provides for valued membership, and that I propose, with respect to the theoretical framework, that organizational leadership roles may, in general, be a source of self-esteem, the discussion of applications of this theory in various organizational development contexts should receive the lion's share of consideration when judging the usefulness of this study. This discussion would be incomplete if I did not emphasize the importance of abstraction in grounded theory.

Denscombe (2010) stated that, "qualitative research sets out to describe, rather than analyse . . . motives, constructions perceptions and experiences" (p. 133). Sheppard (2004) describes this juxtaposition of analysis and description in that, "a key purpose of GT [grounded theory] is the most accurate representation possible of the meanings attached by the respondents to the facets of the particular issues with which we are concerned" (p. 188). The attachment of meaning to data, within the context of the theory one seeks to construct, is achieved through a process of abstraction. A visual and somewhat phenomenological definition of abstraction is that of a process of "grouping shapes and colours in satisfying patterns rather than by the recognizable representation of physical reality or by telling a story" (Abstract, 2000, p. 3). Although, outside the boundaries of defensible grounded theory research, this definition facilitates Sheppard's (2004) juxtaposition of analysis and description. However, and with respect to grounded theory, Klenke (2008) stated that the objective of the methodology is to

provide an abstraction of the actions and meanings of the participants, and not necessarily to convey an accurate perception of their voices (p. 187). Suddaby (2006) stated that grounded theory researchers are more attentive to how the subjective experiences of individual actors can be abstracted, rather than accurate representation of the experiences, per se (p. 635). Martin and Turner (1983) stressed the importance of identifying “a slightly higher level of abstraction than the data itself” (as cited by Suddaby, 2006, p. 636).

Abstraction should be evident to the reader throughout this study. First, the construction of meaning from data proceeds in abstraction. Then, the development of categories through conceptual ordering is also a process of abstraction. Coding and the development of themes proceeds based on a process of successive abstraction. Lastly, theory construction itself is a process of abstraction where one ponders and thinks anew about studied life in order to “pose new questions about it” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 135).

Before I discuss sources of error present in this study and threats to the validity of grounded theory, I close the foregoing description of grounded theory with Suddaby’s (2006) caution to grounded theory researchers that also serves to inform consumers of such research. He stated that we need to remind our selves that we are “only human and that what you observe is a function of both who you are and what you hope to see” (p. 635).

Sources of error and threats to validity.

It is not uncommon for grounded theory studies to take several years to complete (Klenke, 2008, p. 185). In this study, only twelve participants were interviewed for a maximum of sixty-minutes each. My previous, extensive reading of TMT literature facilitated the literature

review's completion within two weeks. Once I received ethics approval, all study activities up to the submission of the first good draft of the thesis took nine months of part-time work, approximating 650 hours. Therefore, one criticism of this study may be that the number of participants and the length and depth of the interviews is inadequate to support the conclusions. Additionally, collecting information regarding the benefits and consequences experienced by the leader, and the leadership tasks (enjoyable, unenjoyable and regular), all within sixty minutes, does not permit the interviewer to go deep.

Denscombe (2010) stated that humans react to the knowledge that they are being studied, and to the knowledge produced by a study (p. 122). Additionally, Sheppard (2004) stated that interviewees may impression manage, in that, when questioned, they may attempt to create a specific impression of themselves to the interviewer (p. 139). Some participants may recite company rhetoric or ideology when questioned, instead of providing the researcher with an accurate representation of their experiences (Charmaz, 2006, p. 27). Lastly, in his discussion of attribute substitution, Kahneman (2002) stated that "when confronted with a difficult question people often answer an easier one instead, usually without being aware of the substitution," however, this can also be deliberate (p. 59).

Throughout the participant interviews, although not in each interview, I noticed each of these aforementioned behaviours. Once conscious of it, I would often restate my initial question or rephrase it in a manner that might elicit a response that, I believed, was more congruent with the inquiry. Upon analysis of the appended interview transcripts, criticisms of this study may include the participants' misrepresentation of their experiences resulting from the behaviours

listed here, or from my own inability to pose questions that would have facilitated the participants' accurate description of their experiences. With respect to Charmaz's (2006) statement that, "how interviewers pose, emphasize, and pace their questions can force data" (p. 32), I may have elicited a response that is incongruent with the associated question and then incorrectly coded the response. The mere presence of the interviewer impacts the validity of the data. Perceived differences in power and status, along with gender differences, may be played-out in the interview and acted on in a manner that impacts the participants' ability to accurately describe their experiences or the interviewer's ability to elicit responses (Charmaz, 2006, p. 27).

Klenke (2008) stated that grounded theory researchers should approach their endeavor with as few professional interests and preconceived notions as possible, and attempt to cultivate an "empty head" (p. 187). Grounded theory researchers should also refrain from a pre-research literature review (p. 188). As stated above, my preexisting knowledge of TMT equated to a pre-research literature review, thus, violating this criterion was unavoidable. With respect to the integrity of the research, I attempted to be aware of, and avoid, the implementation of any interest or bias.

Many of the sources of error inherent in grounded theory can be mitigated through triangulation: seeking to gather data on the object of study from two or more vantage points or methodologies (Sheppard, 2004, p. 234). For robust theory construction, Suddaby (2006) also recommended that grounded theory not be the sole source of data (p. 635). Although theory construction in this study proceeded on the previously discussed tripartite basis, interview content was the only data collected, and then, only through the one process of intensive

interviewing (Charmaz, 2006, p. 25).

Mitigation of sources of error in the data collection process can be addressed by continuing collection until categories are saturated: “categories are ‘saturated’ when gathering fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights, nor reveals new properties of your core theoretical categories” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 113). However, determining saturation requires both experience in grounded theory research and theoretical sensitivity (Suddaby, 2006, p. 639). With respect to the mitigation of coding errors, it is desirable to have more than one person coding interview content and achieve an inter-coder reliability in excess of 90% (Kalof, 2008, p. 97). However, any mis-coding should not materially change the outcome of this investigation: regardless of how the themes are coded or ordered into categories, organizational leadership roles would very likely still present as a culture that provides for valued membership; only the characterization of the nature of the culture, and of how members are valued, would be effected. With respect to these mitigation strategies, possible sources of error in data collection and analysis in this study include, firstly, stopping data collection prior to saturation and, secondly, the conceptual ordering, coding and aggregation of codes performed by only the primary researcher.

Participant sampling in this study did not proceed entirely on a theoretical basis. Specifically, Charmaz (2006) advised that, “initial sampling in grounded theory is where you start, whereas theoretical sampling is where you go,” and that theoretical sampling happens after initial category construction and is informed by it (pp. 100-101). If implemented fully in this study, I would have adjusted my participant sample based on the initial collected data; I would

have, possibly, abandoned previously scheduled participants in order to discover and interview new participants whose experience, in my opinion and based on data collected to that point, would reinforce the theory under construction. However, my only foray into theoretical sampling was to choose leaders of leaders in order to ensure that the participants' roles would be occupied with a greater proportion of leadership tasks, versus management tasks (see Kotter, 1999).

Lastly, I am directly responsible for a source of error: unintended omission of some interview questions. Although participants 011 and 012 discussed the leadership tasks they enjoyed performing (ELT), and those that they found unenjoyable (ULT), the time allotted for interviews expired before I could ask which leadership tasks they performed on a regular basis (RLT). Therefore, this role attribute for leaders in healthcare, RLTs, is only representative of three of the four participants. Also, I failed to ask participant 005 any questions regarding enjoyable (ELT), unenjoyable (ULT) or regular leadership tasks (RLT). This was unintended and was not noticed until the interview was transcribed. Therefore, the discussion of role attributes for leaders in not-for-profit organizations only represents the responses of three of the four participants from this industry sector. Similarly, I failed to ask participant 008 any questions regarding leadership tasks, and as such, role attributes for leaders in the energy industry represents only three of the four participants. With respect to these omissions, I was unable to contact the participants subsequent to the initial interview, since, at the end of the initial interviews, all participants were fully debriefed and told that I was trying to discover a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem. Any information disclosed by the participant after the debrief might, therefore, be biased.

Ethics

This study was conducted in accordance with the Tri-council Policy Statement (TCP2) for ethical conduct for research involving humans (<http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/>). A Request for Ethical Review (RRU Academic Council, 2012) was approved by the Royal Roads University Research Ethics Board prior to any communication with prospective participants. Primary ethical considerations discussed in the request were conflicts of interest, the use of deceit, and potential harm to participants.

Three potential conflicts of interest were identified: my employment in the energy industry, business development activities related to my consulting practice, and my volunteer activity in not-for-profit organizations. At the beginning of the interview, disclosing the name of my employer, describing the nature of my employment, and guaranteeing confidentiality mitigated potential conflict due to my employment in the energy industry. I disclosed the nature of my consulting practice and guaranteed participants that I would not use any privilege gained through research activities to solicit business from the participants or the participants' organizations. With respect to my volunteer activity, I disclosed the names of the not-for-profit organizations to the participants, and informed them that they could not participate in the study if they were currently affiliated with any of these organizations. After disclosure of all potential conflicts, I encouraged participants to confidentially opt-out of the study if they had any concerns regarding potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

With respect to the use of deceit, at no time prior to or during the interviews were the participants told that I sought to discover or construct a theory of organizational leadership roles

as a source of self-esteem. At the beginning of the interview, I only said that I was interested in understanding how they experienced their roles when they both displayed and failed to display the leadership attributes and abilities valued by their organizations. At the end of the interview, and after the participants confirmed that they had nothing more to say, I described terror management theory and disclosed the purpose of the study. After this disclosure, I encouraged the participants to confidentially opt-out of the study if they no longer wished to participate.

Regarding potential harms, at the beginning of the interview I disclosed that I would be asking how they experienced any failures in leadership; I acknowledged that they might find this distressing. I explained that they could choose to not answer these questions and I encouraged them to tell me to stop any line of questioning that was making them uncomfortable. After explaining this, I again encouraged the participants to confidentially opt-out if they no longer wished to proceed.

After initial introductions, and prior to requesting permission to begin audio recording, all interviews began with a review of the research consent form. I explained to the participants how their interview transcript would not include any identifying information. Additionally, I assured them that, should they disclose such information during the interview, the instances would be identified in the transcripts and substituted with a non-identifying version of my own construction. I explained that transcripts would only be identified with a random participant identification number and the participants' sector of employment. I explained how they were able to refuse consent for the secondary use of their transcripts in future research. Lastly, I explained that they could discuss the research with anyone, however, I assured them that I would

not discuss their participation, or a decision to opt-out at any time, with anyone; including with the colleagues who recommended they participate.

Chapter 4: Results

In order to emphasize the thematic content analysis employed in this study, I have chosen to present the results of the interview content analysis in a predominantly narrative format. Only the most rudimentary quantification of the data is included below. The expression of themes was arbitrarily grouped into categories: if 50% or more of the participants expressed the same theme; less than 50%, but more than 25%; and, 25% or less. Some themes were not expressed within the individual industry sectors. All data, presented in tabular format, are provided in Appendix A.

The data were collected in order to describe a role in an organization so that the role may be differentiated from other roles in and outside of organizations. While it is true that the role of leaders in organizations may have much in common with other roles in society, any shared role attributes still serve to define the organizational leadership role. Thus, I propose that an organizational leadership role is defined by the sum of its attributes. Describing the role serves to identify persons to whom a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem may be applied. The collected data also serve to describe how, within the context of terror management theory, an organizational leadership role is a worldview that “portrays life as meaningful, important, and enduring” (Greenberg, 2008, p. 198) and how participants may become objects of value within the worldview.

All Participants

Leadership expectations.

When asked to state the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by their organizations, more than 50% of participants expressed the themes of results-orientation and of

being ethical, equitable or of good character. When expressing the expectation of demonstrating a results-orientation, most participants used the word *results*. Some expressed a quality or characteristic of results; for example, participant 008 said that she/he needed to “make sure that the work quality is there and that it’s credible,” and participant 015 stated the expectation of “organizational efficiency.” Others expressed this theme as a behaviour undertaken to achieve results. For example, participant 009 expressed this as “driving the success,” and participant 011 stated it as being “able to take a position and to demonstrate action.” With respect to the organizational expectation that leaders be ethical, equitable or of good character, leaders expressed this theme in a variety of ways: participant 008 said that she/he was expected to do “the right thing”; participant 009 said that she/he was expected to demonstrate “a real sense of professionalism”; and, participant 014 said that her/his organization wanted “leaders to be authentic.”

Less than 50% but more than 25% of participants expressed the themes of transparency, maintaining ideological discipline, building capacity in others, being strategic, and demonstrating interpersonal or communication skills. Twenty-five percent of participants expressed the themes of demonstrating collaboration and the necessity to possess in-discipline competency. Less than 25% expressed the themes of accountability, the expectation that they derive personal satisfaction from their role or that it be aligned with their personal values, and that they demonstrate independence.

Enjoyable leadership tasks and behaviours.

Fifty percent of leaders said that they most enjoyed opportunities to build capacity in

others or when they were able to be strategic. With respect to building capacity in others, participant 001 described helping others to “think differently,” whereas participant 003 described the theme within the context of organizational change, in that she/he enjoyed the “people and process change,” and “seeing how people embrace change.” Participant 009 said that she/he liked to “see the people in the group grow.” With respect to acting strategically or opportunities to participate in strategy development, some participants used the words *strategy* or *strategic* in their responses; for example, participant 001 said that she/he enjoyed having “strategic conversations,” and participant 011 described enjoying “developing a strategic plan.” However, participant 009 described this theme as enjoying participation in meetings where high-level business decisions are discussed.

One third of participants stated that they enjoyed opportunities to contribute in their technical discipline or as part of a project team. Within the context of alignment with a previous occupational experience, disclosure of which is held confidential, participant 002 discussed her/his enjoyment of “project analysis” and “digging into the numbers.” Participant 015 discussed this theme within the context of opportunities to work on innovative projects. Twenty-five percent of participants expressed that they enjoyed activities that facilitated the implementation of goals, objectives, strategy, etc. Less than 25% expressed the themes of enjoying advancing the careers of others, doing what they perceived as management or administrative tasks, collaborating, interaction or inclusion with others, and opportunities to engage with external stakeholders.

Unenjoyable leadership tasks and behaviours.

Fifty percent of participants expressed the theme of disliking having to perform management or administrative tasks. Some participants expressed this theme directly: participant 001 stated that she/he disliked “Paperwork; the administration of things.” However, other participants provided more detail: participant 002 expressed a dislike of having to manage processes, such as performance reviews; participant 003 expressed a dislike of accounting; participant 010 disliked creating workforce plans and budgets; participant 013 expressed a dislike of having to sort through many email messages; and participant 015 said, “Some of the bureaucracy makes me crazy.”

Aside from a dislike of having to perform management or administrative tasks, objectionable leadership tasks among the participants were diverse. Twenty-five percent of participants expressed a dislike of managing problem performance. With respect to this theme, participant 001 said that, “The difficult conversations are never fun.” Participant 002 characterized this theme as “difficult HR conversations,” and participant 013 described this as a “time when you have to get someone’s attention and let him or her know that what he or she is doing is not right.” Less than 25% of participants expressed a dislike of having to be politically savvy, manage internal or external conflict, deal with ambiguity, or provide excessive direction.

Regular leadership tasks and behaviours.

Fifty percent of participants expressed that they spent most of their time facilitating implementation. Participant 002 expressed this theme as just keeping “the ship afloat” and as “always trying to move ahead twenty different things at once.” Participant 003 said that

“connecting and moving things forward is what I do a lot,” whereas participant 014 described the theme as problem solving, support and advocacy. One third of participants expressed the theme of regularly helping others be successful. Twenty-five percent of participants said that they spent their time being strategic and contributing on projects or within a discipline. With respect to contribution in a discipline or on a project, this was distinct from facilitating implementation as a leader, in that the participants expressed their contribution as that of an individual contributor, and not within the context of a leadership role.

Benefits realized from leadership success.

When describing how they experienced success as a leader, more than 50% of participants expressed the realization of some measure of positive affect, that they were able to exercise greater influence within the organization, or that they received recognition. With respect to positive affect, participant 001 said benefits were “mostly intrinsic” and that “I also get quite a bit out of watching my team grow.” Participant 002 said, “I get a sense of satisfaction from seeing my team succeed.” Participant 012 said that she/he had more confidence, and participant 014 said that, when successful, “you are braver in your risk-taking.” With respect to realizing greater influence, some participants expressed this directly by using the word *influence*. However, most expressions of this theme were characterizations of the exercising of increased influence or the outcome of increased influence. For example, participant 001 described being given “more and different accountabilities” and realizing increased credibility. Typically, being perceived as credible results in the ability to exercise greater influence within an organization. The theme of influence was also expressed as opportunities to influence the careers of others. For

example, participant 012 stated that a benefit realized through success as a leader was opportunities to “share your opinion on something that you might not have been asked before. There are opportunities to mentor people, either informally or through a formal mentorship program.” With respect to realizing recognition as a result of leadership success, many participants used the word *recognition* or *recognized*, however, some described recognition. For example, participant 001 said, “I’m looked at as an expert in what I do,” and participant 003 said, “I love the heightened awareness of what we are doing.”

Less than 50% but more than 25% of participants expressed that, as a consequence of being perceived as successful leaders by their organizations, they realized greater autonomy, they experienced desired inclusion with other leaders, were offered and participated in professional development at the organization’s expense, or received increased financial compensation. Twenty-five percent of participants stated that a benefit of leadership success was the opportunity to participate in activities external to the organization, such as local and national industry associations. Participants 010 and 012 stated that participation in this study was a benefit that they believed was realized as a consequence of their success as a leader in their organization. Twenty-five percent also stated that a benefit of successful leadership behaviour was employment continuance; that is, not being terminated. Less than 25% expressed the benefits of successful leadership as being career advancement, organizational tolerance for their mistakes, or opportunities to contribute to society.

Consequences resulting from unsuccessful leadership behaviours.

Fifty percent of participants expressed the themes of experiencing negative affect or

reduced trust as a consequence of being perceived as unsuccessful in their organizational leadership role. When describing a trying leadership experience, participant 002 said that it had impacted her/his “peace of mind.” Participant 005 described her/his response to negative feedback as, “frustration with myself in that I left something on the table.” When describing a lack of alignment between her/his own leadership values and that of her/his leader, participant 009 said that it created “a very uncomfortable situation. It gets very uncomfortable when there is that tension.” Participant 010 discussed diminished confidence, and participant 011 disclosed embarrassment.

With respect to reduced trust, most participants expressed this theme by describing the consequences of a reduced-trust relationship. For example, participant 001 discussed an impact to credibility, and went on to say, “My circle of influence had shrunk and I had to determine how I could do my job effectively,” and “conflict with my team really increased.” Participant 008 described feeling misunderstood and stated concern “around people thinking that I was not a team player.” Participant 012 discussed how ineffective leadership resulted in others not being comfortable providing feedback or “speaking up” in meetings.

One third of participants expressed the theme that a leadership failure resulted in experiencing motivation to improve their leadership practice. Participant 012 stated that, from leadership failures, “you will often propel because they are meaningful for you.” Participant 002 perceived feedback regarding poor leadership as motivating and “only positive” because it was delivered with respect and compassion. Less than 25% of participants expressed the themes of experiencing increased workload, reduced or withheld compensation, loss of career

opportunities, reduced performance ratings, or termination of employment as a result of failing to display the leadership attributes and abilities valued by their organizations.

Healthcare Participants

Leadership role attributes.

Based on the responses of the four participants from this industry sector, their leadership roles can be characterized as being expected, by their organizations, to be ethical, equitable or of good character; all four participants expressed this. Additionally, participants expressed the themes of being expected to demonstrate a results orientation, demonstrate transparency, and or demonstrate collaboration; each expressed in three of the interviews. Participants in health care did not express the themes of being expected to be strategic, to possess in-discipline competency, or to derive personal satisfaction from their leadership role or that their role be aligned with their personal values. Other themes representative of leadership attributes and abilities valued by their organizations (OLA), were each expressed by one or two of the participants: maintain ideological discipline, build capacity in others, demonstrate interpersonal and communication skills, accountability and being independent.

Three participants expressed the theme of enjoying opportunities to build capacity in others. The theme of enjoying contributing in their discipline or on a project in a manner similar to that of an individual contributor, was expressed in two of the interviews. Themes representing leadership tasks that participants found unenjoyable (ULT) were diverse, in that each participant expressed a single, different theme. With respect to the leadership tasks regularly performed by these participants (RLT), and as stated as a source of error, participants 011 and 012 were not

asked to discuss this attribute. However, participants 014 and 015 both stated that they regularly facilitated implementation.

Benefits of success and consequences of failure.

All participants in healthcare expressed the themes of experiencing positive affect and of realizing greater influence as a consequence of being perceived as successful in their leadership roles. Three of the participants also expressed that they realized greater autonomy as a consequence of success. Other benefits of successful leadership (BSL) were each only expressed by one or two participants, and the themes of benefiting through employment continuance—not being terminated—or by being able to participate in activities external to the organization, were not expressed.

Participants 014 and 015 expressed that they have not experienced any consequences resulting from any leadership failures. However, the themes of experiencing negative affect and reduced trust relationships as a consequence of failing to demonstrate the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by their organizations, were each expressed by participants 011 and 012. Additionally, these participants expressed the theme of experiencing some motivation to improve as a consequence of failure. The themes of increased workload and of a negative impact on compensation were each expressed by either participant 011 or 012. The themes of loss of career opportunity, a negative impact on performance ratings, or that of termination of employment, were not expressed.

Energy Industry Participants

Leadership role attributes.

All participants in the energy industry expressed that they were expected to demonstrate a results orientation. The expectations to be strategic, and to be ethical, equitable or of good character, were each expressed in three of the interviews. The themes of being expected to maintain ideological discipline, build capacity in others, or to demonstrate interpersonal or communication skills, were each expressed in one or two of the participants. The themes of being expected to demonstrate transparency, collaboration, or accountability, to possess interdisciplinary competency, be independent, or to derive satisfaction or that their roles be aligned with their personal values, were not expressed by participants in the energy industry.

As stated in the sources of error for this study, only three of four participants in the energy industry were asked questions regarding leadership tasks. No more than two of the three participants expressed the same theme. These participants expressed that they enjoyed building capacity in others and in being strategic. Two participants did not enjoy tasks that they perceive as being managerial or administrative. The themes of regularly facilitating implementation and helping others be successful were expressed in two of the interviews. Expressions of task themes were less diverse within participants in the energy industry, in that they did not express ten of the twenty-two task themes: ELT, ULT and RLT. However, this lack of diversity is likely due to only three of the four participants being asked task questions.

Benefits of success and consequences of failure.

As did participants in healthcare, all participants in the energy industry expressed the

themes of experiencing positive affect and of realizing greater influence as a consequence of being perceived as successful in their leadership roles. Other themes representing benefits of leadership success (BSL), were each expressed by one or two of the participants, and the themes of realizing greater tolerance for mistakes, and that of being able to contribute to society as a consequence of success, were not expressed by these participants.

Three of the four participants in the energy industry expressed the theme of experiencing reduced trust relationships as a consequence of failing to demonstrate the leadership attributes and abilities valued by their organizations. Two participants stated that they experienced negative affect. Other themes were expressed once, and the themes of increased workload or of a negative impact on financial compensation, realized as a consequence of failure, were not expressed.

Not-for-profit Participants

Leadership role attributes.

Three of the four participants expressed the organizational leadership expectation that they possess some measure of in-discipline competency. The expectation that they demonstrate transparency, maintain ideological discipline, build capacity in others, be strategic, demonstrate a results orientation, and demonstrate interpersonal and communication skills, were each expressed by two participants. Other themes were each expressed by different participants, and the themes of being expected to demonstrate collaboration and to be independent were not expressed.

As stated as a source of error, only three of the four participants from not-for-profit organizations were asked leadership tasks questions. However, all three participants questioned

expressed the theme of enjoying being strategic, and two expressed enjoyment in building capacity in others. Other themes expressing enjoyable leadership tasks were each expressed by different participants, and the themes of enjoying collaboration, or of interaction or inclusion with other leaders were not expressed. The three participants questioned also expressed a dislike of tasks that they perceived as administrative or managerial in nature. Two expressed a dislike of managing problem performance. Other themes of unenjoyable leadership tasks (ULT) were each expressed by a single participant or not at all. Two participants expressed the theme of regularly facilitating implementation. Other themes regarding regularly performed leadership tasks (RLT) were each expressed by a single participant, and the theme of spending most of their time attending meetings was not expressed.

Benefits of success and consequences of failure.

The themes of experiencing some positive affect, realizing recognition, and of realizing valued inclusion with others, all as a consequence of being perceived as a successful leader within their respective organizations, were each expressed by three participants. The themes of realizing greater influence or that of employment continuance were each expressed by two of the participants. Other themes were expressed each in one interview or not at all.

With respect to consequences experienced as a result of failing to demonstrate the leadership attributes and abilities valued by the organizations, only three participants employed by not-for-profit organizations expressed these themes: experiencing some negative affect was expressed in two interviews; experiencing reduced trust was expressed in one interview; and, experiencing a failure as an opportunity to improve was expressed in one interview. Participant

003 had not experienced any consequences resulting from failing to display the leadership attributes and abilities valued by the organization.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Constructing Theory Grounded in the Interview Content

A theory of self-esteem.

Self-esteem is defined as the degree to which one values oneself. Self-esteem may be that of high or low value of oneself. The construct of self-esteem itself has no value associated with it (Reber, Allen & Reber, 2009, p. 719). Adjectives such as *high* or *low* may precede *self-esteem* in text and usage. Self-esteem may also be termed self-regard or self-worth (see Feist & Feist, 2009).

Although eleven of the twelve participants expressed feelings of positive affect as a benefit of leadership success, and six expressed feelings of negative affect as a consequence of leadership failure, feelings of positive or negative affect were not expressed as evaluations of self-worth by the participants. Seven participants expressed the benefit of recognition and five expressed that they benefited by interacting with, or being in some way included with, other leaders. Again, however, no participant expressed these themes in the context of self-worth or self-esteem. Self-esteem was not expressed in either manifest or latent interview content. Thus, a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem for the leader was not discovered through a thematic analysis of the interview content. However, the thematic analysis does reveal a theory of organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture that provides for valued membership.

A theory of organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture.

With respect to a micro-culture, and within the bounded context of this study, the

interview content provides a distinct and valid description of organizational leadership roles. Specifically, most people fulfilling the role of a leader in an organization are expected by the organization to demonstrate a results orientation and be ethical, equitable or of good character. Depending on the industry sector of employment, many may be expected to demonstrate transparency, maintain ideological discipline, build capacity in others and be strategic. Most people employed as leaders in organizations enjoy opportunities to build capacity in others and opportunities to participate in organizational strategy. However, organizational leaders spend most of their time facilitating the implementation of organizational goals, objectives and strategy. Lastly, they tend to dislike activities that they perceive as administrative or managerial.

This description supports the characterization of organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture. McCurdy (2006) stated that, “companies are normally divided into subgroups, each with its own micro-culture” (p. 3). With respect to McCurdy’s assertion, I propose that leaders and non-leaders—often termed individual contributors—are two subgroups within organizations. McCurdy (2006) goes on to describe a culture as the “acquired knowledge that people use to generate behavior and interpret experience” (p. 3). With respect to the participants in this study, the acquired knowledge they use to generate their behavior within their organization and interpret their experience of their organization is represented by both the direct communication of the leadership role expectations of the organization, and indirectly through organizational socialization; for example, in the form of professional and leadership development. When asked to describe the leadership attributes and abilities valued by her/his organization, participant 011 immediately stated, “This organization has a set of values that we

are expected to follow.” Clearly, this participant has acquired knowledge from her/his organization that will influence her/his behaviour. When McCurdy (2006) stated that, “culture is learned” (p. 3) this is what he meant.

In no way do I suggest that all of a leader’s behaviour is a product of organizational socialization. Certainly, everyone’s experience of the world is mediated through the artifacts of a lifetime of socialization. However, to deny the socializing power of organizations would be disingenuous. Schein (1980), in his landmark volume that served to firmly establish the field of organizational psychology, stated that socialization within organizations is the process of teaching “how to get along in the organization, what the key norms and rules of conduct are, and how to behave with respect to others in the organization” (pp. 20-21). More recently, Jex and Britt (2014) have emphasized that organizational socialization’s core process is learning, and that socialization “is synonymous with the process of *acculturation*” (p. 77). Here, I will again refer to Jonas et al. (2001): “For many employees, corporate culture is not only connected to earning a salary, but also to a sense of security and even personal transcendence” (p. 2858).

Many participants discussed socializing forces within their organizations. Participant 005 discussed how leaders in her/his organization are valued in relationship to the organization’s values, and then described how new recruits are selected based on alignment of the recruits’ personal values with those of the organization. Participant 008 discussed putting the company’s interests ahead of personal interests. Participant 011 discussed an executive education program, the goal of which is for the organization to have a “critical mass of people thinking along the same lines.” Participant 015 disclosed that leaders are assessed based on “how well we meet the

organization's values." These organizational leaders have certainly learned how to behave in the organization and the organizationally acceptable filters through which to interpret their experience. Thus, and with respect to Schein (1980), McCurdy (2006), and Jex and Britt (2014), I propose that the thematic analysis of the interview content supports the characterization of organizational leadership roles as a micro-culture and that organizational leaders in this study are members of this micro-culture.

A theory of valued membership.

The participants in this study were asked to describe their experiences within their organizations when they both displayed or failed to display the leadership attributes and abilities valued by their organizations; they were asked to describe any benefits realized as a result of being perceived as a successful leader by the organization, and to describe any consequences they experienced, within their organizational context, as a result of failing to meet the leadership expectations of the organization. The purpose of these questions is to establish how members of the micro-culture of organizational leadership are valued within and by that culture³.

The construct of valued membership can be found in terror management theory, social identity theory and organizational-based self-esteem theory. Becker (1997) said that it is the belief that one is a valued member of that worldview and that one "plays an important part in that drama" (p. 198). Hogg (2007) stated that social identity theory defines group membership in terms of "people's evaluation of themselves as members of a group" (p. 901). Pierce and Gardner (2004) illustrated valued membership in their assertion that people with high OBSE

³ From this point in the thesis, the terms *culture* and *micro-culture*, with respect to organizational leadership roles and terror management theory, may be understood as synonyms.

harbor beliefs like “I am an important part of this place” (p. 593).

With respect to Hogg (2007) and to Pierce and Gardner (2004), I propose that an organizational leader’s value is transmitted to that leader through the organization’s evaluation of the leader’s behaviour. Specifically, a person’s evaluation of her worth to the organization may be greatly influenced by the organization’s behaviour towards her. This is not to discount the organizational leader’s self-assessment of her value to the organization. However, I propose that the organization’s evaluation is the criterion which best articulates the leader’s value with respect to membership in the culture of an organizational leadership role. It is possible that the leader, by her own assessment, may believe that she is not successful in her role, even though she may still be highly valued by the organization. Regardless of her assessment, I propose that her value within the culture is best determined by the culture.

Within the context of this study, I propose that the thematic analysis of the interview content shows that the participants’ organizations transmitted valued membership through the provision of benefits and the levying of consequences. With respect to the benefits realized as a result of being perceived as a successful leaders by the organizations, participants described benefits resulting from the agency of others, usually their own leaders, in the organization. Valued inclusion with other leaders (BSL022) was described by several participants: participants 001 and 003 described how they realized the benefit of being able to interact with the Board of Directors; participant 002 described the benefit of access to highly-placed leaders. Participant 009 described how success had resulted in being invited to meetings with senior leaders from which she/he would have otherwise been excluded. Participants described a relaxing of control

realized as greater autonomy: participant 011 described being left alone more; participant 012 described this as being provided with opportunities to “test and try new things.” Opportunities for professional development at the expense of the organization, and the realization of increased financial compensation, expressed mostly by leaders in the energy industry and healthcare, are also examples of benefits provided by others. Thus, when leaders are successful in their leadership role, their positive value as members of the culture of organizational leadership is transmitted to them by the organization through the provision of various benefits.

Valued membership may also be transmitted by the avoidance of consequences that result from failing to display the leadership attributes and abilities valued by the organization. Three participants stated that they knew they were successful because they were still employed by the organization: BSL020 Employment continuance. One participant was terminated as a result of being evaluated as unsuccessful by her/his own leader⁴. Other consequences of unsuccessful leadership behaviour that are representative of the leaders’ valued membership levied by the organization included the erosion of trust in relationships, negative impact on compensation, loss of career opportunities, and reduced scores on performance ratings.

The positive affect (BSL021) realized as a result of successful leadership behaviours, and the negative affect (CUL006) commensurate with unsuccessful leadership behaviours, likely, in part, arise from the agency of the organization characterized by its provision of benefits and

⁴ It is noteworthy here that participant 009 stated that she/he believed that she/he was aligned with the leadership expectations of the organization, but believed that her/his leader was not. Because the participant’s employment was terminated, the organization’s transmission of the participant’s value—transmitted by her/his leader in the form of termination of employment—is more salient than the leader’s own self-assessment of her/his valued membership in that organization’s culture of organizational leadership roles.

levying of consequences in order to express the value of the participants' leadership behaviour. Therefore, I propose that the provision of benefits and the levying of consequences supports the assertion that organizational leadership roles provide for valued membership. The manifesting of positive and negative affect provides some indication of the influence this valuation may have on the participants. However, and with consideration to TMT literature in the tripartite construction of theory, its manifestation is not necessary for the construction of a theory of self-esteem.

Tripartite Construction of a Theory of Self-esteem

The previous discussion of tripartite theory construction, that includes consideration of interview content within the context of TMT literature, facilitates the construction of a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem, in that organizational leadership roles are a culture that provide for valued membership; specifically, terror management theory shows that valued membership in a culture of meaning is the source of self-esteem (see Greenberg et al., 1986; Solomon et al., 1991). The strength and durability, with respect to the sense of personal value provided by the culture (Greenberg et al., 1986, p. 203), depends on the degree to which the member perceives her organizational leadership role as portraying “life as meaningful, important, and enduring,” and the degree to which she believes she plays “an important part in that drama” (Greenberg, 2008, p. 198). As stated earlier, such beliefs satisfy the definition of the two-component theory of self-esteem posited by TMT (Greenberg et al., 1986, pp. 197-205), and facilitate “the possibility of leading a meaningful and enduring existence” (Greenberg, 2008, p. 206). Thus, a theory of organizational leadership as anxiety-buffer against the annihilation of existence posited by Becker (1997)—as a source of self-esteem—is realized. Here, it is critical

that I state that, although I believe the tripartite construction of this theory to be valid, I do not assert that the participants in this study derive self-esteem from their leadership roles. However, such subsequent investigation, perhaps employing the quantitative methods employed in experimental existential psychology, is discussed below as a recommendation for future research.

Application

Corbin and Straus (1990) stated that the success of research should be determined by its product (p. 16). Although a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem was not discovered in the interview content and, thus, was constructed only within the context of TMT literature, the theory does augment existing understanding of organizational behaviour and has broad application. I propose that an understanding of how leaders may be deriving self-esteem from their role, how the actions of others may be perceived as a threat to this source of self-esteem, and finally how leaders may respond to the threat, can inform how the performance of leaders is managed, how leadership development efforts are structured and communicated, and how one can increase awareness of the meaning of one's own leadership practice.

Performance management.

In this study, participants described their own and their organizations' responses to their successes and failures to meet the organizations' leadership expectations. Such responses from the organizations could be said to moderate the participants' behaviour. For example, participant 002 perceived feedback regarding her/his poor leadership performance as motivating and "only positive" because it was delivered with respect and compassion. In this instance, the

organization's performance management efforts resulted in the participant becoming motivated to improve her/his leadership performance. Additionally, the participant did not provide a disparaging critique of the organization in regard to this event. Thus, and if the participant had been deriving a measure of self-esteem from her/his leadership role, one can conclude that the organization's performance management strategy did not threaten this source of self-esteem. TMT literature shows that if this source of self-esteem were threatened, then it is likely that the participant would have engaged in behaviour that served to bolster her/his leadership behaviour and, possibly, disparaged the organization's perspective with respect to what constitutes appropriate leadership behaviour. This hypothesis is supported by anxiety-buffer experiments conducted by Harmon-Jones et al. (1996), in that we usually respond unfavorably to those who disagree with us and favorably to those who support our worldview, because supporters strengthen our cultural anxiety-buffer and dissenters serve to weaken it (p. 678).

Participant 009 provided an example of what may be characterized as an unfavorable response to the organization's management of her/his performance. This participant defended her/his leadership behaviour as being aligned with organizational expectations and stated that her/his supervisor's expectations were not so aligned. The participant's employment was terminated. Here, if we assume that the participant derived a measure of self-esteem from being a leader, and with respect to Harmon-Jones (1996), then the participant's behaviour—the disparaging remarks—can be explained as an attempt to defend her/his anxiety-buffering worldview of leadership in response to performance management efforts that served to threaten the worldview. Participant 009's comments that “a very uncomfortable situation” and “tension”

resulted, describe an environment opposite to that created when participant 002's unsatisfactory performance was managed. Unlike participant 009, participant 002 remained employed within the organization and progressed in her/his role.

If an organization's performance management efforts are intended to improve the performance of employees, and not a mechanism employed to harass workers out of the organization, and if the desired outcome is to have employees engaged in their work and demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational commitment, while at the same time performing their roles in the manner desired by the organization, then such strategies must include attention to the avoidance of threats to self-esteem. To be successful, the preservation of self-esteem must be attended to in all performance management efforts; since, one may not perceive that a leader is deriving a measure of self-esteem from her/his leadership role until the leadership behaviour, or continuance in the leadership role itself, is threatened. The consequences of performance management efforts that do not attend to the preservation of self-esteem may be that of bolstering or denigrating behaviour and comments from leaders who derive a measure of self-esteem from their role. Such behaviour may include the leader disparaging the leadership attributes and abilities valued by the organization, or the leader may assign blame for their own poor leadership performance to others in the organization or to factors outside of their perceived span of control. Leaders may inappropriately or aggressively defend their conception of proper leadership behaviour. Lastly, leaders may withdraw and disengage from their roles, demonstrate low organizational commitment or exit the organization in order to avoid continued performance management and to protect their own worldview of appropriate

leadership behaviour.

Although the development of specific performance management strategies that serve to preserve self-esteem are beyond the scope of this study, guidance for their development may be found in the transcripts of three⁵ of the four participants who described their own performance management as motivating: participant 010 said, “I brought [the problem] to my leaders and explained to them that there was something for me to learn in this. I had great support from my leadership team”; participant 011 said, “As a person responsible for their own actions, I spent a lot of time thinking about why things went the way they did. There was a lot of thinking about how I’m not going to get caught again in this same kind of mess”; and participant 012 said, “it’s those times when things have not gone well where the biggest leadership jump happens. From those you will often propel because they are meaningful for you.”

Leadership development and personal leadership practice.

Although comments from leaders who experienced the management of their poor leadership performance as a motivator can inform performance management practice, these comments may also serve to inform the content and presentation of leadership development programs. Firstly, however, one must consider how the mere existence of a leadership development program may be experienced as a threat to the self-esteem of some organizational leaders. Although Harmon-Jones et al.’s (1997) study discusses the mortality salience hypothesis, one can speculate that a leader, forced to participate in a leadership development program, may manifest negative evaluations “of people whose behavior, beliefs, or mere

⁵ Only the transcripts of those participants who consented to the secondary use of data are provided in Appendix C.

existence” (p. 25) impinges on the anxiety-buffering self-esteem provided by the valued membership the leader perceives she currently enjoys in her role.

Development is synonymous with change, for if the status quo were acceptable and desired, there would be no requirement to transition to some future state. Bridges (2004) stated that, “it is also transition rather than change that people notoriously resist” (p. 82). Thus, leaders who derive self-esteem from their organizational role must perceive leadership development as non-threatening to their current leadership practice if they are to be engaged in organizational efforts to improve or change leadership behaviour. When attending such development programs, participants may manifest threats to self-esteem by avoiding opportunities for introspection, aggressively challenging the curriculum and bolstering their existing leadership behaviour, not participating in follow-on activities, or by attempting to discredit the program in conversations with their peers or direct reports. Although preserving self-esteem may be difficult to achieve in advance of participation in leadership development activities, it can be incorporated into the program content and presentation.

Five participants in this study cited valued inclusion with other leaders as a benefit realized as a consequence of successful leadership behaviour. Four participants cited professional development as a benefit. Thus, framing leadership development as a reward for already-successful leadership behaviour may contribute to preserving self-esteem. Having leaders reflect on their most successful leadership experiences may also serve to preserve or bolster self-esteem in advance of inviting the leader to consider new concepts and approaches. As discussed in the literature review, Harmon-Jones et al. (1997) showed that participants with higher self-esteem

engaged in more worldview defense. Thus, leaders with high self-esteem may be more resistant to changing their leadership behaviour. The strategies discussed above may serve to moderate the inevitable impacts to self-esteem that manifest as new leadership knowledge is incrementally introduced.

Ideally, leadership development would include a discussion of why humans need self-esteem and how it may be provided by participation in an organizational leadership role. However, increasing awareness of why humans need self-esteem and how they strive to obtain it may cause some people to question their existing behaviour. For example, a leader becoming aware that her leadership role is her primary source of self-esteem may cause her to question her career choices. Of course, this awareness may also result in the leader becoming more secure and successful in her role.

Incorporating an understanding of self-esteem striving into leadership development may serve to moderate personal leadership practice, and, more importantly, make one's behaviour more conscious. Efforts to create, transmit and sustain organizational culture and employee engagement strategies—all done in order to maximize profit in corporations, and to improve service delivery in government and not-for-profit organizations—make the telling of certain truths impossible. James Hollis (1998), a prolific Jungian analyst, reminded us that companies do not love us, they rent our behaviour “only so long as that behavior is productive and makes money for the corporation” (p. 103). However, organizational culture, as I have shown with respect to leadership roles, provides for the construction of a meaningful life for its conscious and unconscious subscribers—as do many other cultures, sub-cultures, micro-cultures, groups,

etc. How, then, do we reconcile the purpose-built culture of organizational leadership roles with our own legitimate need for meaning? Again, Hollis (1998) provided guidance: “the quality of our relationships to others is a direct function of the relationship we have with ourselves” (p. 101). Thus, I propose that personal leadership practice may be improved by developing a non-judgmental understanding of the leadership role’s utility: its usefulness to the leader, and how the leader is served by the role.

Recommendations for Future Research

As stated above, I believe this to be the first study that presents a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem within the context of terror management theory. Experimental social psychology, and more recently experimental existential psychology (see Greenberg et al., 2004; and others), provides the necessary framework and rigor for the falsification of this theory and for the testing of the hypotheses I have proposed. With respect to applied research, researchers may investigate the efficacy of incorporating awareness of sources of self-esteem into leadership development programs; including discussion regarding behaviour that may manifest when sources of self-esteem—the belief in a worldview that provides a meaningful and enduring conception of existence, and the belief that one plays a valued role in the worldview—are threatened. Other applied research may include investigating the efficacy of incorporating strategies that serve to preserve self-esteem into performance management policy and practice.

The interview content raised many questions, investigation of which is beyond the scope of this study. For example, three leaders in not-for-profit organizations expressed that they

enjoyed valued inclusion with other leaders as a consequence of success (BSL022), while at the same time did not express that they enjoyed the task of interacting with, or opportunities to be included with, other leaders (ELT009). Additionally, only one leader in the energy industry expressed the organizational expectation to be transparent (OLA001), while at the same time no leaders in the energy industry expressed the organizational expectation that they maintain ideological discipline (OLA008). Future research may attempt to understand the correlation between the degree of organizational member socialization to the degree to which socializing agents demonstrate transparency. Also, eleven of the twelve participants stated that a benefit of successful leadership behaviour was the experience of some measure of positive affect. However, only one participant expressed an organizational expectation that she/he derive personal satisfaction or realize an alignment between personal and organizational values. Such anomalies and incongruences in the data may serve to inspire future research. Lastly, questions regarding how the organizations transmitted the participants' performance, and questions regarding how the participants perceived their staff or peers were valued by the organization, were asked as ice-breaking questions in order to establish rapport. Future researchers may analyze participants' responses to these questions; provided in the ten transcripts in Appendix C.

Research discussed in the literature review shows a correlation between job loss and suicide, and job loss and ill health. I propose that there may be a category of threats to participation in organizational leadership roles that may be commensurate with mortality salience. Further research may investigate if various threats to employment—threats of being fired—produce responses similar to those correlated to the mortality salience treatment described

by Solomon et al. (2004, p. 21). For example, a supervisor telling one of her direct reports that she thought he was ineffective in his organizational role and that he should be terminated, would likely serve to manifest different behaviour than if the same message was delivered by a stranger not employed by the organization. Then, if the strength and durability of his organizational role as a source of self-esteem was sufficiently high, and with respect to the literature illustrating the correlation between job loss and suicide, I propose that the worker's response may be similar to that correlated to the mortality salience treatment. This hypothesis may be investigated in future research.

Conclusion

This study presents a construction of a theory of organizational leadership roles as a source of self-esteem for leaders within the context of terror management theory. Thematic analysis of interview content served to describe organizational leadership roles as a culture that provides for valued membership. TMT literature shows that valued membership in a culture of meaning is a source of self-esteem. For organizational leadership roles to be a source of self-esteem for an individual, the two-component theory of self-esteem posited by TMT must be satisfied: an individual's belief that the organizational leadership role "portrays life as meaningful, important, and enduring" (Greenberg, 2008, p. 198) and the individual's concurrent belief that she plays an important role—is valued—in this cultural drama. If these beliefs are present, then the organizational leadership role meets the criteria for a source of self-esteem. The strength and durability of such beliefs with respect to other cultural worldviews will moderate the relative magnitude of the sources of self-esteem in the person's life. However, understanding that a person may be realizing a measure of self-esteem from participation in an organizational leadership role can inform performance management practice, leadership development programs and personal leadership practice.

References

- Abstract. (2000). In *The Canadian Oxford Paperback Dictionary*. Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Allison, S. T., Eylon, D., Beggan, J. K., & Bachelder, J. (2009). The demise of leadership: Positivity and negativity biases in evaluations of dead leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 115-129.
- Becker, E. (1997). *The denial of death*. New York, NY: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Blustein, D. L. (2006). *The psychology of working: A new perspective for career development, counseling, and public policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Burke, B., L., Martens, A., & Faucher, E. H. (2010). Two decades of terror management theory: A meta-analysis of mortality salience research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(2), 155-195.
- Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., & Paladino, M. (2004). Transcending oneself through social identification. In J. Greenberg, S. L. Koole, & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.), *Handbook of experimental existential psychology* (pp. 305-321). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., Paladino, M. P., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2), 135-143.
- Catalano, R. (1991). The health effects of economic insecurity. *American Journal of Public Health*, 81(9), 1148-1152.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*

- analysis*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Classen, T. J., & Dunn, R. A. (2012). The effect of job loss and unemployment duration on suicide risk in the United States: A new look using mass-layoffs and unemployment duration. *Health Economics*, *21*(3), 338-350.
- Cohen, F., Solomon, S., Maxfield, M., Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (2004). Fatal attraction: The effects of mortality salience on evaluations of charismatic, task-oriented, and relationship-oriented leaders. *Psychological Science*, *15*(12), 846-851.
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3-21.
- Cox, C. R., Goldenberg, J. L., Arndt, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2007). Mother's milk: An existential perspective on negative reactions to breast-feeding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(1), 110-122.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Eliason, M., & Storrie, D. (2009). Does job loss shorten life?. *Journal of Human Resources*, *44*(2), 277-302.
- Ernest Becker. (n.d.). In Wikipedia. Retrieved May 23, 2015, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ernest_Becker
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2009). *Theories of personality* (7th. Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Franzoi, S. L. (2007). Symbolic interactionism. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.),

- Encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 961-963). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gatherer, D. (2014). The 2014 Ebola virus disease outbreak in West Africa. *Journal of General Virology*, 95, 1619-1624.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.
- Gordijn, E. H., & Stapel, D. A. (2008). When controversial leaders with charisma are effective: The influence of terror on the need for vision and impact of mixed attitudinal messages. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 389-411.
- Grant, A. M., & Wade-Benzoni, K. A. (2009). The hot and cool of death awareness at work: Mortality cues, aging, and self-protective and prosocial motivations. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(4), 600-622.
- Greenberg, J. (2008). Understanding the vital human quest for self-esteem. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 48-55.
- Greenberg, J., Koole, S.L., & Pyszczynski, T. (2004). *Handbook of experimental existential psychology*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R.F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and*

private self (pp. 189-212). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag Inc.

Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Harmon-Jones, E., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1995).

Testing alternative explanations for mortality salience effects: Terror management, value accessibility, or worrisome thoughts?. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(4), 417-433.

Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., Rosenblatt, A., Burling, J., Lyon, D., . . . & Pinel, E. (1992). Why do people need self-esteem? Converging evidence that self-esteem serves an anxiety-buffering function. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(6), 913-922.

Hamilton, D. L., & Crump, S. A. (2007). Entitativity. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 300-302). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Harmon-Jones, E., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Simon, L. (1996). The effects of mortality salience on intergroup bias between minimal groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(4), 677-681.

Harmon-Jones, E., Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & McGregor, H. (1997). Terror management theory and self-esteem: Evidence that increased self-esteem reduced mortality salience effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(1), 24-36.

Heath, H., & Cowley, S. (2004). Developing a grounded theory approach: A comparison of Glaser and Strauss. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41(2), 141-150.

- Hogg, M. A. (2007). Social identity theory. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 901-903). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hollis, J. (1998). *The Eden project: In search of the magical other*. Toronto, Canada: Inner City Books.
- Homan, M., & Miller, L. J. (2008). *Coaching in organizations: Best coaching practices from the Ken Blanchard companies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hoyt, C. L., Simon, S., & Innella, A. N. (2011). Taking a turn toward the masculine: The impact of mortality salience on implicit leadership theories. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 374-381.
- Hoyt, C. L., Simon, S., & Reid, L. (2009). Choosing the best (wo)man for the job: The effects of mortality salience, sex, and gender stereotypes on leader evaluations. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 233-246.
- Jaynes, J. (2000). *The origin of consciousness in the break down of the bicameral mind*. New York, NY: Mariner Books.
- Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jonas, E., Kauffeld, S., Sullivan, D., & Fritsche, I. (2011). Dedicate your life to the company! A terror management perspective on organizations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(12), 2858-2882.
- Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in

- intuitive judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment* (pp. 49-81). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalof, L., Dan, A., & Dietz, T. (2008). *Essentials of social research*. Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kanter, R. M. (1971). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. *American Sociological Review*, 36(2), 333-334.
- Keen, S. (1997). In E. Becker, *The denial of death* (pp. xi-xvi). New York, NY: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative research in the study of leadership*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Kotter, J. P. (ed.). (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*. Harvard Business Press.
- Langton, N., Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2010). *Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications* (5th Canadian ed.). Toronto, Canada: Pearson Canada Inc.
- Locke, K. (1996). Rewriting the discovery of grounded theory after 25 years?. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5, 239-245.
- Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2009). *FYI For your improvement: A guide for development and coaching* (5th ed.). Lominger International.
- Martin, J. (2012). Revisiting Ernest Becker's psychology of human striving. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 53(2), 131-152.
- McCurdy, D. W. (2006). Using anthropology. In J. Spradley & D. W. McCurdy

- (Eds.), *Conformity and conflict: Readings in cultural anthropology* (12th ed.) (pp. 422-435). San Francisco, CA: Pearson.
- Miller, M. A., & Rahe, R. H. (1997). Life changes scaling for the 1990s. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 43(3), 279-292.
- Navaneelan, T. (2012). *Suicide rates: An overview*. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Park, K. (2005). Choosing childlessness: Weber's typology of action and motives of the voluntarily childless. *Sociological Inquiry*, 75(3), 372-402.
- Pierce, J. L., & Gardner, D. G. (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management*, 30(5), 591-622.
- Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., & Dunham, R. B. (1989). Organization-based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 622-648.
- Reber, A. S., Allen, R., & Reber, E. S. (2009). *Penguin dictionary of psychology*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- RRU Academic Council. (2012). *Request for ethical review for research involving humans*. Retrieved 18 May, 2014 from <http://research.royalroads.ca/ethics-students>
- Schein, E. H. (1980). *Organizational psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Schmidt, J. (2000). *Disciplined minds: A critical look at salaried professionals and the soul-battering system that shapes their lives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers,

Inc.

Scott, L. S. (2009). *Two is enough: A couple's guide to living childless by choice*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Sharf, R. (2010). *Applying career development theory to counseling* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.

Sheppard, M. (2004). *Appraising and using social research in the human services: An introduction for social work and health professionals*. Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1991). A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, 93-159.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2004). *The cultural animal: Twenty years of terror management theory and research*. In J. Greenberg, S. L. Koole, & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.), *Handbook of experimental existential psychology* (pp. 13-34). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Schimel, J., Arndt, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2004). Human awareness of mortality and the evolution of culture. In M. Schaller & C. S. Crandall (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture* (pp. 15-40). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Statistics Canada. (2014, February 25). *Survey of Financial Security, 2012*. Retrieved May 23, 2015 from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/140225/dq140225b-eng.htm>

- Stein, J. H., & Cropanzano, R. (2011). Death awareness and organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(8), 1189-1193.
- Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 633-642.
- Transparent. (2000). In *The Canadian Oxford Paperback Dictionary*. Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Watson, T. J. (2012). *Sociology, work and organization* (6th ed.). Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Wilson, J., & Gislason, M. (2010). *Coaching skills for nonprofit managers and leaders: Developing people to achieve your mission*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A: Tabulated Data

Table A1

Leadership attributes and abilities valued by the organization (OLA)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
OLA007 Results orientation	008E; 010E; 011H; 013E; 015H; 009E; 002N; 014H; 001N	9	1	3	2	4	1	2	2
OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character	008E; 010E; 012H; 011H; 015H; 009E; 002N; 014H	8	2	4	1	3	2	1	3
OLA001 Demonstrate transparency	012H; 011H; 003N; 014H; 001N	5	3	3	2	0	0	2	2
OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline	005N; 008E; 011H; 015H; 001N	5	3	2	3	1	4	2	2
OLA015 Build capacity in others	005N; 008E; 013E; 015H; 001N	5	3	1	4	2	3	2	2
OLA018 Be strategic	008E; 10E; 13E; 003N; 002N	5	3	0	0	3	2	2	2

Table continues

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
OLA012 Demonstrate interpersonal and communication skill	015H; 01N; 002N; 013E	4	4	1	4	1	4	2	2
OLA003 Demonstrate collaboration	012H; 11H; 015H	3	5	3	2	0	0	0	0
OLA025 In-discipline competency	003N;002N; 001N	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	1
OLA002 Demonstrate accountability	012H; 03N	2	6	1	4	0	0	1	3
OLA0024 Derive personal satisfaction/alignment	005N	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	3
OLA016 Be independent	015H	1	7	1	4	0	0	0	0

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Table A2

Benefits of leadership success (BSL)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
BSL021 Positive affect	005N; 08E; 010E; 12H; 013E; 15H; 009E; 02N; 014H; 01N; 011H	11	1	4	1	4	1	3	1
BSL003 Influence	008E; 010E; 012H; 11H; 013E; 15H; 009E; 02N; 014H; 01N	10	2	4	1	4	1	2	2
BSL013 Recognition	011H; 13E; 015H; 09E; 003N; 02N; 001N	7	3	2	3	2	2	3	1
BSL015 Autonomy	008E; 12H; 011H; 15H; 001N	5	4	3	2	1	3	1	3
BSL022 Valued inclusion	011H; 09E; 003N; 01N; 002N	5	4	1	4	1	3	3	1
BSL010 Professional development	012H; 11H; 013E; 02N;	4	5	2	3	1	3	1	3
BSL019 Financial compensation	008E; 11H; 013E; 15H;	4	5	2	3	2	2	0	0

Table continues

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
BSL006 Participate externally	010E; 12H	3	6	1	4	1	3	0	0
BSL020 Employment continuance	005N; 08E; 001N	3	6	0	0	1	3	2	2
BSL002 Advancement	008E; 12H; 013E	2	7	1	4	2	2	0	0
BSL016 Tolerance for mistakes	015H; 14H	2	7	2	3	0	0	0	0
BSL025 Contribute to society	002N	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	3

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Table A3

Consequences of unsuccessful leadership (CUL)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
CUL006 Negative affect	005N; 010E; 012H; 011H; 009E; 002N	6	1	2	1	2	2	2	1
CUL015 Reduced trust	008E; 012H; 011H; 013E; 009E; 001N	6	1	2	1	3	1	1	2
CUL004 Motivation to improve	010E; 012H; 011H; 002N	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	2
CUL001 Increased workload	012H	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
CUL009 Negative impact on compensation	011H	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
CUL010 Loss of career opportunity	013E	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0
CUL011 Negative impact on performance rating	013E	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0
CUL012 Termination of employment	009E	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Table A4

Enjoyable leadership tasks (ELT)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
ELT003 Build capacity in others	012H; 011H; 009E; 003N; 014H; 001N; 10E	7	1	3	1	2	1	2	2
ELT004 Being strategic	011H; 013E; 003N; 002N; 001N; 009E	6	1	1	3	2	1	3	1
ELT001 Contribute in technical discipline or on project	013E; 015H; 002N; 012H	4	2	2	2	1	2	1	3
ELT006 Facilitating implementation	011H; 013E; 002N	3	3	1	3	1	2	1	3
ELT002 Advance careers of others	012E; 002N	2	4	0	0	1	2	1	3
ELT 011 Management or administration	003N	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	3
ELT005 Collaborating	011H	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0
ELT009 Interaction / inclusion with other leaders	011H	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0
ELT012 Engage or promote externally	003N	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	3

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Table A5

Unenjoyable leadership tasks (ULT)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
ULT005 Administration or management	010E; 013E; 015H;003N; 002N;001N	6	1	1	1	2	1	3	1
ULT006 Managing problem performance	013E;002N; 001N	3	2	0	0	1	2	2	2
ULT002 Being politically savvy	011H; 001N	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	3
ULT010 Managing internal conflict	014H; 001N	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	3
ULT001 Dealing with ambiguity	012H	1	4	1	0	0	2	0	0
ULT008 Providing excessive direction	009E	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	0
ULT009 Managing external conflict	003N	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	3

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Table A6

Leadership tasks regularly performed (RLT)

Label	Participants	Total	Ranking	H Total	H Ranking	E Total	E Ranking	N Total	N Ranking
RLT006 Facilitating implementation	013E; 15H; 009E; 003N; 002N; 014H	6	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
RLT009 Helping others be successful	010E; 009E; 002N; 14H	4	2	1	2	2	1	1	2
RLT007 Being strategic	013E; 15H; 002N	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	2
RLT008 Contribute in technical discipline or on project	013E; 15H; 002N	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	2
RLT001 Attending meetings	014H	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
RLT012 Engage or promote externally	003N	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	2

Note. Participant identification numbers, industry total and industry ranking are appended with the participant's industry sector of H, E or N; representing healthcare, energy and not-for-profit, respectively.

Appendix B: Coding Manual

This coding manual presents a method of thematic content analysis based on Boyatzis (Klenke, 2008, pp. 94-96). Thematic codes are grouped in categories that were developed through conceptual ordering (Sheppard, 2004, pp. 182-183). The leadership attributes valued by the participants' organizations (OLA), the benefits realized by the participant when they were successful (BSL), and the consequences of unsuccessful leadership (CUL) serve to show how participants are valued within the micro-culture (McCurdy, 2006, p. 3) of organizational leadership roles. Enjoyable (ELT), unenjoyable (ULT) and regular (RLT) leadership tasks, along with organizational leadership expectations, serve to operationally define the micro-culture.

Organizational Leadership Attributes (OLA)

Demonstrate transparency (OLA001).

Definition.

This is the expectation to be readily understood by communicating in a frank, direct and open manner (Transparent, 2000, pp. 1120-1121).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to demonstrate transparency in their communication and or action. Expressions of this theme include: "My leader expects me to be transparent"; "we are expected to say what we mean and mean what we say."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of ethical behaviour, being respectful of others, or admirable or virtuous character traits. Expressions of

this theme may include: “leaders here are expected to be honest and trustworthy”; “we need to be fair and put people first.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Demonstrate accountability (OLA002).

Definition.

This is the expectation of having to account for one’s actions and actions of staff within the participant’s span of control.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to be held to account; be accountable; value accountability; accept responsibility for outcomes; show ownership; take-the-fall; or not blame others for unfavorable outcomes. Expressions of this theme may include: “they expect me to own my mistakes”; “they don’t accept excuses or blaming others.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being result-oriented, decisive, confident or professional. Examples of exclusions include: “leaders are expected to drive for results”; “it’s the outcome that matters, not how we get there”; “we’re expected to make decisions, and then make it happen.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Demonstrate collaboration (OLA003).***Definition.***

This is the expectation to actively participate with others in order to achieve an outcome.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to be collaborative; collaborate; work with others; seek consensus; value teamwork; solicit feedback and include such feedback in a final decision that is made by the majority of participants involved. Expressions of this theme may include: “we’re expected to work together to solve problems”; “I work with my team and we arrive at the solution together”; “we all contribute to decision-making.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of creating alignment; motivating others; coaching or mentoring; leading by example; problem-solving outside of being collaborative; or facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: “I get feedback from everyone before I make the decision”; “I work with my team to keep things moving.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Be ethical, equitable or of good character (OLA004).***Definition.***

This is the expectation to act in a manner that society would judge to be moral, or to act in accordance with a standard of ethics attributable to a profession.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to act ethically, or to possess or demonstrate an admirable or virtuous trait that would be demonstrated within their organizational role and outside of the organization. This theme may be described as being fair or equitable to others; ensuring dignity; being respectful; or avoiding adverse consequences to others. It may also be expressed as demonstrating personal leadership or professionalism. Expressions of this theme may include: “around here, we are expected to do the right thing”; “leaders are expected to be respectful of everyone, regardless of their position.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of themes otherwise coded as demonstrating transparency; accountability; developing trusted relationships; or, building capacity in others. Examples of exclusions include: “this organization values building strong teams”; “leaders here have to be willing to stand up and be counted”; “we’re expected to say what we mean.”

Aggregation.

Authenticity (OLA009), *Professionalism* (OLA020), *Lead by example* (OLA021), and *Personal leadership* (OLA022) were aggregated to this code.

Demonstrate results-orientation (OLA007).***Definition.***

This is the expectation to achieve specified or unspecified outcomes, to focus on results more than on process or effort, and to facilitate others’ attainment of results.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to achieve results or ensure that outcomes have a specific characteristic or meet some condition(s), such as quality or efficiency; align others to objectives or goals outside of the requirement to maintain ideological discipline; motivate or otherwise influence others to achieve organizational objectives; create, modify or improve processes in order to achieve results in a desired manner. Expressions of this theme may include: “I’m expected to help others prioritize and remove road blocks”; “I’m expected to understand the problem and take action to solve it.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of demonstrating accountability, in general; being confident; thinking or acting strategically; occasionally working in a technical discipline or managing a project in a manner similar to that of an individual contributor. Examples of exclusions include: “I’m expected to understand financial accounting”; “I enjoy getting involved in projects.”

Aggregation.

Decisiveness (OLA006), *Quality orientation* (OLA010), *Efficiency orientation* (OLA014), *Creating alignment or motivating* (OLA019), and *Facilitate implementation* (OLA026) were aggregated to this code.

Maintain ideological discipline (OLA008).***Definition.***

This is the expectation of “adherence to an assigned point of view” (Schmidt, 2000, pp. 15-16).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how the organization expects her to align her own, and align others' methods, practices, approaches, values, vision, or communication with those made explicit or implicit by actors in the organization or by the culture of the organization. Expressions of this theme may include: "we are expected to put the company's values and interests ahead of our own"; "leaders are expected to get everyone aligned with our corporate values."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of accountability; results orientation; aligning others to the participants point of view; leading by example; coincidental alignment of personal values with those of the organization. Examples of exclusions include: "I spend a lot of time aligning the activities of my staff with my objectives"; "the organization's values are aligned with my own personal values."

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Demonstrate interpersonal and communication skills (OLA012).***Definition.***

This is the expectation to relate to all kinds of people (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, p. 193) and be an effective communicator and presenter.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to form, attend to, or leverage relationships; relate to a range of personalities inside and outside of the

organization; how they need to be effective communicators and modify their communication style based on target audience characteristics; how they are expected to effectively present ideas and build consensus for them. This may require them to attend to organizational politics by being politically savvy (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, pp. 291-295). Expressions of this theme may include: “leaders need to develop trust”; “success here is all about forming key relationships”; “I need to market and advocate for my team.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of collaboration; building capacity in others; being strategic; being ethical; being professional; driving for results. Examples of exclusions include: “we solve things together as a team”; “I make sure I have the right people on the team.”

Aggregation.

Communication skill (OLA013) was aggregated to this code.

Build capacity in others (OLA015).

Definition.

This is the expectation to create or enhance an individual’s or group’s “ability to perform a task” (Sharf, 2010, p. 30) in the present or in the future, or to ensure the personal and professional development of staff.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to act toward others such that their action serves to improve others’ performance within current roles, in future roles inside or outside of the organization, or in some aspect of the others’ personal life. The

action of the participant may serve to develop a competency, such as problem solving, or a personal trait, such as confidence. Expressions of this theme may include: “we are expected to empower others”; “we are expected to develop talent.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of collaboration; developing trusting relationships; creating alignment in others; motivating others; facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: “I make sure my staff have the tools they need to complete their work”; “I spend time making sure they are energized to complete their work.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Be independent (OLA016).

Definition.

This is the expectation to be successful in a role without needing a lot of direction or support from superiors.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to be independent; autonomous; to not need direction or supervision; to be a self-starter or be self-directed; figure things out on their own; cut their own path. Expressions of this theme may include: “they expect leaders to be able to figure things out without a lot of direction”; “they don’t want leaders to need a lot of hand-holding.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of having

confidence or other positive affect; being results oriented; being accountable; being strategic. Examples of exclusions include: “leaders are expected to own their mistakes”; “leaders are expected to get ahead of the curve and in front of their teams.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Be strategic (OLA018).

Definition.

This is the expectation to have a broad perspective, be future oriented, anticipate future consequences and develop plans to address likely future scenarios (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, p. 351).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to take a systems approach; plan for the future; identify and appropriately assess threats and opportunities; develop a vision or have line-of-sight. Expressions of this theme may include: “I’m expected to think beyond my own department”; “leaders are expected to create a vision and make sure our plans are viable.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of solving problems; removing road blocks; developing others; gaining or exercising influence; facilitating implementation of organizational goals or strategy. Examples of exclusions include: “if there is something that will impede my team, it’s my job to address it”; “I need to translate the vision into a plan.”

Aggregation.

Systems thinking (OLA017) was aggregated to this code.

Derive personal satisfaction / alignment (OLA024).***Definition.***

This is the expectation of deriving a sense of personal satisfaction or positive affect through, or as a consequence of, employment with the participant's organization or in the performance of the leadership role.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to derive a sense of personal satisfaction or feel some positive affect through the performance of their role or through association with the organization. The participant may discuss how value congruence (Blustein, 2006, p. 141) is a condition of employment with the organization or an expectation of leaders within the organization. Expressions of this theme may include: "the work itself is its own reward"; "I'm here because this is the kind of work that is important to me."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being expected to adopt or display the values of the organization or of others. Examples of exclusions include: "leaders are expected to live the values of the organization"; "I align my communication with how my leader communicates to me."

Aggregation.

Alignment of personal values (OLA023) was aggregated to this code.

In-discipline competency (OLA025).***Definition.***

This is the expectation for the participant to possess or exercise expertise in a technical or professional discipline.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are expected to have expertise in the business or endeavor of the organization, or in that of staff under the participant's span of control. Expressions of this theme may include: "the board expects an expert to be leading this organization"; "the first criteria for leadership in this organization is technical competency."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of contributing in a discipline or a project, similar to that of an individual contributor, within the context of it being an enjoyable, unenjoyable or regular task of the participant's role, outside of expressing it as an expectation of the leadership role; being results oriented; being efficiency oriented; building capacity in others; motivating facilitating implementation; problem solving. Examples of exclusions include: "I spend my time solving problems, managing projects and removing road blocks"; "leaders need to understand what's happening and drive for results"; "I spend a lot of time mentoring junior staff."

Aggregation.

Financial management competency (OLA027) was aggregated to this code.

Benefits of Successful Leadership (BSL)**Advancement (BSL002).*****Definition.***

This is the attainment of promotion or advancement within the organizational structure or hierarchy.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they realize a more legitimately powerful position (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, pp. 301-302) within the organization's hierarchy or structure. Expressions of this theme may include: "you get a better job"; "you become more promotable."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of increases in financial compensation; referent power (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, p. 303); increased or improved relationships; increased trust; preferential allocation of resources; opportunities to contribute in a different way inside or outside of the organization, and outside of the context of advancement in the organizational hierarchy or structure; the realization of ability to exercise influence. Examples of exclusions include: "the benefit is that, the higher you go the more money you make"; "as you move up you get treated better."

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Influence (BSL003).***Definition.***

This is the attainment of favorable treatment, or the acknowledgement of, or permission to, exercise referent or legitimate power (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, pp. 301-303).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are able to attain preferential treatment or allocation of resources. Favorable treatment may be a consequence of being perceived as credible. This theme may also be within the context of creating or increasing trust in relationships with other leaders, peers or direct reports. Influence may also be realized by being permitted to contribute their opinion or expertise in a new context, usually across or vertically along organizational boundaries; may include mentoring, coaching or otherwise developing capacity in others. Since one or more bases of power (Langton, Robbins & Judge, 2010, pp. 300-304) are usually associated with status, a participant's statement or description of an increase in status is correlated to an increase in power and the ability to influence others. Expressions of this theme may include: "I've built relationships with people so I can count on them when I need help"; "the more I'm seen as a successful leader, the more opportunities I have to contribute outside of my own discipline"; "when you're a successful leader, you get opportunities to help others grow and succeed."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being included in meetings or events from which they might otherwise be excluded, without exercising influence at the meetings or events; opportunities to form relationships with others without

expressions or descriptions of exercising influence; opportunities to engage with the community or opportunities to contribute to the betterment of society. Examples of exclusions include: “as I realized success, I tended to get invited to more senior meetings”; “I value the deepening of my relationship with the Board.”

Aggregation.

Opportunity for a different role (BSL001), *Secure the engagement of others* (renamed BSL003 to *Influence*), *Credibility* (BSL005), *Contribute in a new context* (BSL008), *Mentoring* (BSL009), *Status* (BSL014), *Preferential allocation of resources* (BSL017), *Increased trust relationship* (BSL018), and *Building capacity in others* (BSL023) were aggregated to this code.

Participate externally (BSL006).

Definition.

This is the attainment of opportunities to participate in activities that are outside of the organization’s core business or endeavor.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they have opportunities to engage with the community, academia, professional organizations, or other peer organizations, that would otherwise not be available to them if they were not successful in their leadership role. Expressions of this theme may include: “I get to talk to people outside of the organization about my leadership role”; “because I’m a successful leader, I was asked to join the board of my professional organization.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working or

influencing across organizational boundaries; developing the capacity of others within the organization; freedom-of-movement within the organization; specific contributions to the betterment of society. Examples of exclusions include: “I get to participate in meetings within the organization that are focused on matters outside of my technical discipline”; “when I’m successful, I get to have a big impact on the community.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Professional development (BSL010).

Definition.

This is the attainment of opportunities to attend training, study a topic, or complete an academic program at the organization’s expense.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they have opportunities to attend leadership training; professional development courses; be sponsored by the organization to complete courses of study at academic institutions. This would usually take place during normal working hours and be at the company's expense. Expressions of this theme may include: “I’m given tickets to events where influential speakers talk about leadership and business”; “the company paid for my MBA”; “I get to participate in our leadership development program.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of any compensation or participation in an activity at the organization's expense that is not dedicated to, or intended for, technical or professional development. Examples of exclusions include: “I get

invited to events where I can network with other leaders in the organization”; “when I’m successful, I enjoy a deepened relationship with the Board.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Recognition (BSL013).

Definition.

This is the experience of having one’s achievements or behaviour favorably acknowledged or appreciated.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how their actions, behaviour or personality traits have been recognized, acknowledged or appreciated. Recognition may be communicated publically, privately, or perceived by the participant through unspoken action or other behaviour. Expressions of this theme may include: “an outcome is that the rest of the organization sees and acknowledges the great work we’re doing”; “people at higher levels are talking about the work that I’m doing.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of exercising or gaining influence, including status; credibility; creating or improving trust in relationships; increasing confidence or other positive affect; career advancement or compensation. Examples of exclusions include: “as I become more successful, there are opportunities to contribute outside of my discipline”; “as you become more successful, you become more promotable.”

Aggregation.

Increased visibility or profile (BSL024) was aggregated to this code.

Autonomy (BSL015).***Definition.***

This is the attainment of freedom or autonomy to exercise agency within the organizational role or across organizational boundaries.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they have new or increased freedom or autonomy. This may be realized only within the boundaries of their current role or expressed as their ability to exercise some agency across the boundaries of the organization. It may be expressed as freedom-of-movement throughout the organization. Expressions of this theme may include: “I have more control over how I prioritize things”; “they leave me alone to try new things.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of contributing technical expertise or undertaking a different role; being able to engage with the community or to contribute to society. Examples of exclusions include: “I get to do different things in the organization”; “I’m able to contribute to my community.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Tolerance for mistakes (BSL016).***Definition.***

This is the attainment of permission to take risks, and the experience of not being punished for making mistakes.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how their previous track record of success as a leader, or some other attribute realized in their role, creates organizational tolerance for mistakes they might make; tolerance may be explicitly or implicitly expressed by the participant's leaders. Participants may say that they are given the benefit of the doubt or are trusted to learn from their mistake and not repeat it. Expressions of this theme may include: “there is more room for failure when you have a track record of success”; “there seems to be more tolerance for taking risks.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of the ability to exercise influence; secure the engagement of others; developing or maintaining relationships with leaders; being accepted by or included with leaders; gaining or increasing freedom, autonomy or trust. Examples of exclusions include: “people help me because I’ve built up some good will”; “I’m able to get people to try new things and take risks.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Financial compensation (BSL019).***Definition.***

This is the attainment or realization, either in the present or deferred to the future, of any monetary benefit.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they received a raise in base pay; a larger than normal bonus; a one-time payment; a long-term incentive which may be in the form of cash, stock or options. Other financial compensation may be received in the form of taxable benefits such as a parking space or parking allowance; company vehicles; concierge allowance; personal use of corporate assets. Expressions of this theme may include: “I get a bigger bonus when I’m successful”; “as you become more successful there are perks, like a company car and parking.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of receiving gifts or offerings that, although have financial value, are more indicative of inclusion, professional development or education. Examples of exclusions include: “you get invited to events to hear influential speakers”; “the company paid for my MBA.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Employment continuance (BSL020).***Definition.***

This is the benefit of maintaining employment within the current organization.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they remain employed; note that this may include being demoted or transferred within the same organization. Expressions of this theme may include: “if I wasn’t successful, I wouldn’t be here”; “if you’re not successful, you won’t get to stay very long.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of career advancement, a change in role within the same organization or any continued permission or tolerance for a course of action or approach. Examples of exclusions include: “success means that you get more opportunities”; “they continue to leave me alone.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Positive affect (BSL021).***Definition.***

This is the benefit of deriving a sense of personal satisfaction, positive emotions, or an expression that the organizations values are aligned with the personal values of the participant.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they derive a sense of personal satisfaction or feel some positive affect through the performance of their role, such as confidence. Participant may discuss how the performance of their role is aligned with their personal values or worldview. Expressions of this theme may include: “the work of this organization is aligned with my priorities”; “I’m really having fun working here”; “the work is

its own reward.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of developing the career or personal attributes of others; being trusted; enjoying autonomy or freedom; receiving recognition; feeling important or having greater status. Examples of exclusions include: “I get recognized for doing a good job”; “I get the freedom to experiment that comes with success.”

Aggregation.

Confidence (BSL004) was aggregated to this code.

Valued inclusion (BSL022).

Definition.

This is the benefit of being invited, or included in, opportunities to interact with other leaders; either peers or superiors.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they are invited to, or included in, events or meetings, the purpose of which is largely social or for internal networking. Although these events or meetings may include a leadership development component, the participant expresses valuing the opportunity to connect, to interact and network, as opposed to development or as an opportunity to exercise or gain influence. Expressions of this theme may include: “I get invited to events where I can network with other leaders in my organization”; “when I’m successful, I enjoy a deepened relationship with the Board”; “I get to spend time with influential people.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of courses of study that focus on professional or personal development, regardless of format; situations dedicated to the exercising of influence in order to advance or facilitate the implementation of the participant's objectives; engaging with external stakeholders or with the community for the purpose of contributing to society. Examples of exclusions include: "I get tickets to events where influential people leaders talk about business and leadership"; "as I become more successful, there are opportunities to contribute outside of my technical discipline."

Aggregation.

Interaction with other leaders (BSL011) and *Collegial or safe relationships with peers or superiors* (BSL012) were aggregated to this code.

Contribute to society (BSL025).***Definition.***

This is the attainment of opportunities to contribute to the betterment of society or humanity.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses the benefits of contributing to others outside the organization with respect to human dignity; wellbeing; human rights; the environment; animal welfare; or any other thing described by the participant as a benefit to society or humanity. Expressions of this theme may include: "if we have a good fund-raising year, I know we'll be making a big contribution to the well-being of others"; "working here gives me an opportunity to help others who are less fortunate."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of opportunities to engage externally without ascribing those opportunities as being a contribution to society or humanity; positive affect; alignment of personal values with those of the participant or the organization; building capacity in others. Examples of exclusions include: “in leadership roles, you can really make things happen”; “the work of this organization is aligned with how I want to be in the world.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Consequences of Unsuccessful Leadership (CUL)**Increased workload (CUL001).*****Definition.***

This is the realization of the consequence of an increase in workload.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how the consequence of a leadership failure was an increase in the participant’s workload or the workload of the participant’s staff. Expressions of this theme may include: “the consequences was that I ended up having to do a lot more work”; “if I’m ineffective, my team ends up having to do a lot more.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of loss of trust or adverse impacts on career progression. Examples of exclusions include: “after that experience, some people stopped returning my calls”; “I got moved into a different, lower role.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Motivation to improve (CUL004).***Definition.***

This is the realization of internal motivation to improve one's leadership performance and competency.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how the consequence of a leadership failure was a learning opportunity; how the failure served their growth or development; how they were motivated to become a better leader. Expressions of this theme may include: "it was an opportunity for me to grow as a leader"; "experiences like this tend to energize me and propel me forward."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of acceptance of the failure without recognizing it as an opportunity for growth or development; negative affect; reduction in trust. Examples of exclusions include: "all I could think of is how they misunderstood me"; "I thought the best thing for me was to leave the organization and find a new job."

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Negative affect (CUL006).***Definition.***

This is the experience of negative emotions, dissatisfaction, disengagement, disillusionment, etc.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses negative emotions such as frustration, pressure, being upset, anger, becoming dissatisfied, anxiety, confusion, losing confidence; feeling humility without direct attributions to being motivated to improve; experiencing doubt, embarrassment or resentment. Expressions of this theme may include: “I get frustrated with myself”; “I tend to be more cautious and unwilling to try new things.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions loss of freedom, autonomy or trust; receiving negative feedback on performance; experiencing humility; being motivated to change or improve; being excluded from meetings or communication. Examples of exclusions include: “I have to rebuild relationships”; “it was an opportunity for me to grow as a leader.”

Aggregation.

Reduced confidence (CUL008) was aggregated to this code.

Negative impact on compensation (CUL009).***Definition.***

This is the consequence of reduction or elimination of any monetary benefit, either in the present or deferred to the future.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they realized a reduction or elimination in base pay; a smaller than normal bonus; the loss of a one-time payment or of long-term incentives which may be in the form of cash, stock or options. Other negative impacts to financial compensation may be realized by the loss of a taxable benefit such as a parking space or parking allowance; company vehicles; concierge allowance; personal use of corporate assets, etc. An expression of this theme may include: “if you don’t do well, you notice it in your bonus.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions of loss of gifts or offerings that, although have financial value, are more indicative of exclusion or reduced trust. Examples of exclusions include: “I was no longer invited to special events”; “it was unlikely that they were going to enroll me in our leadership program.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Loss of career opportunity (CUL010).***Definition.***

This is the experience of a loss of the prospect for promotion or other organizational opportunity, placement or activity valued by the participant.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they were informed directly, experienced, or suspected in some way, that they would not be promoted or considered for promotion; lost the ability to attain a desired transfer; would not be assigned to a desired project

or task; would not be considered for desired professional development or other non-financial benefit. Expressions of this theme may include: “moving to another area was no longer available to me”; “it was unlikely that I was going to get offered the leadership development program.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of losses in financial compensation; termination of employment; reduced freedom, autonomy or trust without direct association with losses of career opportunities. Examples of exclusions include: “if you’re not successful, your performance score is lower and your bonus is reduced”; “I have to rebuild some relationships.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Negative impact on performance rating (CUL011).

Definition.

This is the experience of the participant’s performance score within the organization’s performance management system being reduced or negatively impacted.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how their quantitative or qualitative ranking, rating or score was reduced or negatively impacted. An expression of this theme may include: “when you’re seen as a poor leader, you can still hit all your targets and end up with a poor performance score.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of any other

impacts outside of the ranking, rating or score in the organization's performance management system. Examples of exclusions include: “we’re paid for performance, and if you’re not successful, your bonus is reduced”; “people say some negative things about you when you’re not successful.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Termination of employment (CUL012).

Definition.

This is the experience the organization acting to terminate the participant’s employment relationship with the organization.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how employment with the organization is terminated. Expressions of this theme may include: “I didn’t change, so my leader had to make a change, and I left”; “they didn’t want me around anymore, so I needed to find another job.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of the participants expectations of others, in that if the others do not meet expectations they may be terminated; expressions of employment continuance. Examples of exclusions include: “if someone won't change, then they will need to find another job”; “I'm still here because I'm the kind of leader they want me to be.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Reduced trust (CUL015).***Definition.***

This is the experience of feeling not or no longer trusted, or attributing behaviour or consequences to a reduction in trust.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they were told or perceived that they could no longer be trusted to maintain ideological discipline (Schmidt, 2000, pp. 15-16); that their motives or intentions had become suspect; that they had lost credibility; that relationships were adversely impacted; that they were excluded from meetings or events where they had previously been included; that they felt they needed to be more cautious. Expressions of this theme may include: "I felt that people were questioning my commitment"; "I needed to rebuild some relationships."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of negative affect; loss of career opportunities; negative impacts on compensation; negative impacts on performance rating. Examples of exclusions include: "if I don't do well, I get less of a salary increase"; "I knew that I was no longer going to get the transfer that I wanted."

Aggregation.

Negative impact on relationship (CUL007) and *Exclusion* (CUL013) were aggregated to this code.

Enjoyable Leadership Tasks (ELT)**Contribute in technical discipline or on project (ELT001).*****Definition.***

This is the enjoyment of working in a similar manner to that of an individual contributor or in a role that the participants might normally delegate to their staff.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy working in a role that is typically performed by their staff; working in a project management role that would usually be delegated to their staff; working in their technical discipline(s), as opposed to a leadership role. Expressions of this theme may include: “I enjoy getting involved in projects whenever I can”; “I like being able to review the technical details that supports the decisions we make.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being collaborative; problem solving or facilitating implementation; being a role model; financial management. Examples of exclusions include: “I like to ensure that we arrive at the solution together”; “I like to attend project meetings in order to understand what problems need to be solved or the road blocks that I can remove.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Advance careers of others (ELT002).***Definition.***

This is the enjoyment of providing or facilitating the opportunity for others to advance

within the organization's structure or hierarchy.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy promoting people or advancing their careers; providing stretch assignments as an opportunity for recognition.

Expressions of this theme may include: "I find them a role where they can be recognized across the organization"; "I like being able to help people advance."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of building capacity in others without the concurrent intention of promotion or immediate advancement; mentoring or coaching others' performance; facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: "I like making sure that everyone has the training and tools they need to be successful"; "I like getting people energized about the work they are doing."

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Build capacity in others (ELT003).

Definition.

This is the enjoyment of intervening to create or enhance an individual's or group's ability to perform a task (Sharf, 2010, p. 30) in the present or future.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy acting towards others, such that their action serves to improve others' performance, either within current roles; in future roles inside or outside of the current organization; or in some aspect of the other's personal life.

The act may serve to develop a competency, such as problem solving, or an aspect of personality, such as confidence. This may be achieved through coaching, mentoring or some other personal or professional development activity or program. Expressions of this theme may include: “I like being able to influence the personal development of others”; “I find it very rewarding to see my direct reports grow and develop.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of enjoying collaboration; developing trusting relationships with others; creating alignment in others; motivating others; facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: “it's important to me that we arrive at the solution together”; “I like being able to get everyone on board with the strategy”; “I like getting people energized about the project.”

Aggregation.

Development of others (ELT003) was renamed to *Building capacity in others* and *Mentor and coach* (ELT007) was aggregated to this code.

Being strategic (ELT004).

Definition.

This is the enjoyment of providing a broad perspective, being future-oriented and anticipating future consequences, and then developing plans to address likely, future scenarios (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, p. 351).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy taking a systems approach, planning for the future, identifying and appropriately assessing threats and

opportunities, developing a vision or having line-of-sight. Expressions of this theme may include: “I like thinking about all the moving parts and considering how what we do effects everything else”; “I enjoy thinking about how we're going to get to where we need to be in five years.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of solving problems; removing road-blocks; developing others; gaining or exercising influence; interacting with other leaders for other than strategic purposes; facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: “I make sure that we are working to achieve our strategic plan”; “I make sure that everyone has the training and tools they need to achieve our objectives.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Collaborating (ELT005).

Definition.

This is the enjoyment of working with others to achieve an outcome.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy being collaborative; working or brain-storming with others; soliciting feedback and including it in decision-making; modifying their ideas or objectives in order to seek consensus; valuing teamwork. Expressions of this theme may include: “my decisions are informed and moderated by the team”; “I like it when we all work together to arrive at a solution that everyone can live with.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of creating alignment; motivating; coaching or mentoring; leading by example; problem solving outside of being collaborative; facilitating implementation; building consensus for their ideas or objectives without soliciting feedback or compromising as when collaborating. Examples of exclusions include: “I meet with the team to make sure they understand the objectives”; “I get involved in projects whenever the team needs help solving a problem.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Facilitating implementation (ELT006).***Definition.***

This is the enjoyment of intervening in order to ensure, or increase the probability, that desired outcomes will be achieved.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy solving problems for others; removing road-blocks; motivating others to achieve objectives; ensuring that staff have the tools necessary to achieve objectives; getting involved in projects or work in order to ensure success. Expressions of this theme may include: “I work on my own and with others to operationalize the plan”; “I spend time motivating people to making sure that everyone is moving in the same direction.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working

similar to an individual contributor in a technical or project management capacity outside of the participant's leadership role; building capacity in others for personal or professional development. Examples of exclusions include: "I like to get involved with projects when ever I can"; "I like being able to help my staff develop and grow."

Aggregation.

Motivating others (ELT010) was aggregated to this code.

Interaction / inclusion with other leaders (ELT009).

Definition.

This is the enjoyment of relationships or interaction with other leaders; be they peers or superiors.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy creating or increasing trust in relationships with other leaders; meeting with other leaders; being included in meetings or events attended largely by only leaders. Expressions of this theme may include: "I like connecting with other leaders"; "I like being invited to meetings that include other leaders."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of meeting with leaders in order to facilitate implementation of the participant's objectives or to exercise influence; engaging with external stakeholders or with the community for the purpose of contributing to society; attending meetings or events largely for the purpose of professional or leadership development. Examples of exclusions include: "I like telling my team's story to other leaders"; "I like being invited to contribute my opinion on something that is outside of my

technical discipline.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Management or administration (ELT011).

Definition.

This is the enjoyment of activities typically ascribed to management (see Kotter, 1999) or administration.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy activities such as accounting and financial management; planning and scheduling; reading reports; attending to email; creating workforce plans. Expressions of this theme may include: “I like preparing the budgets and digging into the financial statements”; “I enjoy working with our performance management system.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being strategic; contributing in a technical discipline or on a project; facilitating implementation or problem solving. Examples of exclusions include: “I enjoy thinking about how what we do impacts all the moving parts”; “I enjoy implementing our strategic plan.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Engage or promote externally (ELT012).***Definition.***

This is the enjoyment of participating in activities that are external to the organization.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they enjoy participating in activities outside of the organization; engaging with similar or interested organizations; the community to advance the interests of the organization. This may be within the context of fund-raising, community relations or social responsibility efforts, or participation in professional organizations. Expressions of this theme may include: “I enjoy the fund-raising events where I get to meet some the organizations that we help”; “I enjoy being able to guide the development of my profession through our industry organization.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working or influencing across organizational boundaries; developing the capacity of others within the organization; freedom-of-movement within the organization; collaborating; facilitating implementation or problem solving. Examples of exclusions include: “I like meeting with other leaders in the organization and telling my team's story”; “I like inviting in the community to help develop solutions.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Unenjoyable Leadership Tasks (ULT)**Dealing with ambiguity (ULT001).*****Definition.***

This is the dislike of having to work with a perceived lack of information or direction.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike not having the whole picture; characterize direction as fuzzy or unclear; prefer more data and structure over uncertainty; need all the data before moving forward; are not comfortable filling in the gaps (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, pp. 7-11). Expressions of this theme may include: "I don't like being kept in the dark"; "I don't like having to do things without a clear deliverable."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of having to be politically savvy; saying "no"; disliking bureaucracy; providing excessive direction; dealing with conflict. Examples of exclusions include: "I can't go directly to the CEO for information, I have to go through my VP"; "I don't like having to constantly provide more clarity to my staff."

Aggregation.

Working with a lack of information or justification (ULT001) was renamed *Dealing with ambiguity*.

Being politically savvy (ULT002).***Definition.***

This is the dislike of having to attend to power relationships or being sensitive to how organizations and people function (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, pp. 291-295).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike politics; how they are not, or won't be, political; how they dislike having to attend to various power relationships; or how organizational politics is an unnecessary impediment. Expressions of this theme may include: "people play games and have hidden agendas"; "I don't like having to spend a lot of time persuading one of my peers to adopt our changes."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working with a lack of information or justification; attending to administration or dealing with bureaucracy; managing or intervening in conflict without emphasis on the political nature of the conflict. Examples of exclusions include: "I have to work through a lot of bureaucracy to get anything done"; "I spend most of my time managing conflict between the teams."

Aggregation.

Attending to power relationships (ULT003) was aggregated to this code.

Administration or management (ULT005).***Definition.***

This is the dislike of activities typically ascribed to management (see Kotter, 1999) or administration.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike activities such as accounting and financial management; planning and scheduling; reading reports; attending to email; creating workforce plans. Some planning activities may be perceived as those discussed in

OLA018 *Be strategic*, however, if participants describe such activities negatively, they will normally ascribe them to administration or bureaucracy. Expressions of this theme may include: “I don't like having to do a lot of planning or scheduling”; “I don't like dealing with all the email.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of bureaucracy as resistance to the participant's efforts that must be overcome in order to achieve a goal; managing performance outside of the administrative aspects of using a performance management tool; working with a lack of information or justification. Examples of exclusions include: “I need support from certain people if I'm going to get anything done”; “it's difficult to move forward when you don't know why you are doing something.”

Aggregation.

Attending to email (ULT007) was aggregated to this code.

Managing problem performance (ULT006).

Definition.

This is the dislike of intervening or of communicating with staff in order to identify and seek to resolve, poor performance, or unacceptable behaviours or approaches.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike or avoid communicating directly or indirectly with individual direct reports or teams with respect to the individual's or team's unacceptable performance behaviours or approaches. Expressions of this theme may include: “I don't like how sometimes I need to be a very direct to people who are not

performing”; “I don't like having those difficult performance conversations.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of disliking the administrative aspects of the organization's performance management system; providing excessive direction in order to solve problems or facilitate implementation of plans or objectives; managing or avoiding conflict; negative affect; attending to politics or power relationships. Examples of exclusions include: “I know that it's important to do performance reviews, but I just don't like doing them”; “I don't understand how people can leave a meeting without fully understanding what I expect of them when they could just ask me for more clarity.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Providing excessive direction (ULT008).

Definition.

This is the dislike of having to provide detailed instructions or to continuously provide the same instructions.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike or avoid telling their staff or others the same thing over and over again; repeating themselves; describe how people just don't get it; providing detailed direction or instructions. Expressions of this theme may include: “I don't like it when I have to say the same thing over and over again”; “I don't like having to hold their hand.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of managing problem performance; saying no to good ideas; managing or dealing with conflict. Examples of exclusions include: “Even though our resources are limited, it's still hard to say "no" to good ideas”; “I don't like having to step into the middle of problems between teams.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Managing external conflict (ULT009).***Definition.***

This is the dislike of having to manage conflict that exists external to the organization.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike or avoid managing or dealing with conflict that exists outside of the organization; while engaging with similar or interested organizations; with the community when advancing the interests of the organization to external stakeholders or interested parties. This may be within the context of fund-raising; community relations or social responsibility efforts; or participation in professional organizations. Expressions of this theme may include: “I don't like the conflict between organizations in my sector”; “I don't like having to compete with other professionals in my field.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working or influencing across organizational boundaries; developing the capacity of others within the

organization; freedom-of-movement within the organization; collaborating; facilitating implementation or problem solving. Examples of exclusions include: “I spend a lot of time getting the rest of the organization aligned with my objectives”; “I need to work with our partners in the community in order to achieve my goals.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Managing internal conflict (ULT010).

Definition.

This is the dislike of having to manage conflict within the organization or with or among staff.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses how they dislike or avoid managing or dealing with conflict that exists within the organization or between themselves and their staff. This may be within the context of not liking to deliver bad news or say no, in that it has the potential to create conflict or animosity. Expressions of this theme may include: “Even though our resources are limited, it's still hard to say “no” to good ideas”; “I don't like having to step into the arguments that arise between departments.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working with a lack of information or justification; being politically savvy; managing problem performance; providing excessive direction. Examples of exclusions include: “It's difficult for me to be successful when I don't know why we are doing something”; “I don't like having to watch what I

say around senior leaders.”

Aggregation.

Saying no (ULT004) was aggregated to this code.

Regular Leadership Tasks (RLT)

Attending meetings (RLT001).

Definition.

This is the activity or task of attending meetings in general, without the participant also stating the purpose of the meeting.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they have to attend a lot of meetings, or spend a lot of time in meetings, without stating, describing or alluding to the purpose of the meetings. Expressions of this theme may include: “I spend a lot of time in meetings”; “I’m always meeting one-on-one with my staff.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of attendance in meetings having some purpose, for example: facilitating implementation or problem-solving; managing problem performance; engaging with internal or external stakeholders; motivating, mentoring or coaching; being strategic. Examples of exclusions include: “I spend a lot of time in meetings in order to make sure that things are moving along”; “I’m always meeting one-on-one with my staff to help them solve problems.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Facilitating implementation (RLT006).***Definition.***

This is the activity or task of intervening in order to ensure, or increase the probability, that desired outcomes will be achieved.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they spend a lot of their time solving problems for others; removing road-blocks; motivating others to achieve objectives; ensuring that staff have the tools and training necessary to achieve objectives; getting involved in projects or work in order to ensure success. Expressions of this theme may include: “I work on my own and with others to operationalize the plan”; “I make sure everyone understands the objective and that they have what they need to achieve it.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of working similar to an individual contributor in a technical or project management capacity outside of the participant’s leadership role; motivating, coaching or mentoring without the explicit objective of facilitating implementation. Examples of exclusions include: “I like to get involved in the projects whenever I can”; “I make sure everyone is motivated and excited about being here.”

Aggregation.

Connecting with others or intra-group communications (RLT001), *Problem solving* (RLT002) and *Advocating on behalf of staff* (RLT003) were aggregated to this code.

Being strategic (RLT007).***Definition.***

This is the activity or task of providing a broad perspective, being future-oriented and anticipating future consequences and developing plans to address likely, future scenarios (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009, p. 351).

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they spend a lot of time taking a systems approach; planning for the future; identifying and appropriately assessing threats and opportunities; developing a vision or having line-of-sight. Expressions of this theme may include: “I spend my time developing and implementing a strategic plan”; “I have to make sure that I consider their entire system, all the moving parts”; “I have to think five years ahead of everyone else.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of solving problems; removing road-blocks; developing others; gaining or exercising influence; interacting with other leaders for other than strategic purposes. Examples of exclusions include: “I’m always watching for anything that will slow us down”; “I like to see my people grow and develop.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Contribute in technical discipline or on project (RLT008).***Definition.***

This is the activity or task of working similar to that of an individual contributor or in a

role typically delegated to the participant's staff.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they spend a lot of time working in their original discipline or in a role that is typically performed by their staff; working in a project management role that would usually be delegated to their staff; working in their technical discipline(s), as opposed to a leadership role. Expressions of this theme may include: "I get involved in the projects whenever I can"; "I like being able to review the technical details around the decisions we make."

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of being collaborative; problem-solving or facilitating implementation; being a role model; financial management. Examples of exclusions include: "I get everyone together so that we can brainstorm a solution"; "I spend a lot of time reviewing budgets and developing our financial and workforce plans"; "when things aren't going well, I sometimes need to step-in to get things moving again."

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Helping others be successful (RLT009).

Definition.

This is the activity or task of intervening to develop capacity in others or help others be successful.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they spend a lot of time employing motivation theories (Langton, Robbins & Judge, 2010, pp. 128-210); mentoring (Wilson & Gilson, 2010, p. 17); coaching (Homan & Miller, 2008, pp. 5-8); or intervening in a specific or non-specific way in order to help others be more successful. Expressions of this theme may include: “I spend time just listening, coaching, guiding people”; “I go around the office and try to get people energized about what they're doing.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions of advocating for others; meetings with direct reports where nature of meeting is not specified; solving problems; facilitating the implementation of tactical or strategic objectives; attending to relationships. Examples of exclusions include: “I spend a lot of time building relationships with other departments so that my team can be more successful”; “I spend a lot of time in meetings.”

Aggregation.

One-on-one meetings with staff (RLT004), *Advocating for others outside of span of control* (RLT005) and *Motivating, coaching or mentoring* (RLT009) were aggregated to this code.

Engage or promote externally (RLT012).***Definition.***

This is the activity or task of participating in activities that are outside of the organization.

Recognition.

Participant states, describes or otherwise expresses that they spend a lot of time outside of the organization, engaging with similar or interested organizations or with the community to advance the interests of the organization. This may be within the context of fund-raising; community relations or social responsibility efforts; or participation in professional organizations. Expressions of this theme may include: “I spend a lot of time engaging with the community”; “I spend a lot of time trying to influence the direction of my profession through out industry organization.”

Exclusion.

This theme is not attributable to statements, descriptions or expressions working or influencing across organizational boundaries; developing the capacity of others within the organization; freedom-of-movement within the organization; collaborating; facilitating implementation or problem solving. Examples of exclusions include: “I spend a lot of time building relationships with other departments so that my teams can be successful”; “we have to include the recommendations of external stakeholders in our solutions and objectives.”

Aggregation.

No themes were aggregated to this code.

Appendix C: Interview Transcripts

Participants were assigned, random, non-sequential identification numbers. Participant gender and any other identifying information are held confidential. Only the participant's industry of employment is associated to their transcript. If, during the interview, the participant disclosed information that might have served to identify the participant, that portion of the transcript is identified for the reader and paraphrased with non-identifying content. Two of the twelve participants did not agree to the secondary use of interview transcripts. These two transcripts are held confidential and have been removed from this appendix.

Participant 001; Not-for-profit

R: In your organization, when leaders are doing well as leaders, how are they valued?

P: Well, they're given more autonomy and more authority in their roles.

R: Anything else you can think of?

P: How they are valued? More freedom to do more project work, different higher-level direction work, working across boundaries. So there's a variety and it's primarily role-based. Therefore it would be within their role, their scope.

R: Let's just focus on you for a moment. When it's known to you that you are doing well in your leadership role, what benefits do you enjoy?

P: What do I see? It's mostly intrinsic (BSL021 Positive affect). I have to say that. That's non-profit. We don't have the money to pay bonuses; to do those extra things. So the nature of my work is that it's the long game, and I have to pay attention to that. I rarely have a day where I can check things off a list. I see it over two or three years. I'll give you an example of that.

[Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying

version: I've been here for a few years, and a couple years ago we developed an organizational program that I'm just starting to see the impact of that. It's good to see that moving (BSL021 Positive affect).]

R: You mentioned that it's mostly intrinsic and that it's about the long game. Tell me more those intrinsic things that you realize when you become aware that you're doing a good job as a leader?

P: So, I might go to a meeting and see the results of my work being accepted and celebrated. I interact a lot with our board of directors. These are people who have a great deal of experience in our industry and who have a lot of credibility. I think that that piece is a lot of the reward (BSL022 Valued inclusion). I'm looked at as an expert in what I do (BSL013 Recognition). That's a lot of it. I also get quite a bit out of watching my team grow (BSL021 Positive affect). So, seeing my team have success. I have a policy of hiring people that are smarter than me and better. Really setting them up for success, that's good too. Getting feedback from them and their teams is always important. Seeing the results of their work (BSL021 Positive affect).

R: What are the leadership attributes, abilities and skills that you feel are expected of you by the organization.

P: That's an interesting question because every organization, every culture, is different. Our organization is a caring organization. We're a caring organization because there's a lot of social workers and a lot of helpers here. So expectations can be different. What I do may not be what the organization expects, but as a leader you need to do things that may not be looked on so kindly. It's up to you to set the boundaries because everyone is doing their best and wants the

best.

R: So when you say that it may be something that the organization doesn't like, I would imagine that that would be peers or direct reports. Is that right?

P: Yes, it's mostly the direct reports.

R: What I'm also curious about is that, as I would expect, some of those things are also expected of you by the board.

P: Yes, absolutely.

R: So, what are those things that are expected of you from on-high?

P: I think being mindful of where we are trying to get to and making decisions based on that (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline). We've had some significant strategy changes recently. Supporting my team of executives is really important.

R: That's interesting. You mentioned seeing where we're going, the strategy and support. How is it communicated from the upper part of the organization, the board, that you're doing a good job at the things they expect?

P: I also look for feedback from my peers and I think knowing that they have the right information to make the right connections is interesting.

R: I'll just dig into that a little more. What I'm curious about is how would you know that they think you are being the kind of leader that they want you to be?

P: I don't think I'd be here if I wasn't. So continued employment is one thing (BSL020 Employment continuance), but it's also owning your role. Being given more or different accountabilities (BSL003 Influence). Knowing that people know that they can give me something and I can take that and people to work through it (BSL003 Influence). Does that make

sense?

R: My interpretation of that is, yes I'm still here and some autonomy and the freedom to go ahead.

P: Yes, very much so (BSL015 Autonomy).

R: My next question is, how does that feel for you?

P: Well, it keeps me going. That's what it is. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: Some of the work I'm doing now is made easier by these things.]

R: Tell me a little more about your comment that, "It keeps me going." I'm curious about that.

P: It's why I'm excited about what I do; it's why I do what I do. The ability to make a difference. To really develop the organization and to know that it's going to be strong; like there is some strength in what you're developing.

R: In your statements I heard strengthening and building; I heard contribution or making a difference. To do that, would I be correct in saying that you exercise influence?

P: Absolutely. Because I'm influencing down and up, that's a big part of what I do. Figuring out how to do that that is transparent and that is truly bringing people along. I've worked for and with people who are not as engaging of others; where it wasn't about the collective moving forward, it was more directive. But it's about moving people with you, not about being out front all the time.

R: When we talked about the knowledge that the people you report to are satisfied with your work and you then realize that autonomy, is there any relationship to influence there too?

What I'm trying to understand is that, like autonomy being an outcome of satisfaction of the board, do you also have more influence because of your success?

P: I think they are directly related. If I wasn't experiencing success, I wouldn't have the credibility (BSL003 Influence) or the autonomy (BSL015 Autonomy).

R: When you think of your success in the eyes of the people you report to, or their satisfaction with your performance, how does that contribute to your ability to influence them?

P: That's the basis of it. They hear what I say because they believe that I'm competent (BSL003 Influence).

R: I just want to go back and check something: What do you think are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by that group that you are accountable to?

P: Developing trust (OLA012 Demonstrate interpersonal and communication skill). Transparency (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency) is always important; and that's part of building trust: being transparent. It's not about me. It's about building the teams I work with (OLA015 Build capacity in others). About the people I'm a part of. I'm not a one-person show and I can't do this on my own. So, I think, it's recognizing those pieces. Technical competency gets you in the door (OLA025 In-discipline competency), but the impact of what you do is broader. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: my technical experience got me in the door, but my passion lies elsewhere.]

R: So, I've heard the value of building trust and building relationships. I also heard the value of the technical competency that gets you in the door, and the value of organization building. Are there any other things you feel they might value in leadership? What they like to see?

P: Results. At the end of the day, it's about results (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation).

R: And just to double check, when they communicate success, are you able to tie it back to the technical, relationships, results, etc., or is it something else?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I'll give you an example. Somebody recently had to leave the organization, so I hired a replacement. This new person was immediately able to perform at a very high level. So, it all ties together.]

R: So when all this came together, when did you first perceive this success? Was it through your own observation, or did somebody bring it to your attention?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: A senior board member immediately provided me feedback that this person performed well. So that's great.]

R: What are the leadership tasks and activities that you enjoy most about your role?

P: Having the strategic conversations (ELT004 Being strategic).

R: Is there anything else?

P: Well, working with the team and watching people develop. And, to help people think differently (ELT003 Build capacity in others).

R: What are the leadership tasks and activities that you dislike the most?

P: Paperwork: the administration of things (ULT005 Administration or management). I don't have a lot, but we do have some. The difficult conversations are never fun (ULT006 Managing problem performance).

R: Those difficult conversations, what type of things are they about?

P: The ones where I'm terminating people because they are just not a fit, and or helping people see that they are not a fit.

R: Is there anything else you really dread?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: we've had a change recently that has improved things, but previously, there were some difficulties dealing with one part of the organization.]

R: The difficulty you just described, would you characterize it as conflict or politics?

P: Both (ULT010 Managing internal conflict) (ULT002 Being politically savvy).

R: What I'd like to understand now is what it's like when you have failed to display the leadership attributes and abilities that people expect of you?

P: Well, you know it. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: There was a time when I probably wasn't as successful as I should have been.] So you know when you're not being successful.

R: How do you know? I'm curious.

P: You're not getting the same results. The feedback and your credibility are impacted (CUL015 Reduced trust). You can feel it in how people respond to you.

R: Those people, who were they?

P: My peers is probably where most of the feedback came from.

R: What are the consequences you experience by not being the leader that they needed you to be?

P: People were really great because we are a helping organization. I've got a better

example. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: There was a time when the expectation of my leader and my role was not aligned.]

R: Did you lose anything?

P: Yes, I wasn't happy. I felt like I could only see a small part of the system and I couldn't be effective.

R: I've heard the "shrinking" of your role and not being able to participate in the larger picture, and I'm wondering if there are things you were able to enjoy or realize prior to that difficult period that were now not available.

P: Influence. My circle of influence had shrunk and I had to determine how I could do my job effectively (CUL015 Reduced trust).

R: So your scope seemed to narrow and your influence was impacted. Was there anything else?

P: Well, conflict within the team really increased (CUL015 Reduced trust). [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: there seemed to be two of us trying to do the same thing.]

R: So, if I understand you correctly, there was some redundancy and role confusion.

P: Yes.

R: When the leaders who report to you are doing well, what benefits do you want to transfer or transmit to them because of how you perceive their success?

P: I give them the same things that I value. I give them autonomy. I give them some really good projects or really fun stuff to work through. It's also about their credibility too.

R: So they're establishing that credibility with you?

P: Yes, absolutely.

R: And, you reciprocate by . . .

P: By giving them autonomy, and good work to do.

R: So when you say "good work to do," what were they doing before so that this new work is better for them?

P: An example of that might be [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: One person that reports to me was doing really well at her job, so we needed another function to be filled and she was excited to lead this new function, in addition to her existing role. I felt like she needed and would like a new challenge.]

R: When those leaders are not displaying those leadership attributes and abilities that you expect, what's the impact on them?

P: I insert myself more in their work. I make sure I'm double-checking. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I had one leader that didn't have the capacity and experience for his role, so I replaced that person.]

R: So I heard that you will involve yourself more when you are not satisfied with their leadership, is there anything else that you will do?

P: I give more direct feedback on the performance. I've also inherited departments where the fit wasn't right, so I had to make decisions to change things.

R: So, from their perspective, what would they now see as a change because they are aware that you're not happy with their performance?

P: Since I hire leaders who have the same values as me, they would certainly feel the lack of autonomy.

R: Is there anything else?

P: It's mostly that I would insert myself.

R: I don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: Well, you work with a variety of leaders and fit is so important. People are interesting and having the right people is so important for success as a leader.

Participant 002; Not-for-profit; No secondary use of data

Participant 003; Not-for-profit

R: What do you feel are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the board and expected of you?

P: Vision, a strategic focus (OLA018 Be strategic), accountability (OLA002 Demonstrate accountability), transparency (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency), line-of-sight, and also sector information (OLA018 Be strategic). I think there is an understanding that this organization is similar to some other organizations in that you really need an expert at the head of it to give it credibility. They also depend on me to bring clarity about the content of the work (OLA025 In-discipline competency). I don't think we'd have the same staff that we have if we didn't have a subject expert at the head. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I don't think people in our organization want to work in this organization if they have to work for someone who doesn't get the issue (OLA025 In-discipline competency).

R: In your current leadership role, what are the leadership tasks that you love to do?

P: Visioning (ELT004 Being strategic). [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: My mind is in the future. There's always someone on my team who are very detailed oriented. I enjoy understanding the space we work in (ELT004 Being strategic). Financial management, I enjoy (ELT011 Management or administration). I like the people and process change (ELT003 Build capacity in others).

R: Can you tell me more about that?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: we're working a new business plan that's created a lot of change. Seeing how people change around that has been very positive.] It's seeing how people embrace change (ELT003 Build capacity in others). I really enjoy fund-raising, but I don't like to do it full time. I have a fund-raising team who engages me as necessary. I guess the thing I love the most about all of this is meeting some really interesting people who are doing some amazing things (ELT012 Engage or promote externally).

R: What are the leadership tasks or activities that you have to do, but that you just don't like?

P: The detail of the performance management. I can do the detail, but it's not my strength. I don't mind the financial piece. I don't mind my level of oversight on it, but I don't want to do the accounting (ULT005 Administration or management). Most of the HR stuff, I really like. I'm struck by how much of the HR stuff is about what's happening in people's lives outside of work that influences their work. The other thing I don't like is dealing with the conflict in my sector that is outside of the organization (ULT009 Managing external conflict). [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying

version: there are issues with relationships between organizations. I believe this might be driven by competition for limited funding].

R: We've talked about what you like to do and what you don't like to do. I'm curious about what you actually do day-to-day. What takes up your day from a leadership perspective?

P: I spend a lot of time walking the halls and being visible (RLT006 Facilitating implementation). I spend time connecting internally and externally, building relationships (RLT012 Engage or promote externally) and seeking opportunities to collaborate. Much of my time is spent making sure we meet our strategic objectives. Today I've probably changed hats five times today. I like that. I would say that the connecting and moving things forward is what I do a lot (RLT006 Facilitating implementation).

R: We've talked about the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the board, what you like to do, what you don't like to do and how you spend your time. I'm curious about the benefits you realize when the board thinks that you have been successful as a leader?

P: I get a bit of a sense of personal satisfaction, but I don't think those are the things that really affirm me. I think there is a deepening of relationships with them (BSL022 Valued inclusion).

R: Just to paraphrase, it sounds like when you're successful you enjoy a deepening of relationship with board members. Is there anything else you realize as a consequence of your success as a leader?

P: I love the heightened awareness of what we're doing (BSL013 Recognition). My current board is not necessarily confirming or not confirming. I'm not sure. This is a harder question for me to answer. I just do my job.

R: When you look at your current role, what is available to you, or how are you able to participate, what are you able to do because of your current position that you may not have been able to do at a lower level? What I'm trying to understand is what becomes available to people as they progress as leaders in your organization.

P: Access to the board; attendance at board meetings. They can be there to answer questions and present their work to the board.

R: Is this more influence or opportunity for recognition?

P: Influence. Because the staff is my employees, I don't think they need the board's sanction. People also get more external opportunities. They get to go for more professional or skill-based training that may not be available to more junior staff. I think there is initially some aura attached to going to the board meetings. But that wears off.

R: This may not apply to you, but has there ever been a time when you didn't meet the leadership expectations of the board? I'm curious what the consequences were.

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: Not in this industry. I'm experiencing a little conflict with the board right now and I'm working this issue with them.]

R: That sounds like a successful process, in that it is being resolved quite well. Throughout this process, I'm wondering if there was any behaviour by them toward you that you observed?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: No, I think we worked through it without much change.]

R: When you look at other leaders in the organization, is there anything that becomes less

available, or are there consequences, when they are not successful as leaders?

P: Not consequences, but my style is to meet with them. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: there is something happening right now. I spent some time talking with this leader to help him understand the bigger picture regarding this issue. He was glad that I talked to him.]

R: So, to paraphrase, here was a leader who was working an issue and you intervened to help him understand the bigger picture. I'm curious if there was ever an issue where someone wasn't performing as a leader and what happened?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: There have been some major changes in this organization that resulted in some leaders leaving the organization.]

R: I'd like to paraphrase this to make sure I understand. It sounds like there seems to be an element needing to be fully on-board with the strategic direction. It's not that if they are unsuccessful as a leader that things will be taken away; like not having access to the board, not having influence or getting training. I've seen that in energy and health care. But, in not-for-profit, it appears there appears to be a pretty clear line. We're all in this together, or there has to be a change. These statements are mine and I need you to tell me if I'm on the right track.

P: I think there are pieces there. I think that the other piece is the size of the organization and the financial attitude. In other organizations there's lots of wiggle room for mistakes. We don't have a lot of room for mistakes.

R: That's all the questions I have. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: I love the leadership piece and I really love my trade and other leaders. It's really fun

for me to see other people who have moved into leadership roles. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I think these newer leaders in this organization are more grounded in their roles than previous leaders were. These new leaders have much clearer boundaries and we have better conversations.]

Participant 005; Not-for-profit

R: How are leaders valued in this organization?

P: [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: It's really based on our values, and these values are the basis of how I structure roles (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline).] So how are leaders valued in this organization? They are valued in the sense that leadership, and leadership of people, is in itself a whole an entire job, and we can't expect you to be successful at that if we weigh you down with all these individual contributor roles and responsibilities. The leader's role and responsibility is about empowering other people. What that looks like is that they are pushing out responsibility and authority and they are really developing a high-performance team (OLA015 Build capacity in others). So we've done that for ourselves as a leadership group. We're too big to be a single high-performance team. So what we're trying to do is create multiple high-performance teams.

For our leaders, the leadership team is team number one. So they don't come as representatives of their teams, they see the team that they are a member of as team number one (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline).

R: When you talked about your leadership team, you said that there are people with people-leading responsibilities, but there is also that functional or thought-leadership responsibility. You also described the values of the organization. Whether leaders are people-

leaders or thought-leaders, are they all accountable to those values?

P: Yes, every person is equally accountable in the organization. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: We have developed our recruiting process so that all aspects of candidate selection are seen through the lens of our values. We're looking for values alignment first (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline). If you don't have the technical competency, you're not going to make it through the screening process anyway. We're looking for a value alignment (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline).]

R: When leaders on your team display those values, what benefits do they realize?

P: My first response is to say continued employment (BSL020 Continuance). Not that we operate in that kind of threatening environment, but, at the end of the day, I would say that our organizational values are permission-to-play values (BSL020 Employment continuance). We don't have other values. That's what it takes. So, how are they recognized, rewarded or valued for that? We actually have a conversation around the values and ask. How did you demonstrate that?" Because we're in constant dialogue, we don't save-up the feedback.

R: So it sounds almost digital, if I can use my own language. It sounds like when the leaders display the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization, one thing they realize is that it's a condition of employment. Is there more, and I'm wondering if you could tell me what more they would realize, see or feel, by knowing that they are displaying those values; when they know from you that they are doing a good job?

P: What's more important than me telling them that they are doing a good job I that they are seeing that they are doing a good job. And how that shows up is in our measurements.

[Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: The people that I have in leadership roles are excited about being good people leaders. That is nourishing to them.]

R: How do you know that they get really excited about their success? How is it displayed?

P: We see it through in the display of the values. We see it with people really taking ownership of their area. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: people speak the truth to others in the organization. I can see the specific activities that tell me they are working to the values.]

R: When a leader here feels they're doing a good job, how ever they learn of that, how do you think that shows-up for them? How do they display that? For example, you would tell yourself, "I can see that this person thinks she is doing good job because of something?"

P: I think that it's how they derive job satisfaction. In a traditional sense, there would be a recognition process: here's your, bonus, certificate, or gift card. But, in fact, it's much more tapping into the intrinsic values (OLA024 Derive personal satisfaction or alignment). So who I look for in those leadership positions is that that is their satisfaction (OLA024 Derive personal satisfaction or alignment). [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: seeing that they are doing specific things well, there is intrinsic joy in that for them.] In and of itself, the work is the reward (OLA024 Derive personal satisfaction or alignment).

R: So just for clarity, their evaluation of themselves as a leader is likely something that is intrinsic to them rather than achieving some other external mark or status that has been

constructed for them.

P: Correct. Although it's not all touchy-feely, since we do have specific performance targets, [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: The choice that the leaders have is how they hit those performance targets and they achieve them through our values.] The people that we have are invested in the framework and how they do the job.

R: So when you're selecting a new leader, perhaps from outside of the organization, what would you want that person to be motivated by? So you might say, at this organization, you're going to have to derive satisfaction from your leadership in this way.

P: It's quite simple. You're not going to come here to get rich. They're not here for the paycheck. There is no variable compensation. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: we're really looking for them to understand from our job posting that they will have to get their satisfaction from the job itself (OLA024 Derive personal satisfaction or alignment).]

R: If you said to a new leader, "You're going to have to derive satisfaction from your role in the following manner." What would you say?

P: I wouldn't come at it that way. I would want to know what are they reading, what literature are they looking at, what are they tracking, what voices are they attending to? [Participant contributed identifying information.] Where have they succeeded? Using behavioral-descriptive questions to get more to the essence of that. I'm looking for that spark.

R: So you're looking for that thing that drives them?

P: Yes. [Participant contributed identifying information.]

R: What is it like when leaders fail to display those leadership values and attributes that are valued by the organization? What's that experience like for them? What happens to them?

R: Well, ultimately, they're not here. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: We're a small organization so I don't have a place to shuffle them off to. I try to understand if they have the capability, and therefore, just need support. But if they don't change, they'll need to leave (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline). We also provide multiple ways that someone can grow in the organization. So if they don't want to be a leader, they may be able to continue to progress as a technical expert.] Obviously, people derive a sense of self and identity from being people leaders, so there is a level to which it is about them. But their satisfaction comes from the fact that they are helping other people. So from the very first, we're looking for that; what motivates them. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: when we have made a mistake, we reviewed the process.]

R: I've said this before, but I'm going to say it in a different way. I don't want to convince you of this, but I do want to make sure I understand something. Is it possible that someone here who is successful in their leadership role, that the benefit that they realize for themselves is an implementation of the values that are important to them; since, these values are already aligned with the organization? It's like a congruency between who I am and what I do.

P: Yes. For me, what you're describing is motivation. They are not different here than they are at home (OLA024 Derive personal satisfaction or alignment). [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: They get to do what they want to do.]

R: We've talked about your vision of leadership for the organization and your perception of how leaders in your organization experience their roles. I'd like to focus on you, now. When you think of being a leader, what benefits have you realized for yourself by being a leader in organizations?

P: Personal satisfaction (BSL021 Positive affect). But that sounds kinds of clinical and cold. I'm motivated in all my work to effect change; positive change; to make something better than I found it; to contribute to something. I'd say that, regardless if I was working in corporate or government or not-for-profit, my thing has always been being the purpose-driven space (BSL021 Positive affect). [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I worked in very different places in the past. While there was a clear mandate about how to make a lot of money, there was still a clear brand about how to achieve it.] When I'm in a place where I can see one face of the organization, and then see the shadow organization, that doesn't work for me. I'm out. What I derive a real sense of satisfaction from is seeing it work (BSL021 Positive affect). [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: when I come into work or walk around the office and see people engaged and talking about our values and figuring things out, that's what I get satisfaction from.] I derive a sense of meaning and personal satisfaction from effecting that change, and to be able to see how others respond and see what they are able to do because of the environment that has been created (BSL021 Positive affect).

Ultimately, my job is that of Chief Alignment officer. When I report to the board, I go over a list, but then I see that I didn't do this work, others did the work. I see myself as more of a conductor.

R: I'm glad you mentioned the board. So when you're evaluated as a successful leader by those that you are accountable to, how do you experience that?

P: [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: My evaluation process is very traditional, in that it happens at set times throughout the year and the board refers to specific criteria. I set annual performance goals that are beyond my core responsibilities. Then the board gives me feedback. I receive a lot of feedback and I've had to work to learn how to receive it constructively.]

R: When the board says you are doing a great job—how ever they say that—what benefits do you realize from that?

P: That's the part that is not important to me. I derive almost no value from the positive part of the feedback. I try to ensure that my response to some of their feedback is not defensiveness. My response is frustration with myself in that I left something on the table (CUL006 Negative affect). Learning to take the feedback, both good and bad, and not focusing on the bad, this is the achiever part of my personality. In and of itself, it's not super important to me. It is important to me to feel that people understand that I'm doing a good job, on balance. But really the reward for me comes from see the work.

R: If I understand correctly, it's not so important to you that the board says you're doing a good job, but where you derive satisfaction from your leadership role when you are successful is very much a personal satisfaction. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little more about that. For example, saying, "When I'm successful, here is what it does for me." What is that?

P: Well, it's alignment; ultimately is what it feels like.

R: Alignment with what?

P: Alignment with what is important to me. It's when it's all clicking. It's like skating on dull blades or driving with a wonky wheel; you know when something is off. For me, it's that personal satisfaction. That there is alignment, that things are going the way they need to (BSL021 Positive affect).

R: What is aligned?

P: Me and the work; the alignment between my personal interest and effort and the result. While I'm certainly an achiever and want to achieve that target, the way that get achieved is very important to me. So, at all costs or in spite of other people, those are not ways in which I would derive satisfaction. At the end of the day, although I do appreciate the board feedback, the reality of the situation is nobody has higher expectations of me than me (BSL021 Positive affect).

[Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I'm regularly speaking directly to the board regarding my own assessment of my performance.]

R: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I heard a particular alignment. It's not just alignment between me doing what you want me to do, but it's alignment with the way I'm doing it, what I value and how I'm going about things, because it's very important to you that who you are is aligned with what the board wants.

P: I would agree with how you framed that. It's an alignment of expectation. My accountability to them is not simply around the target or hours of consulting. It's a much bigger thing and in the end I think that is a key accountability for me in this organization. Yes, we could be achieving every qualitative or quantitative standard, and we could still be a deeply unhealthy and unsustainable organization. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following

is the researcher's non-identifying version: Given the type of organization we are, we better have this core business right. But my sense of duty is bigger.] I have high expectations of myself and of others and my frustration comes when there is a lack of understanding of the work. That becomes a challenge. That's the kind of stuff that makes me unhappy and dissatisfied.

[Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: The board might try to push me a certain direction. However, I then have to remind them of their expectations of me and the goals that we had initially set. That's the alignment piece.]

R: I actually don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: I think leadership is this black box and everyone is trying to figure it out and get better at it. I'm certainly always exploring, but I think there are some real basics. [Participant contributed identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: for me it's really about alignment.]

Researcher terminated interview due to time constraints.

Participant 008; Energy

R: My first question is, when you are successful at displaying the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by your organization, how is that communicated to you and by whom?

P: It certainly helps that the leadership values of the organization are the same things that you value yourself. I think that, most of the time, when I'm displaying those, it won't be in the presence of my boss. I don't think I differentiate between the leadership behaviors that I think are important and those that my company thinks are important. We're pretty well aligned and I

don't consciously differentiate them. I think when I am displaying those kinds of behaviors, I would hear it mostly from my peers. My direct reports are not trying to suck up to me, so I won't get feedback from them unless I point-blank ask for it. So most of my feedback comes from my peers when we're dealing with an issue collaboratively. For example, when we're dealing with an HR issue and I might have an HR peer with me; that's the most common instance where I would get feedback.

R: We perceive feedback in a variety of ways, we can see it or hear it, and I'm just wondering what that feedback looks like for you?

P: It might be in a formal speaking engagement where I'm up at the front talking. People's attention might be such that if I'm talking they might give me courteously laughs or they might engage me in dialogue to show that they are interested or engaged. So engagement is one. What was the question again?

R: When you display those leadership attributes and abilities, and you've already said that yours and your organizations are aligned; when you're being a good leader, how do you know? We've already talked about feedback. I'm wondering how else you would know that you're being a good leader?

P: So, engagement would be one. Another would be trust. If we're solving a problem, or dealing with an issue, and if that leads to an honest and respectful dialogue that is not protecting turf and defensive and I feel like people are approaching it with the right intentions and the right motives, if we can get to that kind of a space, then I feel like I'm at least playing my part. If we can say things the way they are and not tip-toe around the issue, then I feel like we can solve the problem.

There are some parts of the role you can't delegate. You have a role that company has given you and you have to do the job and clean up the mess. So in those kinds of circumstances, how do I know that I'm doing the role? I don't think I get the direct feedback that I'm doing the job. I have to look at my own plate and see who owns what and when I see that I own it, I see that I got to get it done. Maybe it's a self-monitoring thing. I may get some encouragement from my boss that I'm letting something slide. The way I keep track of stuff is that I keep a list of who's responsible. I have a regular meeting with my boss to hold me accountable to my list. I'm a conflict avoider, so sometimes it's easy to hide from those messy ones. This is a way to make sure that they don't get lost in the shuffle.

R: I heard a mix of things, and I'll just recap them. You said that you get feedback when people are engaged with you; you can tell that they are listening; I heard trusting relationships and being able to build trust; I heard self-monitoring; and encouragement, in that you'll go to your boss and ask if you're on the right track.

P: There is one missing that I'd like to add. In most circumstances, I'm not the doer, I'm the initiator of action. Sometimes, when I talk to my leaders, they say they are going to do it; to make it happen. So if it doesn't come back that might be a sign for me, there might be a disconnect between what I asked for and what's happening. So I wonder if they don't understand me or don't agree with me. I have to understand that. That's another bit of indirect feedback that I'll throw into the mix.

R: Can you name that?

P: Maybe traction or follow-through on verbal commitments.

R: I also heard an acceptance or rejection of what I initiated. It's like you put it out there

and they either did it or came back to you with something.

P: When it's working, I should get feedback like, "Hey, that's not a good idea." Or they say it is a good idea and they do it. When people think it's a good idea, I'm responsible to ensure that they have the tools and capacity to do it. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I have a way to keep track of mine and everyone's commitments.] There's a credibility piece. If we've agreed to it, let's do it.

R: What do you feel are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization and yourself?

P: I'll use my own words instead of the corporate bosses. One of my main roles is managing performance. I help people develop and do their best; find that happy place where they can be themselves so they can be outstanding. So, it's people development (OLA015 Build capacity in others). Part of it is creating an environment where people can be successful. A lot of that is helping prioritize, removing roadblocks and creating alignment (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation). It's building the right team so we have the right knowledge and authority to make things happen. It's creating the environment so we can do the right thing to make things happen (OLA015 Build capacity in others). In my role, there is a fair bit of financial commitment, so I need to make sure that the work quality is there and that it's credible (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation). It needs to be aligned with the company goals and standards (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline). I think of those as being some practical things. I think if I was to step up a level, it's about doing the right thing (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character), about building a great organization (OLA015 Build capacity in others), about thinking beyond our little patch of turf and thinking about the whole system (OLA018 Be

strategic). I think when people have the context around the business drivers, they have the riverbanks to do their own jobs.

I think in our organization, when people try to take shortcuts to get to a goal, it catches up with them reputationally. It catches up to them after a time. You need to put company interests ahead of other interests (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline).

R: And the long-term benefit of not taking shortcuts is?

P: You've got trust, credibility, good will, and you get to have important discussions. The opposite is hoarding information and distrusting and competing with people. Trust is key.

R: When you look back on your career, then the present and forward, how have you benefited by being a successful leader?

P: I still have my job and I'm still being compensated (BSL020 Employment continuance). I value continuity and long-term relationships. When I think what being a good leader means, it means being a good boss, colleague and employee. It also means doing my best and not holding back on gifts that I may have. I think that by being a good leader I create a space where people can make a contribution. It creates good will. And since I'm flawed like everyone one else, I can build up some good will where people step in and help me out on the things that I struggle with (BSL003 Influence). By doing that, I create a space where I can be successful at the things I like, and have others help me with what I'm challenged with. I think the most fun I have at work is working across boundaries and solving multi-disciplinary problems. Having the leadership style that I do, I get to have fun doing that (BSL021 Positive affect).

R: When you talked about building relationships that facilitate your ability to go to someone about an area that is not your strength, and they help you, what's the benefit of getting

them to cover for you on that?

P: When it works well I get to spend less time at things I don't like and I'm not good at. But it also builds trust because I'm showing them my vulnerability. People want to be in a trusting, mutually beneficial relationship. But it's a two way street. Maybe they will ask me to help them on something that I enjoy doing. There are some things you have to do yourself. But sometimes it's grey. When we help each other, it can create a fun and play environment. It's not as lonely a place, and leadership roles can be made into that.

R: As you've moved through your career in leadership roles, what do you feel has become more available to you, or benefits you've realized?

P: Influence. In terms of making things happen, I think there might be two things: the brilliance of your idea, and the organizational clout to make it happen. Being a successful leader you are granted greater authority to make things happen, both through position authority, but through people trusting you. You can influence things that you think are good and important by displaying good leadership style (BSL003 Influence).

R: Is there anything other than influence that you realize as you progress?

P: I think there are short-term ego things like job titles (BSL002 Advancement) and salary (BSL019 Financial compensation). I think all those are very fleeting in that you get a fat head for a few months, but the shine on it fades pretty quick. You're left with the relationship and obligations that you need to carry. That's what will sustain you. It won't give you an adrenaline boost, but it will make it fun to come into work.

R: So it sounds like it's primarily influence that you value and realize as you progress. I'm wondering if there is anything else?

P: To have greater control over my priorities (BSL015 Autonomy).

R: Would that be autonomy?

P: Yes. When you're starting out, people often tell you what to do and how to do it. As you progress, your riverbanks end up being more conceptual. You have more creative space and more freedom to figure out what needs to be done and how.

R: What has been your experience when you have failed to display those leadership abilities and attributes that were expected?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: The biggest example I can think of is that we changed the way we made decisions as an organization. I saw this changing, but I didn't hear anyone telling me why. It felt to me like it was a change by stealth. So I asked some very difficult questions to a senior leader about what was happening. It was communicated to me to get on board and not be difficult.]

R: When you got that feedback, did you perceive or foresee any consequences to your actions?

P: I had the thought that I was being misunderstood. I think people might have misunderstood my motives. I think I had some concern around people thinking that I was not a team player and that I might be unwilling to change the way I do things because of my own arrogant view of how things should be done. I was nervous that people would misread my intentions. I didn't feel much else (CUL015 Reduced trust).

R: I'm curious what you thought could have been the consequences of them perceiving you the way you think they did?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-

identifying version: it happened during a difficult business cycle when we were losing some people, so the thought did cross my mind that I might be part of the group that loses their job. I thought that they would be thinking that they need to keep the best people and I might not now be one of those people.] It's a fine line between being a team player, and being a leader who is expected to think and speak up. I think, however, that if I live by my own values and principles, and if that is not valued and I lose my job, then I probably don't want to be here.

R: I don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: I can't think of anything.

Participant 009; Energy

R: In your organization, how are leaders valued?

P: In this organization, I would say they are more valued by results and the bottom line (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation); more than the how.

R: How is that value expressed?

P: In almost everything we do. It's the way we do our budget, the way we do our quarterly reviews, the way the town halls are done in the departments and in the corporate communication from the CEO every year. It's very apparent that it's the bottom line is what drives, and has driven, this organization.

R: Leaders are valued on results. How is the achievement of those results expressed to the leader?

P: It's everywhere. It's actual versus plan and at the end of the day, if you have the results, there is a good chance that you'll be seen as a good leader in this organization. It's evolving, but that's where we are at right now.

R: And, if some one is seen as a good leader in this organization, what does that look like?

P: It's basically the same thing again, if they consistently meet their targets and if they are at the early and middle level leadership role, they are the ones that get the next opportunities. There is not an evaluation of how they deal with people, it's more the results that they have achieved.

R: So, when somebody has achieved those results, what benefits would they realize now that they have achieved these results and recognized as a good leader? What does that do for them?

P: Whether they know it or not, they are talked about more at senior levels about who's in-line for the next opportunities and who consistently gets the job done. If there are big issues to be dealt with, then they are often included in conversations that they would not normally have been included in. They get an opportunity to participate at a different level.

R: Can you think of examples of any other benefits that they might realize?

P: The ones with the best results get the higher bonuses, and there is more of a discussion about their long-term incentives and their whole compensation package. Those people that consistently exceed expectations, we can't lose them.

R: So we've talked about financial, and you have mentioned they are talked about at higher levels regarding opportunities, and that they are included in meetings and discussions that they might not have been in the past. Is there anything else?

P: Some of them get accelerated opportunities that they might have been a little further away from. If they've had a few good years of meeting results, they somehow get to the front of

the line.

R: What kind of opportunities would those be?

P: Promotional usually. Every now and then, it's an opportunity to take on a new project or new assignment. I think that those people absolutely rise to the top of those discussions.

R: I'm wondering that, in your role, is there anything that you feel that you have realized as a result of displaying the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization, in your own role?

P: In this organization, my role has not necessarily been a role that has been at the table. I think the way I'm getting recognized is that I am at the table when decisions are getting made. And when there are discussions about different topics, I end up at the table (BSL022 Valued inclusion). I'd say that that is probably recognition (BSL013 Recognition).

R: When that happens for you, and you realize it, how do you experience it? What's it like for you?

P: What does this feel like for me? Well, for me, I believe it's my discipline that gets me to the table, but once at the table, I enjoy being part of the business (BSL022 Valued inclusion). I don't just want to talk about my discipline, I want to talk about the business: what we're doing, where we're going, how we're doing it, and have a broader impact. So, when I'm able to do that, that's a pretty good feeling when you're being included in conversations outside of your discipline, and maybe in a broader sense and broader perspective. So, yeah, it's a good feeling to be operating at that level (BSL003 Influence).

R: What are those leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by this organization?

P: I think, results-oriented, driven (OLA007 Results orientation), a real sense of

professionalism (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or be of good character)—I think that comes out on a regular basis—and the other one I talk about a fair bit is the leaders initiative to get things done. We need people that are thinking about it and using good judgment to get things done and not just waiting for things to happen around them. That’s a big thing for us. There’s a lot going on in the organization, like there is in any organization, so the people who are kind of standing there the freeway is looking pretty fast with cars going both ways. We expect people to be moving and keeping up with the traffic. I’ve seen too many leaders who just seem to be caught in a whirlwind. Our boys need the basic understanding that it’s the pedal to the metal (OLA007 Results orientation) and they need to lead by example (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character).

R: So, I hear an almost active engagement. Is that correct?

P: Yes, this is not a sit-back in your office and wait to manage people organization. You’re in there. Part of the success, you’re driving the success (OLA007 Results orientation), you’re leading by example (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or be of good character). We don’t have too many people whose job it is to only manage people. It’s mostly, or all hands on deck, and working leaders for the most part. Which makes it difficult because we expect to be good to people. So there is pressure from both sides. It’s difficult and we make no bones about it. It’s a challenge, but that is certainly what is expected.

R: What is it like when leaders fail to display the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization?

P: I’d say that, in this organization, is that there is nothing really positive that happens for them in terms of those things I mentioned before, but there’s nothing really negative that happens

to them either. It's more like a holding pattern and, rightly or wrongly, that's where we're at right now. There is lack of the positive, but there is nothing really negative. Very seldom do I see leaders taken to task for not delivering, other than momentary outbursts. There is nothing long-term.

R: What do you think might be happening internally with the leaders who have become aware that they are not displaying the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I think the organization was stagnant for some time. It's only been recently that we have communicated that we expect people to lead. I think that's what people are struggling with.] I think we've been going the speed limit for a long time, and now we're asking them to go a few kilometers over the speed limit. It's a different expectation.

R: Has there been an instance in your role where you haven't displayed the leadership attributes and abilities that were valued by the organization? What was that like for you?

P: I can honestly say that I've never been in a position where I wasn't displaying the attributes valued by the organization, but I have been in a position where my leader didn't appreciate what I was doing because they had a different view. That creates a very uncomfortable situation. It gets very uncomfortable when there is that tension (CUL006 Negative affect). The tension was between what the company's values were, what my boss's values were and what I was doing.

R: Did you feel that what you wanted to do was more in-line with the company's values?

P: Yes, there was no doubt. [Participant provided identifying information].

R: What consequences did you experience or what were you worried about during this instance?

P: Well I wasn't worried about very much, but my boss made a change. So I left that organization (CUL012 Termination of employment).

R: Were there any other direct or indirect consequences that you experienced?

P: Yes, I got a little more personal attention about my views and what I was saying. It wasn't being appreciated. It got to be a pretty frosty situation and I think it had a negative impact to the people around at the time (CUL015 Reduced trust).

R: Was that more attention happening when you were still there?

P: Oh yeah. It was a little frosty for a while and it just started to get a little more and more awkward (CUL015 Reduced trust). Then there were discussions that other people were involved in and I wasn't (CUL015 Reduced trust). Eventually, it just ended.

R: What are the leadership tasks or activities that you do in your role?

P: I would say that, at this point in my career, I spend a fair bit of my time in the coaching and mentoring (RLT009 Helping others be successful) end of the world. Half of my leadership team has spent a fair bit of time in leadership roles and the other half hasn't. I have pretty regular meetings with them to be the sounding board and the coach and mentor (RLT009 Helping others be successful). That's the value that I offer at this point.

R: Is there anything else that you spend a lot of time on?

P: It's interesting because all those things are about providing perspective. As you move up in an organization, you have a broader perspective of how things fit in. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I also provide

this perspective to my peers (RLT009 Helping others be successful).]

R: Tell me more about providing support to your peers.

P: We can't really tell anybody to do anything. It's all about influence. I've been told that I should just go out and tell people to do stuff. I don't do that. I'd rather that we have a discussion and they come up with the solution. I think that when you come into an organization that's not really focused on the people, and you start focusing on the people, you have lots of opportunities to have those discussions. I have daily opportunities for those discussions (RLT006 Facilitating implementation).

R: What do you enjoy doing most in your current leadership role?

P: I like to see the people in the group grow. When it's all said and done, I should probably judge my success by how successful people have become in their own careers. When I see people coming in with problems and they say, "This is the way I think we should do this," I get a real charge out of that (ELT003 Build capacity in others). And the other thing I get a real charge out of is just being involved in the business discussions. I'm happy to talk about my discipline, but sitting around the table when business decisions are getting made, that's when I get really fired up. That's when I like coming to work in a big way (ELT004 Being strategic).

R: What do you think has contributed to your success?

P: For me, I put myself in the other person's shoes. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: Throughout my career, I've just always put myself in the other person's shoes. If I wouldn't want to be treated a certain way, why would I treat them like that. That's my advice to leaders. I think this has helped me gain credibility around the organization.]

R: What are the leadership tasks that you just don't like to do?

P: What I don't like is talking to people about the same things over and over again.

[Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: When I see people doing the wrong thing out of complacency or inattention, I don't think that that is something that should happen. I have regular meetings with everyone and I talk about expectations. I also constantly offer people the opportunity to chat if they think it's unfair or if there is an issue. But when they don't deliver, and I didn't know that they weren't going to deliver, that's a part of my job that I find disappointing and frustrating.] The whole time I've been in business, I don't think I ever needed too much direction. I just wanted to know what we need to do and then turn me loose. I looked forward to coming to work everyday and I really hope the people that work for me look forward to coming to work. But when I see people making mistakes, I wonder what was missed. Do you not understand what was expected? Is there some complacency here? In our business, we can't afford that. We have to get the detail right. I find that my patience is greater for the younger people. The people who have been around a lot longer, I wonder, how many times do we have to have this conversation? (ULT008 Providing excessive direction). [Participant provided identifying information.]

R: When you think about your current role and leadership career, what did you look forward to with respect to the benefits of being a leader?

P: To be honest, I never really thought about it. I've always been just really happy with what I was doing and the only reason I accepted the next job was because somebody asked me to do it. I think that if you can't be really happy in your own skin, doing what you're doing today, then you're really just wasting time (BSL021 Positive affect). When I see someone really

enjoying what they're doing, that's the kind of person I notice. I think, "I wonder if they can take on this next piece of work?" When people who come to me and ask, "When am I? When am I?" I never thought like that.

R: How did you expect to benefit from your leadership role? Were there any benefits that you did realize because of your success?

P: Sure, you're at the next level table. For me, that's what it's all about: I get to participate at the next level. That's the benefit. It's the next level of knowledge an opportunity to participate in the business at a different level (BSL003 Influence). [Participant provided identifying information.] If I operate at the next level, that means that people who work for me are going benefit from the perspective that I'm gaining.

R: I don't have any more questions for you. I'll turn off the recorders and we can debrief.

Participant 010; Energy

R: However you define them, what do you believe to be the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by your organization and expected of you?

P: The attributes?

R: Yes, the attributes and skills; how you're supposed to be a leader.

P: This may sound far too linear, but I believe it paints a picture for you. There are four parts to leadership, as we see it. One is setting direction (OLA018 Be strategic), leading self (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character), leading others and driving results (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation). Here those are the things.

R: When you're successful at meeting those expectations or displaying those attributes, yourself, how would you say that you benefit from that success?

P: Actually, I just want to add something. We call these the capabilities. It's the what of leadership. There is another side of it: the how. There is more of the how. So, when you say attributes, I think it's a combination. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: we have a name for this program.] I think it's both the what and the how that are important. So, what was the question, again?

R: Thanks for explaining this. When you think of yourself in your own role, when you are deemed successful at meeting those expectations, how do you feel you benefit from that?

P: I don't know if I'm going to answer this well. When leaders are able to set the direction, manage themselves, get the results through others and in a way that sets up a good environment; what I get out of that is the satisfaction (BSL021 Positive affect) of enabling others potential. To me the difference between an individual contributor and a leader is that a leader gets results through others. If you're not focusing on the how and getting those results, you're probably working too hard at the wrong level. That's not satisfying for myself or for anyone around me.

R: I might ask the same questions a couple different ways. From your last response I understand how you benefit from being a good leader. As you are a good leader, what becomes more available to you in the organization; what do you realize from succeeding in your role?

P: I guess it is that motivates me, individually, is doing the kind of work that I like to do (BSL021 Positive affect). I think that as you get better and better at being a leader, the technical depth, while still foundational, is less important. As I've tuned up my leadership, I find that it's not just a small technical area that the organization can see me doing. There is this whole leadership side of things (BSL003 influence).

R: It sounds like it allows you to work across technical boundaries and opens up opportunities in different parts of the organization. Is this right?

P: Yes. For me, it's not a traditional upward ladder opportunity. It's more of a lattice where I can contribute in different areas. That's what's exciting for me.

R: With that breadth of role, what have you been able to do? Is it contribution, influence or something else? What does it look like?

P: For me it's fun and different and challenging work. That's what it is for me (BSL021 Positive affect).

R: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

P: No.

R: When you look back on your career and how you attained progressively more responsible leadership roles, what have you realized as you progressed through those role? What has changed in your day-to-day work?

P: I think it continues to be the getting of results through others: the continued satisfaction (BSL021 Positive affect) and the influence (BSL003 Influence). [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I've been in different companies and in different roles.]

R: You mentioned that as you are more successful as a leader in an organization, there are more opportunities to contribute outside of you technical discipline. I'm wondering if anything else comes to mind that you realized as you are recognized as being successful.

P: No.

R: If there has been an instance where you haven't met those expectations with respect to

your leadership, what happened there? Did something become less available or did something else happen?

P: Let me talk about what comes to mind with your question. It may or may not be what you're looking for. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: there was a time when I had developed a great followership in one role, but then something changed and I had difficulty getting people to do the work. I wondered what was going on because it was such a new experience. It's not like something became less available to me.] I just had to learn how to do something. I brought it to my leaders and explained to them that there was something for me to learn in this. I had great support from my leadership team. Every situation becomes a learning opportunity. There is satisfaction that comes from that growth (CUL004 Motivation to improve).

The way that you are asking that question, if there were repercussions organizationally, that's not what happened. It did shake my confidence (CUL006 Negative affect) and I really had to concentrate on changing. Is that what you're looking for?

R: I'm not looking for anything in particular, but what you've explained makes sense. If I could paraphrase, there was a self-monitoring process. You noticed that something wasn't working for you; that something was going on that challenged your confidence. It also sounds like your leadership was supportive.

P: Yes, that's correct.

R: Have you ever been in a position that others have said that you are not being the leader we need you to be, we need you to be this way?

P: No.

R: What leadership things do you love to do?

P: I got to do this interview. I like this (BSL006 Participate externally). Also, I got asked to be a mentor to a high-potential employee. I love to share my journey and experience with others. I like mentoring and helping people find their path (ELT003 Influence). During some recent performance reviews, I asked people how I could support them. I learned that what they like is that I offer an alternate perspective for them. I am in a place where my team can come and I can help them through their challenges. I love seeing other people succeed (ELT003 Influence).

R: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

P: No. I think that sums it up.

R: So what are those leadership tasks or activities that you just don't like at all?

P: I don't mind giving feedback, I've done a lot of terminations, I coach leaders on their challenges and leadership but I think it's all the management responsibilities that I don't like. In a leadership role, you just don't lead the people, there are times when you need to do the budgets and workforce plans. I find that this takes away from my leadership (ULT005 Administration or management).

R: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

P: No.

R: We've talked about what you like and don't like. Day-to-day, what leadership tasks and activities do you find yourself doing most of the time?

P: Listening, coaching, guiding and clarifying expectations. I give feedback and recognize people. I'd say that there is a lot of listening (RLT009 Helping others be successful).

R: We've talked about what the organization expects and how success is experienced,

and how you approached leadership challenges. When you look at others in the organization who are coming up through leadership roles, as they become progressively more successful as a leader, how do they benefit by success as a leader? What becomes available to them?

P: I think it's similar to what I said earlier. Developing leadership gives you such breadth. As the organization gets more interested in leadership, it's more about the breadth. You see productivity, a different point of view and diversity.

R: if I could go a little deeper into that; as people realize more success as leaders in this organization, there seems to be more opportunity across boundaries. Is there anything else that they might notice as they become more successful.

P: I'm struggling because I'm getting confused between what you notice as you move up up a hierarchy. There is more political savvy and emotional intelligence that's required. That's what you notice and you better have it.

R: I'll give you an example, but I don't want to say that this is true for you. You actually already gave me an answer, in that you said that was that they tend to realize opportunity laterally and across boundaries.

P: Where I think you might be going is asking if you get differentiated development. That's something that can happen.

R: Can you explain that? I haven't heard the term differentiated development before.

P: If we see that you're developing and demonstrating all these great things as a leader, we'll probably assess you as having higher potential as a leader. What we want to do is unlock that earlier. We're going to invest more in you in comparison to others.

R: What does that look like?

P: It's primarily targeted development plans, coaching, stretch assignments. I think it's available to everyone, but we're becoming more disciplined about it.

R: Similar question to what I asked you; let's say that someone, in their leadership role, is not displaying those leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization. What kind of consequences might they realize; what would happen?

P: If it was really getting in the way, they would be gone. I would say that I'm seeing a growing intolerance of poor leadership skills. We are calling it out, recognizing the ripple effect that any one leader can have on the entire organization. I think the consequences are getting more extreme. It used to be that all you needed to do was deliver. There is more attention being paid to the leadership side of things.

Often times, however, it's not that black and white. What we are trying to do is have a conversation about the what and the how. The performance rating of leaders is impacted by how well they are doing the what and the how. The other thing that we are seeing is providing feedback directly on a person's leadership before it was more about results.

R: I think that's all I have for you. Do you have any you'd like to add?

P: No.

Participant 011; Healthcare

R: What do you feel your organization values with respect to the leadership attributes and abilities of their leaders?

P: This organization has a set of values that we are expected to follow. They speak to leadership skills and translating that to day-to-day action. One of them is respect (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character). A leader must demonstrate respect (OLA004 Be ethical,

equitable or of good character). Must be transparent (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency).
That's the open and honest piece (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency). So to me, those are just core values. What the organization expects of a leader is to be able to take a position and to demonstrate action (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation); so to take a concept to practice, to take an idea to its fruition (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation) in a collaborative way (OLA003 Demonstrate collaboration). As a leader, this organization can be very supportive in achieving these demonstrated skills, but the organization doesn't always demonstrate it themselves. What it says it wants from you as a leader, isn't always what the bigger *it* does; which is tough.

[Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: We have an executive education program. This really sets you up to understand what it is you need to do, and how you need to behave, as a leader.] Ultimately what they want to get is to have a critical mass of people thinking along the same lines (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline) so that we can transform the system.

R: When you think of your leadership role, what are the leadership tasks that you like the most; like doing the most?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: I really enjoy developing a strategic plan (ELT004 Being strategic) and implementing that plan (ELT006 Facilitating implementation); taking a concept and helping and shaping others and be informed by others to understand where we should be and where we should be going (ELT005 Collaborating). Then having the skill set, and drawing on the skill set of others, to translate that into an operations plan.] When you see things implemented as a result

of that, I find that incredibly rewarding as a leader (BSL021 Positive affect). It's engaging, but also doing something very practical. Many leaders just want to orchestrate, but I want to see that orchestration taken to something that is very practical. I want to develop the plan (ELT004 Being strategic) and operationalize it. It's not like I'm doing all the work (ELT006 Facilitating implementation), but I'm working with others to do that.

R: Is there any other leadership activity in your role that you enjoy?

P: I find it very rewarding to see growth a development in my direct reports (ELT003 Building capacity in others). I function as a mentor, or maybe more of a coach (ELT003 Building capacity in others). I create a lot of space for them to test new things, to do new things. I'm not going to tell them how to do their job. They're going to ask me and we can talk about what would work. So I find it very rewarding to see them grow and develop, and be creative (ELT003 Building capacity in others). Because that's the only way they're going to get ownership. They have to lead their staff; use the same techniques and strategies. So, functioning as a role model.

R: Does anything else come to mind?

P: This is something I don't have the opportunity to enough of, but as a leader, I like connecting with other leaders (ELT009 Interaction / inclusion with other leaders). I'm not a natural networker. I don't seek out people to talk and schmooze, but I like to connect with people and share common experiences (ELT009 Interaction / inclusion with other leaders). [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: There was a recent event where I was able to see people. This validated that you're in the right group; I'm in the right part of the organization; that I'm at the right level; that you're dealing with peers.] So that kind of networking, I find rewarding (ELT009 Interaction / inclusion with

other leaders).

R: Are these peers also fellow leaders in the organization?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: There might be some managers or directors, but it's typically senior directors, vice presidents, etc.: that senior leadership team.]

R: During those opportunities when you connect with other leaders, tell me more about how that is for you, how you experience that?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: At these times when all the leaders get together, I'm also able to connect other leaders with each other. Some people may not know each other because they haven't been around as long as me, so I'm able to connect them.] It's also great to catch-up with people that you don't see very often; to find out what they're doing and why they are there. It's a gap in my needs in this organization and these events fill that need. Maybe it might not help me as a leader, but just as a person; to connect with peers and those that are influential. I know a lot of senior people that have moved through the system and these events help me check-in with them. If I wasn't in a leadership role, I wouldn't have that opportunity (BSL010 Professional development) (BSL011 Interaction / inclusion with other leaders).

[Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: One of the other things I enjoy as a leader is that my discipline has it's own leadership team (BSL022 Valued inclusion). There can really be open and honest communication around that executive table. It's okay to disagree and there is a comfort level with that now. The culture that our lead has created makes it very comfortable to have a forum

where you can speak openly.]

R: What are the things you enjoy the least?

P: This is not necessarily from a leadership role, but it's the games people will play and the hidden agendas; I just don't get it. I don't want to have to play those games and sometimes you get stuck in the middle of things. Knowing how people are "players" will effect how you deal with them, how you communicate with them, in an email. I don't like having to be restricted that way. I would rather just be in your face. To me, that's what I like the least. Because I have to adapt my style, outside my comfort zone, to be able to move my agenda forward. I don't mind adapting my agenda to people that are open and honest, but for those that I know will manipulate and turn things in different ways, it makes it challenging to move forward. [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: When we discuss making changes, we know that some people will go nuts, escalate it up the food chain and go political. They will escalate many, many levels. Then our strategy has to be, how can we best position ourselves to be successful, to make this change that's not threatening and still take a baby step in the right direction? So, how do we manage them? People shouldn't have to be managed (ULT002 Being politically savvy). They should grow up.

R: Is there anything else that you like least about your role?

P: The whole power relationship thing. [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: It's risky talking to people two layers above you. You always have to go through people. It's risky to even be seen talking to people at a level above your direct supervisor. However, if they approach you, that's fine, but you should never approach them (ULT002 Being politically savvy).]

R: Is there anything else that you don't enjoy doing as part of your day-to-day leadership role?

P: As you move along the food chain, get into more higher level positions, your world in many respects becomes smaller. I find that I have fewer and fewer friends at work. There are fewer and fewer people in your role and you're limited to your peers, or above; but you can't go too far above because you'll get in trouble. I find it more and more isolating. There were more opportunities for personal friendship in the past (ULT002 Being politically savvy).

R: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

P: No.

R: How does the organization respond when you are displaying those leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization?

P: I would like to be able to tell you that the organization responds in a positive, rewarding manner, but I wouldn't necessarily say that it does. Sometimes when it responds, when I am displaying those behaviors, I learn that it isn't okay to be honest and transparent. It's always okay to be respectful. But some things should not be said, or shared, or you have to choose when you are being transparent. You are transparent, but you don't say everything all the time and you have to choose when you are sharing information. I'd like to say that the organization responds favorably when you behave according to its norms, but that isn't necessarily always the case. When I look at other leaders, how they share information, it's all over the map.

R: How do you know when you're doing a good job as a leader?

P: To a large extent, I know I'm doing a good job as a leader when I watch myself and

observe myself. I don't rely on my supervisors or my peers for giving me feedback. We did 360's this year and I was very strong, but I rely on watching myself, listening to myself. I tell myself to pay attention to what I'm saying, be patient. When you know what it takes to be a good leader, you offer yourself that feedback loop. Positive feedback from peers, your reports or people you collaborate with, yes that's great, but I don't count on it. If I ask for feedback, I will get it. Do you hear it on an informal basis? Yes, but as a leader, I don't go looking for it. I don't need the stroking, I don't have the ego that I need that.

R: Let's talk about that awareness that you've cultivated and that awareness that you have that let's you know that you're doing a good job as a leader. Can you tell me a little more about that process and experience?

P: It's like an out of body experience because you're watching yourself.

R: When you do this and get that positive self-feedback, and you tell yourself that you think you're doing okay, what's that like for yourself? How does that make you feel?

P: I can relax a little more if I feel that things are going well. I can settle into the conversation more. Maybe even be more present. However, I think that this is even more valuable when things are not going well. When I can hear myself responding to this person and I'm getting too emotionally involved in a situation. It helps me disengage and back away a little bit, and be a better listener.

R: When you see that things are going well, describe to me the emotions that go with that or how it translates into your day-to-day life.

P: I'm one to beat myself up pretty badly because I have high expectations. But yes, to give myself that positive feedback, it feels good. But it doesn't last because you're a feedback

junkie. It's difficult to describe any long-standing emotional bonds to the positive self-feedback.

R: Let's turn it around. When you're not having the best day, and you're that objective observer, and you say that I could have done better here, tell me about that.

P: It's really easy to beat yourself up. To me, it's matter of how do you make that correction? I say, oh my god. How did I get myself into this and how do I get out of it without hurting myself and hurting the outcome? It's a beat yourself up thing, but you're also getting to know that group better . . . so you don't make that same mistake. It's easiest on a one-to-one basis. Because we're always trying to move agendas forward, you don't want to get into that negative situation. How do you avoid getting there in the first place? It's best to build rapport with that person before you have to do a deal. How do you connect with that person? How do you build that relationship?

R: When you haven't performed the way you would have liked to, what's that experience like for you?

P: It's not a good experience. It's a negative experience, initially, but then it's a matter of integrating. So how do you learn from this? How do you move forward? Because nobody is going to give you the good, bad and ugly. So how do you move forward so next time I will not do this? I should have checked in up front about what is going on in their lives before I started this conversation.

R: So tell me about how it feels in the moment when you didn't do your best. Tell me about the consequences for yourself when you feel that you did not perform at your best: this is what I'm thinking, what I'm feeling.

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-

identifying version: About a month ago I didn't perform as well as I wanted I realized that I had become too emotionally engaged in that situation. It affected my performance. All I can think about is how I will do better next time and I'm not sure I have the answer yet.]

R: I think I've got a good understanding about how you monitor your leadership performance, let's talk about the organization now. How does the organization communicate to you that you're doing a good job as a leader? Who does that, and how?

P: If I can demonstrate that I've done well, I get more money (BSL019 Financial compensation). The money piece is nice, but it's always secondary. There is the formal feedback that identifies the things I'm doing well, but then there are the things you're doing bad. They say, "you should try to do this more." Beyond the annual reviews, there is the occasional email to say that you're doing a good job, thanks; but that's pretty weak.

R: I realize that this is pretty weak, but when you are recognized by the organization, as being a "good leader," what benefits do you realize? You mentioned money. What other things are there?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: So when I was chosen to be part of the organization's leadership development program (BSL010 Professional development), that was recognition (BSL013 Recognition), that was status (BSL003 Influence). I speak about it. I say, "I did this program and I was supported by the organization." I had support from multiple parts of the organization. You have to be selected and all this other stuff to get into it. So, it's a status thing (BSL0003 Influence).]

R: So status might be considered a "softer" thing. For example money and being in the

program might be considered concrete things. I just wondering if there are any more of those hard of soft things that you realize as a benefit.

P: To me, if you are being successful as a leader, I think you're left alone more (BSL015 Autonomy). This gives you freedom of movement and independence in decision-making. So, although there is accountability, there isn't that nagging need requirement to report in on how you're doing. I feel I have a lot of independence to make decisions (BSL015 Autonomy). To me, this is one piece. I'm trying to think of more things I realize as a leader.

R: As a good leader. So think of it as, I'm doing good and because of that, these are the things I realize or appreciate?

P: I am struggling with this because I don't think the organization does a great job. There is rarely a meeting that goes by with my staff that I don't acknowledge that they did a great job or that I appreciate that they did this. My immediate supervisor never says that.

R: Let's turn it around. You talked about your self-monitoring, but what's it like when you fail to display those leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization? How is that communicated by others?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: That's very interesting because I really blew something in the past. A bunch of things happened and everything just went to hell. A special meeting was set up to talk about it, but everything was so sanitized that it was hard to tell that I was in trouble or that they were pissed-off. It would have been good if they just said, "You really blew this. Don't do it again. Next time, do this." It was just way too soft for me, but that might be my style not them. Also, if you don't do well, you'll hear about it in the performance review and what you get the salary

increase (CUL009 Negative impact on compensation).

R: I heard conversation and meeting, and that you'd hear about it in the performance review and that it could effect your pay-for-performance, these are kind of concrete. What about those softer things that you experienced that time when you didn't display those things that they were looking for?

R: As a person responsible for their own actions, I spent a lot of time thinking about why things went the way they did. There was a lot of thinking about how I'm not going to get caught again in this same kind of mess (CUL004 Motivation to improve). [Participant provided identifying information. The following in the researcher's non-identifying version: I thought I had something under control, but I truly didn't. There was a lot of introspection around how I choose to share information. I don't know if it changed me, but it made me more cautious (CUL015 Reduced trust)]

R: As a leader in the organization, when things are going well there tends to be some recognition: you get positive feedback from peers and from my team, my good performance will probably be reflected in my pay, I get to be a member of the executive education program and there's the positive affect that goes with that. Was there a thought or feeling at the time, when things were not going well, that something could change? Maybe not the things I listed, but something with respect to you being a leader? Was there anything going through your head when they were having these discussions?

P: Change in terms of my status or loss or my employment?

R: Sure, or something else? Whatever you think.

P: No. I don't think so. This might reflect the language around this organization as being

a continuously learning organization. So there isn't "punishment", there's the opportunity to grow and learn. So there's a willingness that you have to take risks. But this was something I blew, and having that feedback as gentle as it was reflected that philosophy. It's like they said, "You made a boo-boo. We'll learn from it and move forward. Just, don't make the same mistake again. And there was no overt threat. So, there was no loss. From a personal perspective, I was embarrassed (CUL006 Negative affect). Someone at my level and maturity shouldn't be making these kinds of mistakes. So you cower a little bit, but you move forward. So I didn't feel that I was going to lose something, except that I was personally embarrassed.

R: I think we're almost done. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: Just in terms of my organization. There are some really healthy parts, and there are some really unhealthy parts. So I think it's up to each one of us, wherever we can, to demonstrate health as a leader; to acknowledge, to show recognition, to provide feedback in an appropriate and timely manner. And I think that, in itself, makes a stronger organization. When I look at behaviors of peers and at senior levels I wonder how their behaviour can be tolerated. I wonder how those individuals are going to get the feedback that they need. It sure isn't up to me to tell them. I think, as an organization, we've done some good things, but there is still a lot to do.

R: Now that we've come to the end, I'd like to go back and ask you one of the first questions? What is it you appreciate the most about being a leader in this organization?

P: I would say it's the relationships with those that report to me, and my peers.

R: And your leadership role is important to you how and for what reason?

P: I naturally a shit-disturber, so that translates into a change agent in this current environment. So status quo is not okay. I was brought into this role to make change and I will

continue to make change. Once I'm not able to, then I'm gone because my value is limited. I'm not here to just help people grow and develop. I'm here to give them the power and the insight to move forward and to bring those that don't report directly to me along that same path.

R: That's all I have. Thank you.

Participant 012; Healthcare

R: What are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by your organization?

P: I would say that they want transparency (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency), accountability (OLA002 Demonstrate accountability), collaboration (OLA003 Demonstrate collaboration), and an ethical and fair workplace (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character). My activities must support those core values. My decision-making and approach aligns with and supports those values.

R: Does anything else come to mind regarding what the organization values?

P: No, I think that's it.

R: With respect to your role, what happens when you're successful at demonstrating those skills; specifically, how is success communicated to you and by whom?

P: When it's working well I'm able to see it in the actions of those who report to me and see demonstrable evidence of that reach. What does that mean? That means that in meeting in forums when we come together, I hear from my direct reports that they feel open and free to challenge and question things that we do and that there is a clear understanding of why we do what we do.

When it doesn't work, I hear things like I don't understand or I can't influence how decisions are made. That links back to those leadership values in that if we fully respect the

people and their skills, if we are transparent in our decisions making, if we are transparent around the principles in which we work and there's no feelings of secrecy. It also demonstrates itself in our actions and strategies that support our expected outcomes.

R: When I process what you just described, it sounds like you're able to observe how your leadership is causing the outcomes that you desire. How else would you know, or how else would it be communicated to you that you are being successful as a leader?

P: There are your basic operations priorities. Whatever they are as performance measures, I can see if the team is speaking to those and aligning their strategy back to those. I also observe that the development needs of others are being met. When I see people that have developed skills that enable them to advance, that to me is a trigger of success; because that demonstrates to me, either through my actions or my mentorship, that I am effectively creating an environment that within which they can grow. As they succeed more, that to me is a reflection of successful leadership, because it's about people development as well.

R: Aside from observing the actions and growth of others, and aside from achieving the metrics, is there any other way that you would know or be told, either directly or indirectly, that you are doing a good job as a leader?

P: It is about the dialogue and the discussion. It's about seeking feedback from people I work for and with. Being a good leader is about modeling the skills you want to see in others. So, I do seek feedback from my team on my actions. I open up my performance review to my team. I want to ensure that I'm meeting the needs of the people that work for me. It creates safety and is part of walking the talk.

R: You mentioned that you have your team contribute to your own performance review

process. How much of your understanding of how successful you are as a leader comes from the performance review process?

P: Not a lot of it comes from that. I think, the piece that is the raw feedback, I get this through a formalized 360 process. This is more impactful than the person I report to assimilating and regurgitating feedback to me. So, from a performance review perspective, I get less value from someone reporting back to me a condensed version. I prefer to get it directly. Also, feedback from my direct reports that everything is great and going well is not helpful for me. I know I'm doing a good job, but there has to be places that I can work on. Unfortunately, the formalized review process is fraught with the problems of impacting my future succession plans or salary. Therefore, the difficult conversations, or actually being able to talk through something, doesn't happen in the formal performance review process. So those conversations are less effective than some of the less formalized or continuous feedback. I'd prefer a point-in-time and in real-time feedback.

R: I think I understand well how you get more salient feedback on your leadership. Can you describe a little more how the more formal review process is different?

P: I think it's because the stakes are different. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's none identifying version: These meetings have a specific goal. Specifically, once a year you will meet with your leader for one hour to review your performance for the year, it will be rated and that rating will be used to determine your merit-based increase or lack there of. It's an administrative process. Depending on who is doing it, can be more narrow or broader.]

R: I think I understand how you're able to determine your performance. Regardless of

how you know you're being successful, what benefits do you realize or appreciate? How do you benefit?

P: So how do I benefit when I see progress in my team?

R: More specifically, I'd like to know how being successful benefits you directly?

P: In it's purest form, it provides opportunity for either different roles (BSL003 Influence) or professional advancement (BSL002 Advancement). It also provides opportunity to test and try new things (BSL015 Autonomy). When you're successful, and when you feel that success, you get the buy-in and willingness for people to try things that they are uncomfortable with (BSL003 Influence). So if I see that I've been successful, I have more confidence (BSL021 Positive affect) to try that thing that may feel a little uncomfortable because I have a track record. I also have more credibility (BSL005 Credibility) with people and they are more willing to entertain ideas (BSL003 Secure engagement of others) that may not have been a place they would have otherwise gone. It gives you some street cred (BSL003 influence) with your team and gives you confidence (BSL021 Positive affect) as well. Opportunities do come to you. For example, when I think of having this conversation with you, someone has suggested that you are someone who I might want to talk to. The opportunity to have this conversation with you (BSL006 Participate externally) is important to me in that it's a demonstration of success.

R: You mentioned that opportunities come to you, and one might be this conversation. I'm wondering what other kind of opportunities there are?

P: Educational opportunities (BSL010 Professional development); to participate in national or other boards (BSL006 Participate externally); sometimes it's an opportunity for additional responsibility that might be outside of your current scope (BSL003 Influence).

Another opportunity that becomes available is to share your opinion on something that you might not have been asked before (BSL003 Influence). There are opportunities to mentor people (BSL003 Influence), either informally or through a formal mentorship program.

R: When you mentioned that you might get an opportunity to share your opinion as you gain success or credibility, how is it different than how you were able to share your opinion in the past: is it with different people or is it the manner in which you can share it?

P: I think it's in forums where you can have more influence (BSL003 Influence). I also think that as your success expands, your ability to connect with other people changes. I think you become more attuned to what's happening with others because you can reflect that back to a particular point in your own leadership life. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: over a period of time, at each point in their career, and reflect that back on your own experience.]

R: The questions I have for you now are about when or if you haven't displayed those leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by the organization, how do you experience that?

P: There are two places: setting up an expectation of something and not following through on it; and it's frustration with my team, in that I see the negative and don't see what they're going through. That's not the person I want to be. So I know that I have to manage myself.

R: Just like I asked about the benefits you realize when things are going well, I'm curious about any consequences you've experienced when things have not gone well.

P: I don't think there have been any professional consequences. I think the consequences

of things not going well is more work (CUL001 Increased workload). The consequences is also quiet; nobody speaks up in meetings (CUL015 Reduced trust). There is humility when something has not gone well (CUL006 Negative affect). But, in an optimistic way, it's those times when things have not gone well where the biggest leadership jump happens. From those you will often propel because they are meaningful for you (CUL004 Motivation to improve). They are things you carry and you know what that feeling is like.

R: It's interesting that you haven't realized any professional consequences. So I interpret that as not experiencing any sanctioning or punishment from the organization. However, I heard some work effectiveness consequences. Are there any other consequences at all with you interactions with the organization when things haven't gone well?

P: I think there just seems to be more of a caution. That willingness to try something new gets cut away a bit. There is caution, trepidation (CUL006 Negative affect) and anxiety (CUL006 Negative affect). I think it does take longer to achieve something because you have to build the relationship again (CUL015 Reduced trust). And along with that, I have more anxiety (CUL006 Negative affect) doubt, trepidation and second-guessing of myself (CUL006 Negative affect). It is healthy, but it changes the playing field.

R: What are the leadership things that you like most about your role?

P: I'd say it's the autonomy and the ability to influence not only the clinical care (ELT001 Contribute in technical discipline or on project) that we provide, but also the opportunity to influence opportunities (ELT002 Advance careers of others) and personal development of others (ELT003 Build capacity in others).

R: What are the leadership tasks and activities that you like the least?

P: Busy work: doing things without a clear reason or end point just because we're always done them (ULT001 Working with lack of information or justification). One of the things that does frustrate me is the unwillingness to stop something that isn't showing value.

R: Can you think of anything else that you have to do as a leader, but that you just don't like to do?

P: No.

R: I don't have any more questions for you, but is there anything you'd like to add.

P: At the end of the day it's all about the relationships with people and understanding why we do what we do and understanding exactly what we want the outcome to be. Often times as leaders, we ask people to do things that don't necessarily align with the end that we want. There needs to be a willingness to say, "Is this good enough or clear enough."

Interview time expired.

Participant 013; Energy; No secondary use of data

Participant 014; Healthcare

R: What do you feel are the leadership attributes and abilities that are valued by your organization?

P: So you want to know what the organization values, and not my personal leadership values?

R: Yes, what the organization values, please.

P: Well, we certainly have established values around transparency (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency) and ethics (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character). We have core values. They want their leaders to be authentic (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good

character) and transparent (OLA001 Demonstrate transparency) and focus on quality (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation).

R: I'm interested in the leadership attributes and abilities that are expected of you by the people you report to. Does this cover those?

P: Sure.

R: What are the leadership attributes and abilities that you personally value?

P: I get asked this a lot. It's how you practice them. I think it's really important to be authentic, transparent, ethical, and present; you need to be resilient. Communication and interpersonal skills are really important to have as a leader. People don't follow you just because you tell them to.

R: When you are successful as a leader in your organization, what benefits do you realize, or what is more available to you by virtue of being successful?

P: Like all industries, everyone is results-driven. The only way to achieve results in healthcare where growth far outstrips resources, is to have all the people working together. When we have good quality care, when people are doing their jobs and feel respected, when we get excellent patient feedback, then I consider that success of leadership. If we lead well, then people are working for us to achieve those results. A successful leader will get a team to work as hard as it can.

R: You've described the outcomes of success, but as you are seen as a successful leader, either by peers or your leaders, how do you personally benefit? What becomes more available to you, or what are you able to do as a leader that might not otherwise be there if you weren't as successful as a leader?

P: I'm not sure I fully understand your question, but I'll take a stab at it. One of the things you see as you are successful as a leader is that you are leading high performing team. The team can then realize more capacity and can do more. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I see that in the teams I lead. Success in leadership is the creating of capacity to do more.]

R: I might ask the same question in a few different ways. As you have moved through progressively more responsible leadership roles, what are you able to do as you become more successful as a leader that you wouldn't be able to do if you were less successful as a leader?

P: Certainly with experience there are some consequences of that. Every time a problem comes to you it's not new. Your ability to problem-solve is greater. The leadership I do now is far more strategic, thoughtful and innovative, versus fire fighting. I have capacity to follow problem quickly. Is that what you mean?

R: I think we're getting close. You mentioned that you're able to devote more time to being strategic. I've heard that kind of thing before. I'm also curious about what opportunities or things are available to you when you are successful as a leader in this organization, that might not be available to someone who isn't as well regarded as a leader?

P: I see that you're asking me the same question that you did earlier, and I appreciate that. Well, one of the things that you realize when you have credibility in leadership is you are braver in your risk taking (BSL021 Positive affect). I have more experience with respect to what risks I can take. Also, there seems to be more organizational tolerance for some of that risk taking or innovation (BSL016 Tolerance for mistakes), like spending extra money, there is a lot more latitude for an experienced leader to do that than there would be for someone who hasn't

established that track record.

R: You mentioned more tolerance and more space for credible leaders. Are there any more things like that that successful leader seem to enjoy?

P: Well, sure. There are scarce resources that you are competing for and a successful leader will get preferential allocation of them (BSL003 influence).

R: Could you think about anything that more successful leaders experience with respect to relationships?

P: In terms of hiring, you'll get more talented people wanting to work for the more successful leader. You get to add the best and brightest to your team.

Another thing that comes with being successful, and I wouldn't consider myself successful—you're presuming that, and I'll leave it at that—is that people will give you the benefit of the doubt and trust you (BSL003 Influence).

R: Thank you. Yes, I'm calling it successful, but you can interpret that however you wish. One way to look at it might be to think of when things are going well for you versus not going well. Just to turn the tables, when you're not performing, when you weren't being the leader you needed to be, or more importantly, the leader your leaders needed you to be, was there anything that was either taken away, not accessible or consequences?

P: I wouldn't say that my performance varies very much. I get up everyday and try to do my best. It mostly comes down to an ability to get resources; and that's money. I've probably been more successful than many of my peers in that regard. You don't get them all the time. It's hard to keep people engaged at those times.

R: Like I've done earlier, I'll ask this question a couple different ways. You mentioned

that when leading is going well, the organization tends to open up more space for risk tolerance, there's more trust there and resources become more available. There are a lot of positive relationships that are built and you're able to influence people. But when things are not going well do these things become less available because the people you report to are thinking that you're not being the leader that we need you to be right now; although they might not say that directly? Do you tend to see things not happening for you?

P: There might be small pockets of that. But I'm very transparent and a good communicator. Any failure to move forward would be known to be not a leadership failure. I would be consistent in my efforts to show that I'm working my best to get things done.

R: I have some different questions now. What do you consider to be the leadership tasks or activities that you enjoy performing the most?

P: It's changed over time. In the early part of your career you get a lot of satisfaction for accomplishment and task completion, now in the latter part of my career the most enjoyable parts of my job are spending time with my staff in a mentoring kind of role (ELT003 Build capacity in others). When you are early and midcareer, you're really on a hamster wheel. Later you shift and spend more time on the people part. I didn't enjoy it as much early in my career, but now it's the thing I enjoy the most.

R: And what do you consider the leadership tasks that you least enjoy performing?

P: I don't think there is anything I dread. If anything, I'd like to meet all needs of your team. There are limited resources; so saying no to things that you know would make a difference is really hard (ULT010 Managing internal conflict). It's a hard part of the job, but I embrace it because I know it's an important part of the job.

R: We've talked about the things that are most enjoyable and the things that are difficult for you, but I'm curious what leadership tasks and activities actually consume your day.

P: Lots of meetings (RLT001 Attending meetings) and problem solving (RLT006 Facilitating implementation); supporting and advocacy for all the teams (RLT006 Facilitating implementation). They need support so that they can do their work. I spend most of my time in meetings to help people solve problems. There are lots of one-on-ones with my direct reports (RLT009 Helping others be successful). There are other stakeholders who need my support and advocacy (RLT009 Helping others be successful).

R: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

P: Lots of people have email and financial stuff, but the lion's share of my work is face-to-face interaction to get things done (RLT006 Facilitating implementation). I don't spend a lot of time alone.

R: I don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: No.

Participant 015; Healthcare

R: What do you believe are the leadership attributes and abilities that are expected of you by your organization?

P: They expect confidence in the area (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character), interpersonal skills (OLA012 Interpersonal or relationship skills), good communications skills (OLA012 Interpersonal or relationship skills), organizational efficiency (OLA007 Demonstrate results orientation), honest, trustworthy (OLA004 Be ethical, equitable or of good character), collaboration (OLA003 Demonstrate collaboration), team building (OLA015

Build capacity in others), independent (OLA016 Be independent); that's enough.

R: Are these what your leadership assessment is based on?

P: They assess us on how we meet the organization's values (OLA008 Maintain ideological discipline). Then they assess on accomplishments (OLA007 Results orientation).

R: When you have been successful as a leader, when people have recognized that you're being the kind of leader the organization wants you to be, what benefits do you realize when that happens?

P: There have been variable approaches to merit in this organization. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: the process has changed a bit over the years. Merit is the basis for a pay raise (BSL019 Financial compensation).]

R: I'm wondering that, as you're doing a good job as a leader in the organization, what else, aside from more compensation, becomes more available to you?

P: I think opportunity. No just career progression, but in terms of interesting projects. It's a way to get yourself out of the day-to-day (BSL003 influence).

R: Anything else?

P: I'm not one that seeks a lot of outside feedback, but I guess one of the side benefits is a sense of confidence and pride (BSL021 Positive affect). People recognize that you're doing a good job (BSL013 Recognition).

R: From the standpoint of relationship, how does success as a leader impact relationships with others in the organization?

P: I've seen that having a track record of good performance helps you get support

(BSL003 Influence), rather than criticism, when things aren't going well. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: I have one area that I'm responsible for that isn't doing as well as my other areas. Since I have a good track record, there seems to be more tolerance for this failure (BSL016 Tolerance for mistakes).]

R: Is this a kind of space that opens up for you?

P: Yes.

R: Can you tell me a little more about that? What does this support look like when you've got that track record of good performance?

P: [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: Because I've got a good track record, I get more understanding from other leaders regarding that area of mine that isn't doing as well as the rest of my portfolio. When I explain to the other leaders, they are more accepting of what I'm doing. I'm getting more support corporately, than if I were failing in many areas (BSL016 Tolerance for mistakes).]

R: Would it be fair to say that they might trust you and give you the benefit of the doubt?

P: Yes, they trust me and they run interference for me.

R: In the past, and this might not apply to you, when you weren't performing as well as a leader, and it was noticed, was there any thing that became less available? Were there consequences?

P: I don't have any direct experience with that. I guess there has been stuff in my career that reflects badly on me, whether or not it was due to my participation in it. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: there was one event that was significant and that I thought a lot about. Although no one has ever

mentioned or indicated that that event did impact my career, I often wonder if it did have an impact.]

R: When you look around your organization, do you see things that are less available to people who may not be as highly regarded, with respect to their leadership, as you are?

P: Not really. I would say no. We all think we're the best, but it's not true. [Participant provided identifying information. The following is the researcher's non-identifying version: For example, I think that I might have been the best applicant for a position, but I can't know exactly what they're looking for. I might think the person they picked isn't the best choice, but they might just be the difference that they were looking for.]

R: If I understand you correctly, it's not that there is only one way to operate, and being successful at that one way gets you more opportunities or other benefits. It's more that someone you perceive as less successful might just be taking a different approach or on a different track. Is this correct?

P: Politics, and other things. You never really know why things happen. There's always stuff going on in the background.

R: Can you tell what your favorite leadership tasks and activities that you enjoy doing the most?

P: I enjoy the more innovative things.

R: Can you tell me more about this? Is it innovative ways to lead or innovative projects to work on?

P: It's innovative projects to work on (ELT001 Contribute in technical discipline or on project).

R: Anything else?

P: I love the people I get to work with and the teams. That's about it.

R: What are the leadership tasks and activities that you dislike the most?

P: The usual reports, finance and the make work reports. Some of the bureaucracy makes me crazy (ULT005 Administration or management). Sometimes you have to just hold your nose and do it.

R: We've talked about the things you enjoy the most and the least. On a day-to-day basis, what are the leadership tasks and activities that you end up doing on most days?

P: I don't actually know. I would say that part of every day is devoted to supporting my areas. So this means meetings about issues (RLT006 Facilitate implementation), future plans (RLT007 Being strategic); the fundamental operational stuff (RLT006 Facilitating implementation). I would also say that there is a fair bit of liaising with other departments (RLT007 Being strategic). Helping them work the system and solve problems (RLT006 Facilitating implementation). There is also individual project work (RLT008 Contribute in technical discipline or on project).

R: When you look back on the leadership roles throughout your career, as you moved through progressively more responsible roles what has become more available to you as you've moved ahead? What are you able to do at higher leadership roles that you weren't able to do before?

P: Independent decision making (BSL015 Autonomy), broader influence; I can influence a broader range of projects and decisions (BSL003 Influence).

R: I don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you'd like to add?

P: Your interview focused on reward for performance. I think that the majority of people in healthcare appreciate the feedback, but I don't really need that. There is the intrinsic reward of doing a good job and the value of that to the system.

R: Yes, I have asked a lot of questions about how people are rewarded. I hear that you are saying that people get their own internal reward from doing a good job.

P: Yes, I know when I'm doing a good job. I don't really need my boss to tell me I have.

R: Thanks for that. I'll give you a little debrief and explain what I'm looking for.