



Cass Business School
CITY UNIVERSITY LONDON

ALLEN & OVERY

Leadership, Professionals and Power

Cass Business School's Annual Summer Leadership Symposium,
organised in association with Allen & Overy

20 May 2016



Foreword

For the past few years, Cass Business School has been organising an Annual Summer Leadership Symposium around a particular theme. We seek to do something special, by bringing together leading academics and practitioners to explore a significant topic from multiple perspectives.

Each speaker is limited to fifteen minutes – academics must condense the complex insights they have developed through many years of painstaking research; practitioners must synthesise the learning they have gained from decades of painful experience.

And we invite a similarly diverse and interesting set of participants to discuss our ideas with us.

The theme of the 2016 Summer Leadership Symposium was: *Leadership, Professionals and Power*. Organised by the Cass Centre for Professional Service Firms and held in association with Allen & Overy, it turned out to be ‘one amazing day’.

We were joined by more than 100 leading scholars, senior professionals, regulators and clients from around the world to discuss the challenges, implications and prospects for leadership and power in the changing context of professional work. Our debates were organised around four related themes:

- Leading autonomous followers
- The dark side of leadership, professionals and power
- Regulators, professionals and power
- Expert leadership and leading experts

The result was a thought-provoking and highly engaging set of discussions – inspiring ideas, generating insights and encouraging collaborations. One professional told me afterwards: ‘I talked to more Professors today than I did during my entire MBA’. And the academics valued the opportunity to discuss their ideas with so many intellectually curious and highly experienced professionals.

This report is intended to highlight some of the important ideas introduced during the formal presentations, as well as the major themes that emerged during the discussions. I hope this spurs further thoughts, insights and actions, both for academics and practitioners, as you explore the complex interplay of leadership and power in a professional context.

Professor Laura Empson

Cass Business School

Director, Centre for Professional Service Firms

www.cass.city.ac.uk/cpsf



Contents

1. Leading autonomous followers	5
<hr/>	
Laura Empson , Professor in the Management of Professional Service Firms, Cass Business School	
Mary Uhl-Bien , Professor of Leadership, Neeley School of Business, USA	
Philip Davidson , Managing Partner, KPMG UK	
2. The dark side of leadership, professionals and power	9
<hr/>	
Dennis Tourish , Professor of Leadership and Organisation Studies, Royal Holloway College	
Mats Alvesson , Professor of Business Administration, Lund University, Sweden	
Andrew Roscoe , Global Practice Leader, Egon Zehnder	
Jo Silvester , Professor of Psychology and Deputy Dean, Cass Business School	
3. Regulators, professionals, and power	13
<hr/>	
David Cooper , Professor of Accountancy, Alberta School of Business, Canada	
Margaret Cole , Chief Risk Officer and General Counsel, PwC UK	
Hugh Wilmot , Professor of Management, Cass Business School	
Andre Spicer , Professor of Organisational Behaviour, Cass Business School	
4. Expert leadership and leading experts	17
<hr/>	
Marianne Lewis , Professor of Management and Dean, Cass Business School	
Wim Dejonghe , Senior Partner, Allen & Overy	
Sara Louise Muhr , Associate Professor, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark	
Amanda Goodall , Senior Lecturer in Management, Cass Business School	
5. Ongoing discussions	21
6. Speaker biographies	24
7. Participants	29
<hr/>	

Reporting by Caroline Scotter Mainprize, caroline@csm-communications.co.uk

A man in a dark suit, white shirt, and patterned tie is speaking. He is wearing glasses and has a name tag on his lapel that reads "ALLEN & OVERY Philip Davidson KPMG". The background consists of horizontal blinds.

Leading autonomous followers

1. Leading autonomous followers

It is axiomatic that leaders, by definition, must have followers. However, in the context of professional service firms, concepts such as ‘leaders’ and ‘followers’ are problematic, as traditional hierarchical power dynamics are replaced by more ambiguous and negotiated relationships among professional peers. A professional may be reluctant to take on leadership roles, but even more reluctant to accept the role of a follower. So how does anything ever get done in a professional service firm, and why don’t things go wrong more often? Should we stop thinking in terms of individual leaders and followers and think, instead, about leadership as something that professionals do together?

Co-constructing leadership among professional peers

Does anyone have power over you?

Not as far as I’m concerned, no.

Does anyone think they have power over you?

I don’t think so.

Professor Laura Empson opened the Symposium with this quote from a research interview, an exchange between herself and a senior client relationship partner in a law firm she was studying.

She explained the concept of the ‘leadership constellation’, which she developed as part of her research into leadership in professional service firms. This is the informal power structure that sits alongside and overlaps with the firm’s formal power structure. It is only visible to the people within it, or to those “who bump up against it when they try to do something and find they can’t”. Because of these peculiar power dynamics, in the context of a professional service firm, leadership is co-constructed: ‘peers come together to create something that looks like leadership’.

Her research finds that this co-construction involves three concurrent and interlinked processes, which Empson has termed ‘legitimising’, ‘negotiating’, and ‘manoeuvring’.

‘Legitimising’ is the process by which an individual comes to be seen as a leader or a potential leader; in other words, it is about granting and accepting a leadership identity. Legitimising comes from ‘succeeding in the market while your peers infer that you have leadership ability’. Empson stressed that, as far as your professional peers are concerned, it is market success – being able to win business with clients – that matters more than technical ability, no matter how technically expert you may be.

‘Negotiating’ and ‘manoeuvring’ are about leadership authority – how you get people to do things in an environment where, as one professional in her research study put it, ‘frankly nobody has to follow anyone’? The leader has to ‘walk a tightrope’ between enabling and directing, through acting politically while being seen to be apolitical.

All of these processes are related; for example, why do professionals infer leadership ability from market success? Because, unconsciously, they recognise that the skills that make someone good at manoeuvring (acting politically while

being perceived to act with integrity) are the same skills that make them good with clients. Both activities require social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability and apparent sincerity.

And all the processes exist in a state of ‘unstable equilibrium’. A small disturbance in any one of them can have unintended consequences for the others. The dynamics between powerful actors in the leadership constellation are constantly acting to destabilise and restabilise the equilibrium. And that, ultimately, is why it is so difficult to lead a professional service firm.

Leadership is not something a person does, but something that happens between people.

The importance of followership

Professor Mary Uhl-Bien looked at the co-construction of leadership from another perspective, focusing on the ‘red-headed step-child’ of leadership – the concept of ‘followership.’ A quick audience poll at the beginning of her presentation revealed that very few of the symposium participants were eager to identify themselves as ‘followers’, presumably because they associated the idea of being a follower with sheep-like passivity.

But, as Uhl-Bien pointed out, this is not the case. A ‘follower’ can often take the initiative, or actively support and ‘carry’ the leader. In fact, ‘a lot of followership looks like leadership’. Co-constructing leadership does not mean that one person is always leading and one is always following.

And following is important. If everyone’s a leader, said Uhl-Bien, then what they are doing is more accurately described as teamwork or collaboration. ‘Somebody has to follow because, if nobody’s following, there’s no leadership.’

Good followership involves a willingness to defer to someone by accepting their knowledge or experience. It requires competence (leaders cannot achieve things on their own) and candour (providing constructive feedback). Non-followership, on the other hand, is anti-authoritarian, resistant and sometimes malevolent. Because effective leadership is dependent on effective followership, we should increase our interest in followership and actively train and develop people in that skill.

It is in following that leadership is created.

Striking a delicate balance

Philip Davidson picked up on some of the ideas introduced in both of the previous presentations as he explored how he has seen these dynamics play out in his role as Managing Partner of KPMG.

At KPMG, as in other global professional service firms, increasing size and complexity has meant that the introduction of some ‘corporate’ structures and practices is inevitable. The UK firm now has 15,000 clients and at least five distinct business models.

Gone are the days when a department was named after the partner in charge of it (eg ‘Barlow’s department’), and when individual partners combined their role as owners of the firm with leading, managing, selling and delivering services on behalf of the firm. As the firm grew, it was inevitable that management would be delegated to a small number of partners and a leadership group. Partners had to give up some of their independence. However, said Davidson ‘the spirit of partnership is still crucial.’

He explained that, in his experience, partners exhibited two distinct types of followership (though they will still see themselves as leaders rather than followers). Some partners behave like followers in that they choose to act in ways that conform with the executive leadership and that are consistent with the agreed strategy.

Others look upon leaders as ‘first among equals’. These partners are ‘willing but challenging followers’. They are happy to delegate management and strategy development ‘upwards’, but they still expect to be able to challenge the leadership. They want to make an informed choice to follow the strategy, and the leaders they have appointed to develop the strategy.

Achieving buy-in from 600 partners, along with 1,000 directors and people-leaders, is not easy, said Davidson. It is impossible to take every partner through every hour of work involved in creating the strategy in order to win their commitment – nor is it necessary. To achieve buy-in, you need to offer evidence, but you also need to present your proposals with the confidence that comes from knowing you have done hard work and proper analysis. If you can convince them of that, then the partners will respect and choose to follow the leadership.

Some partners behave like followers. Others look upon leaders as first among equals.





**The dark side of
leadership,
professionals and
power**

2. The dark side of leadership, professionals and power

Professional service firms are particularly political environments. Successful leaders need to be good at lobbying, bargaining and manipulating in order to build consensus among diverse individuals and interest groups. But what happens when political activity among professionals goes too far? This session explored the dark side of leadership. It looked at how leaders can derail and cause damage to the organisations. What can professionals learn from the world of politics? How can a professional learn to come to terms with their dark side?

When transformational leaders go bad

Professor Dennis Tourish opened the session with some well-known examples of leaders who have gone bad, challenging the dominant perception that ‘Leadership is an unalloyed good’. Miracle-working ‘super-bosses’ are expected to transform organisations and do great things, especially when they are charismatic, ‘transformational’ leaders.

But there are often ‘dark-side consequences’ to the characteristics of this type of leadership. Charisma itself is not necessarily bad, though many so-called charismatic leaders are, in reality, ‘boring men in suits’. There are positive exemplars, but often a leader’s charismatic reputation is derived mostly from the situation they find themselves in – such as Nelson Mandela. Steve Jobs was personally charismatic but also highly abrasive. It could be easy to emulate his abrasiveness, suggested Tourish, but not so easy to match his brilliance.

We expect leaders to communicate a compelling vision – but sometimes visions are bad. We also want them to promote a common culture, which is a good thing if we are talking about norms of behaviour, but not if the culture discourages dissent. And there is a fine line between giving employees individual appropriate consideration and terrorising them.

Tourish observed that the billions of dollars spent on leadership development have done little to encourage employee engagement, largely because the all-encompassing responsibilities of the leader leave little room for individual responsibility, encouraging attitudes of ‘powerlessness and malaise’. Dissent is seen as resistance to be overcome rather than useful feedback, and opposition to change is perceived as ‘self-interested political behaviour’.

Dissent is seen as resistance to be overcome rather than useful feedback.

The messiness of leadership in practice

Professor Mats Alvesson continued in a similar vein, arguing that the way people talk about leadership is very different from what actually goes on in organisations.

He gave an example from his study of a large management consultancy that described itself as a ‘perfect meritocracy’, in which the best and the brightest were hired, evaluated and promoted. But when he observed a meeting about promotions, all these meritocratic ideals were ignored. Instead, managers were behaving highly politically, throwing in new criteria and defending or putting forward their ‘own’ people. However, ‘everyone in the meeting believed that it was not like this at all’, to the extent that they did not recognise a transcript of a recording of the meeting.

Organisations are idealised, he suggested, for both external and internal audiences. But in practice, people have multiple social identities and affiliations, and different loyalties and priorities, all of which leads to messiness and political behaviour.

In addition, he described how management and leadership typically play a very small role in how people in organisations actually get things done. Many problems are solved ‘horizontally’ by going to other people in the network or peer group, rather than by applying to someone further up the vertical chain of command. Indeed, if we talk about leadership and followership, we should also add ‘peer-ship’ or ‘collegiality’ to the vocabulary of co-constructing leadership.

Alvesson concluded by observing that there is always ‘double-acting’ in organisations, largely because ‘telling the truth all the time can make you many enemies’. There is a large and generally positive discourse about leadership, even though it actually plays a minor role in practice in organisations.

No one mentions power and politics, despite the fact that they are going on everywhere, all the time.

‘Why might I be wrong?’

In an interesting contrast to Empson’s presentation, **Andrew Roscoe** (Global Practice Leader, Egon Zehnder) thought that some of the leadership challenges in professional service firms stem from the belief that ‘the client is king’. When the ‘power of client feedback trumps everything’, internal behaviours do not weigh as heavily. Characteristics that might be attractive to clients – such as being dominant, socially bold and self-assured – may be valued within the firm, even if they are ‘wearing’ to colleagues on a day-to-day basis.

He also pointed out that the traditionally flatter hierarchy of a professional service firm means that there is less scope for people to ‘practise’ leadership. People tend to join professional service firms because they want to help clients rather than because they want to achieve high status, so they are not interested in practising leadership.

Drawing from his experience in working with leaders, Roscoe said that the question that helps leaders be more self-aware and stops them going off the rails is: ‘Why might I be wrong?’. He observed that this can be a very difficult question for professionals because their careers are ‘predicated on giving the right advice’. For individuals to be effective leaders, and to keep asking themselves ‘What don’t I know?’, the whole environment has to be supportive. It is important to ‘call out dysfunctional behaviour before it becomes too damaging and when there is still an opportunity to change behaviour’. He mentioned recent work, for example, by Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey at Harvard on adult brain development showing that we can all develop new behaviours, provided the motivation is there and the right development support is given.

Some of the leadership challenges in professional service firms stem from the belief that ‘the client is king’.

Looking below the surface

Professor Jo Silvester, whose research focuses on ‘Politics with a big P’ (ie professional politicians), asked if politics really does represent ‘the dark side of leadership’ – or if the more overt examples of political behaviour are simply ineffective political action.

Politics is usually condemned because it is assumed to be about self-interest. However, political behaviour is a fact of life and endemic to organisations. Professional politicians have to deal with different groups who want different things from them. It is exactly the same in the workplace, particularly as you move higher up.

In an echo of Alvesson's argument about the idealisation of organisations, Silvester introduced the idea that every organisation has both a formal and an informal aspect. The formal organisation is the tip of the iceberg, what is displayed and talked about externally. This is usually concerned with matters such as clarity of purpose, efficiency and transferable knowledge. Focusing on the formal organisation ignores the fact that what really gets things done is generally enabled by tacit knowledge and trust.

The informal organisation is all about values, attitudes and beliefs – and this makes it difficult for organisations to be truly meritocratic and diverse. If we want to get rid of the self-interested type of politics and enable firms to enact what they promise in the formal organisation, we need to support individuals to be able to negotiate and influence within the informal organisation.

If you can see the politics, it's not being done right.





**Regulators,
professionals and
power**

3. Regulators, professionals and power

Self-regulation was once a defining characteristic of a profession, but recent decades have seen a sustained erosion of public confidence in professional conduct as scandal after scandal has rocked the professions, and there has been a steady encroachment of regulatory control in response. So who's in charge now? Does the client come first, as professional service firms like to claim, or is it the regulator, as the regulator would like to think? An elite group of professional firms occupy an immensely powerful position in the global economy. What power can any national regulator have against these global giants?

Heading towards a post-professional world?

Professor David Cooper gave an overview of the changing relationships between professional firms and regulators. The 'classic Anglo-American model' featured feudal professional bodies and weak regulators. The professions were self-regulating based on assumptions of 'moral values' and 'gentlemanly' behaviour; a professional body was 'a group of wise men able to define what was in the interest of the public'. However, this model was highly reliant on states to provide monopolies, and came under pressure because neoliberalism brought with it a distrust of monopolies and a tendency to favour markets and to reduce the regulatory state.

The modern model features large professional firms and bureaucratic regulators. Professions now concern themselves less with the public interest than with making money. The large regulatory system is itself highly professionalised and nationally focused. Regulators make rules, but with a limited sensitivity to compliance – that is, they develop the rules but hope that professional bodies will make people comply.

At the same time, professionals themselves are beginning to inhabit the state and regulatory agencies. There is a lot of inter-connection and penetration, and many continuing tensions, from large firms that may be viewed as 'too big to fail', to globalisation and international standardisation and concerns about inequality and democratic access.

Professor Cooper asked: 'Are we heading towards – or already inhabiting – a post-professional world?' Large business service firms (often multi-professional and share a focus on serving clients) operate alongside interdependent, transnational regulators, who see themselves as an emergent profession. Importantly, the regulators are reliant on the regulated for developing, monitoring and enforcing rules. This makes power not about a simple struggle over resources, but about shaping corporate and state discourses to create a partisan, but seemingly taken-for-granted, understanding of the public interest.

Are we heading towards – or already inhabiting – a post-professional world?

Shifting dynamics in the regulatory context

Margaret Cole (Chief Risk Officer and General Counsel, PwC UK, and former Managing Director, Financial Services Authority) gave some further insights into these shifting dynamics, drawing from her experience on both sides of the divide. A key point to understand, she said, was that regulators don't operate in a vacuum. They have to be responsive to the mood of the times, and operate at all points on the spectrum, from 'light touch' regulation working with the grain of the industry to tough enforcement and zero tolerance.

Not all regulators are equal. Self-regulation still exists but it is often in contention with appointed state regulators. For example, auditors were traditionally monitored by the ICAEW, a membership organisation and professional body. But the FRC (Financial Reporting Council) has now been appointed the primary regulator for the audit of public interest entities. Is this an erosion of the ICAEW's powers?

And the power dynamics are not as they may appear at first. Despite the image of the FSA as a 'Leviathan' stalking the City, when she first joined the body Cole said: 'I wasn't nearly as powerful in my new role of Director of Enforcement as I expected to be'. The firms being regulated by the FSA were usually better resourced than the regulator and able to call on better advisers. The FSA was 'scared of over-reaching itself' and being accused of bullying and 'picking on the little guy' – but it was then subject to the accusation that it was not doing nearly enough.

As a result, she said, regulators have to be strategic and considered about the cases they choose to bring. They must win most of them or they will be called toothless. Ultimately, firms are keen to avoid the 'theatre' of a Parliamentary Select Committee, which can destroy reputations very quickly. And professionals do care about taking a reputational hit – much more, in fact, than about an eye-watering fine from a regulator.

Professionals do care about taking a reputational hit – much more, in fact, than about an eye-watering fine from a regulator.

The myth of self-regulation

Professor Hugh Wilmot explored further the complex power dynamics involved in the work of regulators, pointing out that regulation itself is quite 'privatised'. Even when governments are involved, he said, opinions are formed by views and attitudes that have been developed in the private sector. There is a lot of lobbying, as well as 'revolving doors' and secondments; these ensure that the neoliberal ideology is pervasive and, in fact, taken for granted.

He argued that self-regulation is a myth. All professions are supported by charters that go beyond the authority of any professional body. And self-regulation itself is always in tension with commercial pressures, as well as with the problems of scale, internationalisation and fragmentation. Where, for example, does the issue of tax avoidance sit regarding self-regulation?

The key issue is that of trust. That is what market success depends on, and when trust is lost, a firm's licence to operate becomes vulnerable. Wilmot suggested that the role of professional service firms and regulators in rebuilding trust could centre on building a more democratically accountable approach to regulation. There should be a shift from thinking about 'power over' to 'power to', and from 'compliance' to 'challenge'. This of course brought with it its own challenges, such as what to do about whistle blowers and how to support the people prepared to make those challenges.

Power defines what 'normal' is.

Regulators and the role of culture

The important role of dissenters, challengers and devil's advocates was reinforced by **Professor Andre Spicer**, who opened with the simple contention that 'regulators exist to stop smart people doing stupid things'.

Spicer argued that the tendency for the 'brightest and best' to ask questions was 'inconvenient' for both firms and individuals. So firms quickly fall into a habit of managing themselves into 'stupidity', creating an environment in which

people are discouraged from thinking too much and, eventually, stop asking questions. This may work in the short term (certainly for individuals who are promoted), but long-term problems are buried. When these start to add up, the results can be disastrous.

As investigations into the recent financial crisis demonstrated, dysfunctional cultures are often identified as the driver of problems. So firms embark on culture change initiatives, usually starting with the much vaunted ‘tone from the top’. But culture change takes too long; there is the ‘danger of losing interest as the agenda shifts, culture disappears into the black hole of HR, and it happens all over again’.

Spicer asked whether regulators could tackle the issue of culture in ways beyond just changing the rules, or whether they look to their own cultures and question whether they had a role in reinforcing dysfunctional cultures in the first place. He argued that firms should concentrate on building structures that support ‘negative capabilities’ and ‘reflexive routes’, including post-mortems and ‘pre-mortems’. Devil’s advocates were an important part of this, with newcomers, outsiders and critics potentially forming what he called ‘anti-stupidity taskforces’.

Regulators exist to stop smart people doing stupid things.





**Expert leadership
and leading experts**

4. Expert leadership and leading experts

So, when authority is contingent and autonomy is extensive, how does leadership happen? Why should someone who is a respected authority in their own professional field be any good as a leader? Why do professionals prefer to be led by professional experts? When everyone is focused on doing their professional work, why are some people singled out for leadership roles and others passed over? This session drew on learning from the broader professional context, including medicine and academia, as well as law and investment banking, to explore these themes and to consider the implications for leadership more generally.

Leading through paradox

As Dean of Cass Business School, **Professor Marianne Lewis** is in an ‘interesting place’: as a faculty member and a leader of faculty, she also studies leadership.

She introduced the idea of ‘lead[ing] through paradox’ to engage with the tensions that exist in all organisations. Traditionally, leaders are providers of certainty and motivation, she said, while paradoxical leaders enable ‘coping’ and ‘learning for agility’. The reason an expert may be effective as a leader is that they have ‘lived those paradoxes’ that exist in their own profession and have thrived. They, therefore, have empathy (they know what it’s like) and credibility (they can prove they’ve done it), and this results in mutual respect.

In leading academics, Lewis has to engage with tensions such as that between individuality and collegiality. But that is not all. ‘Paradoxes are nested’, she explained. The more you dig into tensions in organisations, the more you find one begets another. And the broader your responsibility, the more paradoxes you live with. In universities, a leader has to manage tensions between excellence and efficiency, school and university, as well as the typical leadership paradoxes of being decisive and empowering, empathetic and challenging, confident and humble.

Managing these paradoxes involves reframing the questions. For example, instead of ‘What matters most – publishing, influencing practice or teaching?’, she suggested the question should be: ‘How do we enable impact through thought leadership?’ And instead of: ‘How will you retain faculty?’, she asks: ‘How do we co-create an energising, supportive, magnetic hub?’

She concluded, perhaps inevitably, with an ‘anti-conclusion’: the paradox of knowledge. ‘The more we know, the more we don’t know, which is why events such as this symposium are so energising and important.’

The broader your responsibility, the more paradoxes you live with.

Law firm leadership in practice

Wim Dejonghe (Senior Partner, Allen & Overy) framed his presentation as ‘10 observations of leadership in law firms’. These observations came from reflecting on his experience as Managing Partner and, more recently, Senior Partner at

Allen & Overy. It was significant that they all mirrored, to a greater or lesser extent, the issues that were identified in other presentations.

Chief among them was the importance of staying in touch: your credibility as a leader depends on maintaining your impact with clients. However, Dejonghe acknowledged that time imposed some limits and that balance was important: 'If you can't do the actual work, at least spend time with clients', he advised, as this reassures partners that you still have your finger on the pulse. He admitted that there was no denying politics in an organisation, and that you have to have a network of trusted people who stand up to you. It is part of the role of the leader to create an environment in which that can happen.

He said it was important 'not to chase every ball'. As a leader, you also have to be a follower: 'There is no way I can make every decision because I don't have the skills.' He cited as an example his need to defer to the IT Director because his expertise was different. But the central paradox of leading in a partnership is about the need to 'win hearts and minds ... If you make top-down decisions people won't execute them. But the partnership needs to know that, if a decision has to be made at the top, then you will make it.'

You have to have a network of trusted people who stand up to you.

Self-managing professionals

Professional firms want to employ people who 'self-manage', said **Dr Sara Louise Muhr**. They need people who can take the initiative and have ideas. They may be asked to take on a project, but they are given (and indeed, expect) the freedom to decide how to do it, and when and where they want to work. But this focus on 'time and tasks' is only one side of self-management. It is also about how people manage their own potential and careers, and about how they employ themselves and 'live the culture'. The time and tasks aspect is more visible and explicit, said Muhr; the second aspect is more subtle – but it is the more interesting and important for leaders to understand.

In a 'flat' organisation with such freedom to 'invent' your own work, individual responsibility becomes the norm, and that includes responsibility for deciding just how much to work. In a culture where there is little or no top-down control, and where monitoring is largely carried out informally by peers, there is no ceiling for how much an individual can work.

The successful leader understands how his or her actions and words influence the norms in the organisation indirectly. Culture is not regulated by the formal hierarchy, but by the informal organisation – the part of the iceberg below sea-level in Silvester's presentation. The leader might say: 'I didn't ask them to work so much', but that statement is worth nothing if the culture says differently.

Professionals can never say they're done or they're good enough, so they can never work out when to say 'no'.

The difference that expert leaders make

Dr Amanda Goodall's research has shown that successful leaders are those with a deep understanding of the core business of the organisation they are trying to lead. 'Being a good manager alone is not enough'. This, she assumed, sounded like a 'no-brainer' to the people at the Symposium, but she explained that, in other fields, it is viewed as 'counter-intuitive'.

Her research, based on analysis of large data sets, reveals that the best universities are more likely to be led by top scholars; the best basketball players made the best coaches; and in Formula One, the most successful team leaders started their careers as drivers. Similar results were found in medicine – to the dismay of professional managers – where hospitals were ranked higher when they were led by doctors than when led by professional managers. In a study of top hospitals in the US, physician-led hospitals achieved quality scores approximately 25% higher than the average.

Goodall suggested that one might think this finding is only relevant to experts and professionals. But in a study of 35,000 randomly selected US and UK employees matched with employers, having an expert leader was the strongest predictor of a worker's job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is important for the obvious reasons, but there is also increasing evidence that it is linked to employee productivity. In a recent study of academics, she found that having a distinguished researcher as an immediate manager was highly correlated with job satisfaction and also with commitment to the organisation. Expert leaders have a positive effect on the work environment as well as on manager practices.

Finally, she raised the question of why professionals were perceived not to want to make the move into leadership positions. Of course, they were intrinsically motivated and loved their work – but an economist would also point out that they were often extremely well paid because their earning capacity was tied more to their expertise than to their position in the hierarchy. Were non-experts incentivised to take on senior jobs in order to boost their pay? And did this explain the hostility with which her findings in medicine had been received by the non-expert managers?

Successful leaders are those with a deep understanding of the core business of the organisation they are trying to lead.





**Ongoing
discussions**

5. Ongoing discussions

Wide-ranging discussions followed each group of formal presentations, introducing different perspectives and making new connections between ideas.

Co-creating leadership and followership

- Does active followership include the ability to choose not to follow someone? There are some leaders you should not engage with.
- Followership buy-in is challenging. Is it better to get someone to buy in to ‘something’ rather than buying in to ‘someone’? Is persuading someone to buy into ‘someone’ at the root of political behaviour, or of so-called charismatic leadership?
- How does positive followership fit with politics? And who is giving power to whom? Are leaders able to give followers power, or is positive followership all about followers giving power to leaders?
- Is it possible for structures and strategy to take the place of leadership and followership?
- Incentives are the ‘oil that greases followership and leadership’. How do you incentivise someone who wants to deviate from followership?

The need for dissent

- How do you strike the balance between leadership and followers who like to challenge?
- Challenges and sceptical followers are needed. It is not insubordination. If challengers are suppressed, problems tend to get magnified. Equally, if too much space is given over to challengers, there is a risk that ‘discontent will feed upon itself’.
- Finding a balance between the two is essential: you need ‘the right sort of challenge in the right spirit at the right time’.

Informal and formal organisations

- Are organisations over-playing the transparency card, especially when it comes to HR systems which claim to ensure, for example, meritocratic hiring decisions? Such formal systems refuse to recognise the political side.
- A challenge for organisations is whether they acknowledge that legitimate systems are only part of the story and whether they can, and should, train for political skill.

Politics and the younger generation

- We are always being told that Millennials expect autonomy and independence and that they reject hierarchies and politics. How will they fare as they become more senior in organisations, or as the start-ups they are currently working in (having rejected traditional hierarchies) scale up?

- Politics can be very context-specific; young and inexperienced people should be helped to understand that it is ‘okay’ to access information about who has got power and, particularly when moving to a new organisation, to try to understand a new set of power relationships and politics.
- If younger people genuinely have different expectations of employer/employee relations, it may have implications for the structure of professional firms in the future. The model may change to become a ‘platform’ offering work and training, with collaboration replacing the traditional manager/subordinate relationship.





Cass Business School ALLEN & OVERY
CITY UNIVERSITY LONDON

Leadership,
Professionals
2016

**Speaker
biographies**

6. Speaker biographies

SESSION 1: LEADING AUTONOMOUS FOLLOWERS

Laura Empson is a Professor in the Management of Professional Service Firms and Director of the Centre for Professional Service Firms, Cass Business School. She is also a Senior Research Fellow at Harvard Law School. Laura's research into PSFs has covered themes such as leadership, governance, mergers and acquisitions, the professionalisation of management, organisational and identity change, knowledge management and diversity. In 2013, she was honoured by the Financial Times for her research in this area and has received a series of funding awards from the Economic and Social Research Council of Great Britain.

Laura is lead editor of the Oxford Handbook of Professional Service Firms (2015, Oxford University Press) and is a Member of the Editorial Boards of the Journal of Management Studies and Organisation Studies. At KPMG UK, she is the Senior Independent Non-Executive and Chair of its Public Interest Committee.

Before joining Cass, Laura was on the faculty at the University of Oxford for ten years. She has a PhD and an MBA from London Business School. Before becoming an academic, Laura worked as an investment banker and strategy consultant.

Mary Uhl-Bien is the BNSF Railway Endowed Professor of Leadership in the Neeley School of Business at Texas Christian University, USA. Mary's research focuses on complexity leadership, relational leadership, and followership, and has published in such journals as Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management and The Leadership Quarterly.

Mary's papers on complexity leadership theory and followership theory have been recognised with a series of Best Paper Awards in leading journals and conferences. She is a founder of the Network of Leadership Scholars in the Academy of Management and is currently serving as its Division Chair for the Organisational Behaviour Division.

Philip Davidson was appointed as the Managing Partner of KPMG UK in November 2015. Prior to that, Philip held the role of Chief Operating Officer for KPMG International. His background is in Advisory where he held the role of Global Head of Transactions and Restructuring, and advised under-performing companies and their stakeholders on operational and financial restructurings.

Philip's business experience includes helping very large groups of lenders solve difficult issues with under-performing loans, helping stressed companies stay in control of their situation, and helping multinational companies optimise the value of their businesses.

SESSION 2: THE DARK SIDE OF LEADERSHIP, PROFESSIONALS AND POWER

Dennis Tourish is a Professor of Leadership and Organisation Studies at Royal Holloway, University of London, where he will also be Director of Research for the School of Management beginning in September 2016.

Dennis is the editor of the journal *Leadership* and the author of numerous papers and several books, including *The Dark Side of Transformational Leadership: A Critical Perspective*, published by Routledge in 2013.

Mats Alvesson is a Professor of Business Administration at Lund University, Sweden. Mats is also an honorary visiting professor at the University of Queensland Business School and a visiting professor at Stockholm Business School and Cass Business School.

His main research interests lie in the fields of organisation and leadership studies, and he is particularly known for his key contribution in forming the field of critical management studies.

He has undertaken extensive research and published widely in the areas of qualitative and reflexive methodology, critical theory, organisational culture, knowledge work, identity in organisations, gender, organisational change and management consultancy. He has published more than 20 books with leading publishers and his work can regularly be seen in leading academic journals.

Andrew Roscoe joined Egon Zehnder in 1998 and is a member of the Global Executive Committee of the firm. He has responsibility for overseeing the performance of the firm's 68 global offices and working with the managing partners of those offices.

In recent years, Andrew has also led consulting assignments for international energy sector companies on the appraisal and development of senior executives worldwide. Prior to joining Egon Zehnder, Andrew worked for a London-based investment bank, Cazenove & Co, where he specialised in M&A transactions across several sectors. Andrew holds a BSc (Hons) in Mechanical Engineering and an MBA from London Business School.

Jo Silvester is a Professor of Psychology and has recently been appointed as Deputy Dean of Cass Business School. She is an organisational psychologist who specialises in the assessment and development of leaders in public, private and political organisations.

For the past decade, Jo has studied political leaders and predictors of political effectiveness. She developed the first competency-based selection process for prospective Parliamentary candidates for the Conservative Party (2001-2), and redesigned the approvals process for prospective Parliamentary candidates for the Liberal Democrat Party in 2009.

Other research interests include diversity and leadership emergence in investment banking, leadership and political effectiveness and cognitive and behavioural predictors of empathy judgements.

SESSION 3: REGULATORS, PROFESSIONALS AND POWER

David Cooper is a Professor of Accounting at the Alberta School of Business, Canada. Recent visiting Professorships have been at Said Business School, Oxford, and Strathclyde University. David obtained an undergraduate degree from LSE, a PhD from Manchester, three honorary doctorates and multiple research awards. David has written or edited nine books and published more than 80 articles and book chapters.

David is an editor of *Accounting, Organisations and Society*, Consulting Editor of *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* (which he co-founded) and is a member of six other editorial boards. Currently, he studies the development and implementation of strategic performance measurement systems and systems of global regulation of accounting and accountants.

Margaret Cole joined PwC as a partner in September 2012. She is the UK firm's Chief Risk Officer and General Counsel and a member of the Executive Board. Prior to joining PwC, Margaret was Managing Director of Enforcement and Financial Crime at the Financial Services Authority (FSA) and a member of the FSA's Board.

Before the FSA, Margaret spent more than 20 years working as a solicitor specialising in commercial litigation. Margaret founded and led the Dispute Resolution Department at the London office of international law firm White & Case. Before that, she was a partner at Stephenson Harwood, where she was responsible for the recovery actions in relation to the Maxwell Pension Fund.

Hugh Willmott is a Professor of Management, Cass Business School, and Research Professor in Organisation Studies, Cardiff Business School. He previously held professional appointments at UMIST (now Manchester Business School) and Judge Business School, Cambridge.

Hugh is a fellow of the British Academy. He is currently Associate Editor of the *Academy of Management Review* and was previously Associate Editor of the *Journal of Organisation*. He has also served on the editorial board of *Accounting, Organisations and Society*; *Journal of Management Studies*; and *Organisation Studies*.

Andre Spicer is a Professor of Organisational Behaviour and the founding director of ETHOS: The Centre for Responsible Enterprise at Cass Business School. He is an expert in the areas of Organisational Behaviour, Leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Andre has produced work on organisational power and politics, organisational culture, employee identity, the creation of new organisational forms, the role that space and architecture plays at work, and leadership. His work looks at a wide range of settings, including knowledge-intensive firms, financial institutions, seaports, universities, libraries, media organisations and new social movements. He has published extensively in a number of top scholarly journals, as well as publishing numerous field leading books and being a frequent media commentator.

SESSION 4: EXPERT LEADERSHIP AND LEADING EXPERTS

Marianne Lewis joined Cass Business School as Professor of Management and Dean in November 2015 after a decade as Associate Dean at the University of Cincinnati. She has a PhD from the University of Kentucky and an MBA from Indiana University. Her research explores leadership and management issues involving organisational paradoxes. How change and complexity accentuate tensions, such as competing demands, contradictory pressures and challenging double-binds.

Marianne's work develops paradox theory to explore related leadership opportunities and challenges. Her studies span multiple contexts, applying this lens in such fields as product development, organisational change, governance and technology implementation. Her paper, 'Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide' received the Academy of Management Review Best Paper Award in 2000.

Wim Dejonghe is Global Senior Partner of Allen & Overy LLP. He was Global Managing Partner from 2008-2016. He was Managing Partner of the Belgian offices from 1996 until he was elected to be Global Managing Partner. He has also co-led A&O's global corporate practice. Wim joined Allen & Overy as a partner in 2001 having previously been a partner of Loeff Claeys Verbeke.

Wim co-wrote the book *M&A in Belgium*, the only in-depth and comprehensive legal guide to Belgian M&A transactions. He practised corporate law in Belgium and also practised law in Spain and the USA. He received his law degree at the University of Louvain (KUL).

Sara Louise Muhr is an Associate Professor at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. Her research focuses on critical perspectives on managerial identity and Human Resource Management, especially in relation to issues around coping with diversity and expectations in modern, flexible ways of working.

Following this broader aim, she has worked in various empirical settings such as management consultancy, prisons, the military and police force, pole-dance studios and executive networks, where she has engaged with issues such as power, culture, emotional labour, gender, ethnicity, leadership and work-life balance.

Amanda Goodall is Senior Lecturer in Management at Cass Business School. She started in fashion, then moved to NGOs, and finally into academe. She researches the relationship between leadership and organisational performance, and believes that leaders should have a deep understanding of the core business of the organisations they are to lead. Being a good manager alone is insufficient.

Amanda has developed a 'theory of expert leadership' based on her empirical work. Evidence supporting expert leadership comes from hospitals, universities, Formula 1, basketball, professionals and from large US and UK random samples. Her current research is on clinical leadership in healthcare settings. Amanda has been a research fellow at Cornell, Zurich University and Yale later this year.



Participants

7. Participants

Name	Organisation
Scott Addison	Spada
Jill Ader	Egon Zehnder
Jeremy Allen	Standard & Chartered
Johan Alvehus	Kristianstand University Sweden
Marcel Amrein	Niederer Kraft & Frey Ltd
Mark Barbour-Smith	Credit Suisse
Emma Bayliss	KPMG
Simon Beavis	
Sinan Belhawi	Medial Booking
Julie Bishop	Law Centres Network
Nadia Bouzidi	
Louise Buckle	KPMG
Christopher Byrne	Ogier
Mary Canning	University College Dublin - UCD School of Business
Jonathan Caulton	Maples & Calder
Mark Charles	HSBC Bank PLC
Kate Cheetham	Lloyds Banking Group PLC
Nick Claydon	Brunswick Group
Imogen Cleaver	Cass Business School
Joan Cradden	Brodies LLP
Sarah David	Guardian Media Group
Stephen Denyer	Law Society of England & Wales
Amanda Dickens	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Elena Doldor	Queen Mary University of London - School of Business and Management
Catherine Duffy	A & L Goodbody
James Entwisle	Hymans Robertson
John L Farry	Deutsche Bank AG
James Faulconbridge	University of Lancaster
David Freedman	Hymans Robertson
Susann Gjerde	Kristiania University College
Richard Gray	HSBC Bank PLC
Richard Grove	Allen & Overy
Stefanie Gustafsson	University of Bath
Peter Hayden	Mourant Ozannes
Gavin Haynes	Barclays PLC
Nick Hedley	Hedley May LLP
Dina Hetherington	Allen & Overy

Name	Organisation
Kate Huggins	Leathwaite
Christopher Humphry	Eden McCallum
Sajid F. Hussein	Bank of America Merrill Lynch
Ruchi Kaushal	Liberty Global Europe Ltd
Ian Kirkpatrick	University of Leeds
MaameYaa Kwafo-Akoto	Allen & Overy
Edwin Lee	Cass Business School
Gillian Lord	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Ioana Lupu	Cass Business School
Martin Martinoff	ICAEW
Katie Matthews	Allen & Overy
Anthony May	Hedley May LLP
Melanie McLaren	Financial Reporting Council
Harper Michael	KPMG
Szilvia Mosonyi	Cass Business School
Laura Muir	Barclays PLC
Julie Munk	Copenhagen Business School - CBS Public-Private Platform
Mary Murphy	Mint Consulting
Jeremy Newman	Cass Business School
Alex Ohlsson	Carey Olsen
John O'Shea	IMI
Rastko Petakovic	Karanovic & Nikolic
Manuel Protasio	Vieira de Almeida & Associates
Natasha Quattrain	Media and Leadership Trainer, Executive Coach
Philip Rakhou	Avicenna Ventures
Carlos Ramirez	ESSEC Business School
Eugenia Rebotunova	Sayenko Kharenko LLC
Tim Regan	Regus Group PLC
Nigel Reglar	Barclays PLC
Alasdair Robertson	Maples & Calder
Keith Robson	HEC Paris
Philip Rodney	Burness Paull LLP
Caroline Scotter Mainprize	CSM Communications Ltd
Christoph Seckler	Leuphana University of Lueneburg
Vanessa Sharp	Policy Analysis Centre Limited
Richard Shoylekov	Wolseley plc
Lennart Simonsen	Krogerus
Vernon Soare	ICAEW
Crawford Spence	Warwick Business School
Mika Stahlberg	Krogerus

Name	Organisation
Jo Stancliffe	Allen & Overy
Stefan Stern	Cass Business School
Geir Sviggum	Wikborg Rein & Co
Frances Swaine	Leigh Day
Juani Swart	University of Bath
Lindsay Tomlinson	
Amilcar van der Horst	Avicenna Ventures
Andrew Wallace	Leathwaite
Shubhada Watson	Deloitte
Charles Wild	EY
Leo Wilson	Allen & Overy
Matt Ziegler	Barclays PLC

