

Group assignment

TU-E3010 - Leading as practice

22.3.2016

Manu Tenhunen - 224048

Samu Hautala - 296966

Alok Kumar Jain - 546519

Carlos Martínez - 52080

Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	1
Experiences.....	2
Analysis.....	4
Samu's Case.....	4
Manu's Case.....	6
Carlos' Case.....	7
Alok's Case.....	8
Conclusion.....	10
Sources.....	11
Appendices.....	13

Introduction

Leadership theories are very diverse and some could be seen in Leadership as Practice. In this assignment we reflected on four different leadership cases generated by individual experiences, of each of our group members, and have tried to analyze these cases with the theoretical framework. In doing so we realized that all four cases were very different from one another and we realized the article by Grint (2005) provides the best bridge between the cases and helps in deepening the understanding of leadership. In this article, the author uses a typology to classify the problems and the requirements for collaborative resolution and classifies power and authority in three different dimensions: Command, Management and Leadership. We classified our different experiences in this different categories and this provided a common ground to relate the cases we were working with and be able to find some similarities and differences.

Methods

After the group was formed we all wrote down our leadership experiences before the first meeting, so that when we met we would have the time to discuss cases through. Surprisingly, even though at first it seemed that no one felt they had a very “special” leadership experience, they all ended up being unique and very different from each other. During the first meetings we all explained our experiences more thoroughly while trying to provide some extra insight with comments or questions to one another. We also agreed to complete our research for the theoretical section by the next appointment, which was set in that meeting. To start with, each of us should find at least one article for their own case.

We ended up having multiple articles each for the experiences. Because of the diversity of theoretical articles, we decided that we needed a base framework to group our insight together. We based our thinking for the assignment on the article by Grint (2005): Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of ‘leadership’. In our second discussion we realized that we were able to relate our different experiences to one of these dimensions and therefore, we structured the present document with these typologies as the logic flow of our reasoning.

Before the last meeting then we decided that each of should have their own summary and analysis completed. Before the last meeting we would also review each other's text to get ready for combining them.

In the last meeting we tied our experiences, cases and analysis together and completed the missing parts. In this meeting we also realized after talking our experiences through that as Grint (2005), among others, suggests, leadership is not comprised of a rigid set of rules, but is rather a flexible, adaptable and situation-contingent approach to guiding people towards common goals.

Experiences

“My leadership experience was a negative one. While I was performing my mandatory military service several years ago I learned for the first time a very different way that leaders and leadership might work. I learned especially how the strictest form, command type, of leadership works. In the Finnish defense forces at the barracks there are daily duty officers watching over the company, handling all the practicalities such as dining, daily routines and so on. The role of the duty officer would be rotated throughout the company and each private would be in charge of the company at least a couple of times during their service. At the very beginning of my service I was assigned the duty and performed it under a superior officer. Due to mistakes made by my superior officer there was a problem at the unit and as I was also signed as a duty officer, I too was blamed for the mistakes. Even though I had no control over the situation as I was still learning the rules and was just following orders from my superior. Later I learned that it really does not matter if I was right or wrong or if I was just following orders, I was penalized anyway. My feelings about applying strict command type of leadership in situation that did not necessarily require it was very unpleasant and seemed extremely unfair, especially given the nature of the situation.”

- *Samu Hautala*

“My leadership example is from a big 4-day airsoft game held in Sweden. There’s almost 2000 players in 3 or more factions so military style of leading and organizing (general > platoon leader > squad leader so on) is needed to get anything done on the battlefield. I teamed up with a group of friends who knew each other beforehand. One of them had finished Finnish army’s reserve officers school and served in Afghanistan as a peacekeeper so he was the natural choice for a leader. He and the others didn’t have

much experience from the actual event, few of them having visited 1-2 and for the most this was the first one, but this was my fifth event so I knew how things really worked there.

Before the game started I told a lot of great stories about previous events and got the novices even more excited about big battles and a lot of shooting around. But when the actual game began we got boring scouting missions and basically saw no action for the first day. Some of us were getting bored and irritated because our squad leader followed the order very strictly and we could just sit around guarding some location for hours even though we could move around, take combat, come back etc. I told the leader that we are getting bored because nothing's happening but he just asked us to calm down and wait something to eventually happen. There was a small mutiny going on the whole second day but on the evening when we had returned to base, eating and getting ready to sleep, the squad leader approached us all and said that there was clear tension in our group so he had clearly done something wrong and wanted to correct that. He took notes from our feedback and the next day we completed our missions but had some free fun also. Things got more interesting for all of us and we all had great time."

- *Manu Tenhunen*

"In this experience I was the head of a group of 18 people and I was managing all the activities related to the organizing of events, concerts and activities for the two weeks of holiday at my hometown. I was responsible for organizing the meetings, keeping track and control of the different tasks and communicating with local authorities and show representatives during the two years preceding the two weeks of holidays. During this time, I underwent a lot of pressure because I was the one through which all information went through and this made me be also responsible for many tasks that could have been spread among the group. In spite of this, some people helped me with the organizing of specific events and others with the accounting, but in the end it all came back to me.

Being the head of the group was a very demanding task that led to many challenges throughout those two years, but I remember it as a very positive experience that let me understand better about the leading position and the management of groups."

- *Carlos Martínez*

"It took just one meeting to shape my perspective of leadership. It was just one interaction for me to be fan of this leader.

I was fortunate enough to join a mega green field project right after completing undergraduate studies. It was a steel production plant in making from scratch with ambition of highest production capacity in the country. We were a team of two hundred fresh graduates, trusted with the future of

this project. Since everything appeared in a mess at that time the organization was having tough time upholding the formal promises made to us on joining letter. Providing quality accommodation and arranging food and other recreational facilities was the responsibility of the organization. These responsibilities were tough to maintain as there were a lot of people involved and township was still in construction. Several meetings were conducted with concerned department over these issues, all to yield nothing. We decided to take this issue to the Executive Director of the project, partly unsure with this move as he was really busy man with overall responsibility of that huge project. We got reply of our mail by his assistant arranging a meeting with him a week later. This meeting gave me a chance to have an interaction with Rajesh Jha, the leader who inspires me most.

The meeting started at 7:00 PM and was scheduled to end at 7:30. He was the most alive and energetic person in room even though his schedule was way more harsh than ours. Perfect texture of voice representing authority and compassion at the same time. "I will not let my GETs (Graduate Engineer Trainee) suffer", he said with particular emphasis. However, the problem wasn't that trivial and instead of brainstorming over the solution he made his intentions clear to us, pitched the organizational culture and value and motivated us to be the agents to realize vision of the organization. He asked us to come up with the solution and promised his support. "If you are facing the problem, come to me with the solution and I will implement it. It is you who takes responsibility of your problems" – I still value this! After this meeting our focus was on finding the solution to the issues instead of blaming the organization. The meeting ended at 8:30PM and nobody in that room looked tired from meeting stretching triple the time allotted to it."

- Alok Jain

Analysis

Samu's Case

In the article "Problems, problems, problems" Grint (2005), K mentions a view about different types of leadership styles: command, management and leadership. Same types of leadership were also mentioned in "Military Leadership: A Context Specific Review" by Wong *et al.* (2003) that reviewed current studies in military leadership: systems, organizational and direct levels of leadership. Inspecting our groups leadership experiences, we identified that each of our experiences were an example of different level or style of leadership.

Samu's experience, perhaps largely due to fact that it was in military context, is a clear example of the most direct command type of leadership. As a subordinate in a very hierarchical organization, where the chain-of-command is very clear, direct command is the most visible and used leading style. Defense forces and militaries in general have very visible power structures and traditional way of leading people that has remained principally the same for centuries. Great example about how visible and strong the hierarchy was is mentioned in the article about the military leadership: "military has both very clear 'surface-level structures' as well as very clear 'deep structures' defining power arrangements" meaning the visible insignias and rank as well as a deeply rooted military culture and code of conduct that affect the life even outside the barracks. Although other types of leadership styles have their place in militaries, the direct leadership dominates time range from immediate up to 2 years and is largely used on the lower level of the military organizations and thus is most visible for individuals performing the mandatory military service that ranges from 6 to 12 months. However, on this level the direct leadership is also practiced on multiple contexts such as classroom, battle training and deployment. Fresh privates are taught the new structure and the hard rules from day one.

Direct command may be the most effective way to lead large groups of people in a short time but when direct command is applied in a situation that is not truly critical, that does not need immediate action, at least in this event it had only negative consequences. In Samu's example the "unfair" handling of the situation resulted only in losing trust and creating tension between the superior officers and the subordinates. It is true that the military environment supports this kind of behavior, but the question is if it would be more beneficial to practice other types of leadership, even in the lowest levels of the organization. In the article reviewing military leadership same question is raised as some studies suggested that teams that had more supporting leaders had better results in tests.

Trust is also essential for teams and I believe that the effect of trust increases even more when lives are at risk. For example, in an another article, "Trust in Leadership and Team Performance: Evidence from NCAA Basketball" by Dirks. K, the author studied how much trust affects team performance. The conclusion was that the trust in superiors, in studies case the coach, was very important factor in predicting team performance. So to say at least, building trust can be seen as one of the main tasks of leaders. In worst case losing trust can be irreversible as it was in Samu's case. One might argue that being a harsh leader creates better team spirit between the subordinates as they go through the hurdles together and learn to trust each other, but again the study about trust placed trust in leadership above the trust in teammates, as trusting teammates was not surprisingly as important.

How different levels of leadership could be applied in this level could be something to study more. For example, in the Manu's case the leadership style is more of a blend between command and management types.

Manu's Case

Military style organization and authorial leadership is necessary for the situation because quick and decisive decision-making is needed. Orders come from the top but in the case of an airsoft event one should take account that everybody is there on their own will to have fun which can be different things for different people. Even though there are missions to complete you are totally allowed to go play your own game. It cannot be known why the squad's leader was so eager to follow the orders: maybe it was because he was used to it in the Finnish army and thought this as a similar situation but also, there's a possibility that he was just building his authority and image by being strict and formal in the beginning.

Some of the courses articles mentioned that a great leader should take account that people and situations are different and adjust to that. The squad leader, for example, could have been a bit more democratic in his leading style and ask how we preferred to execute the missions etc. He should have definitely asked his subordinates what they wanted to do before the game even started so we could have some kind of mutual understanding. It was good that he eventually noticed the mutiny in the group and took action because of it but he could have done it sooner if he had read the silent messages.

One thing we considered is why group needs a leader or what is the main function of the leader in that situation. In a great article about team-leadership (Morgeson *et al.*, 2010) is said that "*Whoever (inside or outside the team) assumes responsibility for satisfying a team's needs can be viewed as taking on a team leadership role*". This samples our case perfectly; the actual leader didn't satisfy the whole team's needs which started a small mutiny against him and almost led to a formal – actual -leader situation where part of the group follows the other leader. This is very functional way of thinking that leader is there to only satisfy team's need but valid at least in this case where no actual performance is needed. It is also pointed out in the article that once forming a group one of the first tasks is to define its "mission". Meaning that the leader should know team's expectations and adjust his acts according to them. Purpose is to create a group in which everyone can and wants to belong into. In a way this is just one way of saying that leader should adjust in the situation but at least it provides something to focus on: satisfying the team's needs whatever they might be and making sure that everybody is satisfied.

The forming of the group followed a model for small-group formation developed by Tuckman. He suggested based on a large amount of literature studies that groups go through four different stages: forming, storming, norming, and performing (Tuckman, 1965). First the group is formed and the members get to know each other, form relationships etc. Then “storming” begins because of interpersonal relationships or group’s tasks. Opinions are expressed, new standards and roles are adopted, as a whole the group creates new norms which suit it better. After this, the group can perform effectively and the group’s energy is devoted to the task.

This is exactly what happened in the case group. First the group formed and then began the storming in the form of mutiny against the leader. The leader took action and wanted to change how he and the group acted so new norms were adapted. Then everybody had more fun and the group performed a lot better. Tuckman’s model is only descriptive so it doesn’t tell, for example, how leader should act in this different stages and how he could make the process smoother but Tuckman did point it out that for different groups in different situations the length and difficulty of stages can be diverse. It was clear that in this case the leader could have gotten the group to performing stage a lot quicker and some of the storm can be completely avoided if you have a good talk with the group in the beginning.

Carlos’ Case

As we discussed in the group meetings, this case would fall in the category of management, because Carlos was the responsible for the organization of the processes and could delegate some tasks but most of the activities of the group depended on him. In this way, his role was in the type of control that Barker (1993) defines as ‘simple control’. Instead of trying to control everything by himself, some values could have been adopted by the group, so as Barker (1993) proposes, the group could have been self-managed and considering that everyone accepted the values, concertive control would be exerted on the group by its own components, so that managerial positions could organize the direction of the group but the control would rely on the own group.

From the point of view of Social Network Analysis (SNA), the head was the bridge between most of the outside organizations and the own group and, even though he is in a position of advantage bridging this structural holes (Burt, 1992), if the group lost this member, their activities would be negatively impacted as they would lose a great deal of contact with the outside world and the information flows would be badly hampered. That’s why from this approach it is also recommended that the tasks and communications performed by these individuals are spread among the different members in the group.

The dynamic delegation of tasks is a way of coping with these problems, and as such, Klein (2006), defines different perspectives of leadership depending on the delegation made. Among them: Functional team leadership, in which the group could be divided in hierarchical functional teams that would follow a structure that would have different leaders and these ones would report in a bottom-top fashion, as in traditional organizations; shared team leadership, consisting of an interactive and fluid process in which individuals influence one another in the achievement of the group goals. Conger and Pearce (2002)

In this way, the group could be either divided in groups that would have tasks in different fields, and one person would be the leader of that group and reporting to the 'manager' (Carlos in this case). Or another option would be shaping the group dynamically so that depending on the tasks or activities the leader or manager would be changing and ones that might be acting as leaders in one situation would be led in another context.

After the different perspectives, our group discussed that some sort of delegation or reshaping of the group was needed. And the best way for the control of the group would be to give values and let people control one another and delegate more tasks to the different people involved either in a hierarchical way or in a dynamically shared leadership. An alternative that also came out in the discussions would be something as the RACI matrix, used in business process mapping, which allocates different people with different roles to various tasks. In this way, for a task there would be people Responsible for it (execution of the task), Accountable (the one that is answerable for the correct completion of the task), Consulted (subject matter experts) or Informed (people that need to be informed of the action). Kofman *et al.* (2009)

Alok's Case

Alok's example provides an excellent example of how a leader can optimize the resources to solve problems and at the same time preserving his own resources. They approached leaders at every hierarchical level before the executive director and everybody tried to solve the problem either by micromanaging it themselves or delegating the task to junior officials which resulted in no concrete results. Involving people in solving their own problem not only results in better outcome and satisfaction but it also induces a sense of belongingness. In this case, the words of the leader turned the rebellions into the responsible members trusted with tasks.

Richard A. Barker (2001) defined leadership as "a process of transformative change where the ethics of individuals are integrated into the mores of a community as a means of evolutionary social

development". We found this definition completely relevant in this example. Before the meeting the general conception among the workers was that their problem is being ignored and nobody bothered about their problem. They were seeing themselves outside the community and were trying to seek attention from the 'community'. After that meeting their thoughts were aligned with the organization's objective. Now they were the part of the community solving the problem for the better outcome. They developed insider perspective. In that sense, the above leadership example accurately fits the definition provided by Barker.

Empowering leadership is the process of implementing conditions that enable sharing power with an employee (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). This leadership style foster participation in decision making, provide autonomy and remove hindrances and bureaucratic constraints to performance (Ahearne *et al.*, 2015). Here they were empowered to solve their problem and were trusted with that task. Several layers of bureaucracy were eliminated as they were making the negotiation and deals with external service providers themselves with the given budget, and if the deal was under that budget they didn't faced any issue in getting management's approval for the deal.

This exercise also built cohesion between all the trainees, as they conducted voting to elect members to represent their group. They structured themselves to reach out to everyone with the maximum impact. This fostered companionship and cooperation between them, which helped in getting work done in office also. They were better able to collaborate in solving official problem that required inter-departmental cooperation, which speed-up the project progress.

Conclusion

After presenting the cases and analyzing them with the pertinent literature, we believe that our cases show how diversely leadership can be practiced but also how well some actual studies can provide a framework that can be actually applied to a myriad of real world situations. Even though many leadership theories have very different views about leadership, talking about our experiences made us realize truly how much the leadership style can change depending on the person, situation and context. Leaders are not bound to any specific style, of course disregarding the borderline cases. For example, one should not try to be strategic leader in a combat situation.

The importance of sharing the leadership showed up in all cases. In Manu's, Samu's, and Carlos' cases the leader could have shared some of the responsibilities to the subordinates. The groups in each case could have worked more efficiently and the members wouldn't necessarily felt so suppressed. On the other hand, Alok's case presented an excellent example of spreading leadership by giving the power over their own working conditions to the employees.

All in all, leadership is not a strict set of rules, but instead it comprises adaptiveness to the situation, simplification of the processes and alignment of personal and organizational goals. We believe that the set of cases presented and our analysis thereof, illustrate properly the leadership practices that can be found and how they could be repurposed for the better integration of the people and the organization in order to procure an ideal working environment and effectiveness in the collaboration.

Sources

K. Grint, "Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of 'leadership'", *Human Relations*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 1467-1494, 2005.

L. Wong, P. Bliese, D. McGurk, "Military Leadership: A Context Specific Review", *US Army Research*, paper 16, 2003.

K. T. Dirks, "Trust in Leadership and Team Performance: Evidence From NCAA Basketball," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 85, no. 6, pp. 1004-1012, 2000.

F. Morgeson, D. S. DeRue, E. Karam, "Leadership in Teams: A Functional Approach to Understanding Leadership Structures and Processes," *Journal of management*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 5-39, 2010.

B. W. Tuckman, "Developmental sequence in small groups," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 384-399, 1965.

J. R. Barker, "Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 408-436, 1993.

J. Conger, C. Pearce, "A landscape of opportunities. Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership," pp. 285, 2002.

A. Kofman, A. Yaeli, T. Klinger, P. Tarr, "Roles, rights, and responsibilities: Better governance through decision rights automation," In *Proceedings of the 2009 ICSE Workshop on Software Development Governance*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 9-14, 2009.

K. Klein, J. Ziegert, A. Knight, Y. Xiao, "Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 4, 590-621, 2006.

R. Burt, "Structural holes: The structure of social capital competition," *MA: Harvard University Press, Cambridge*, 1992.

X. Zhang, K. Bartol, "Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement," *Academy of management journal*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 107-128, 2010.

M. Ahearne, J. Mathieu, A. Rapp, "To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance," *Journal of Applied psychology*, vol. 90, no. 5, pp. 945, 2005.

R. Barker, "The nature of leadership," *Human Relations*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 469-494. 2001.

Appendices

Samu's original story

When I was performing my mandatory military service several years ago I learned for the first time a very different way that leadership might work. Especially how the strictest form of organization leadership works. At the barracks there are daily duty officers watching over the company, handling all the practicalities such as dining, daily routines and so on. The role of the duty officer would be rotated throughout the company and each private would be in charge at least a couple of times during their service. In the beginning privates would have superior officer to guide them as privates were still learning the ropes. At the very beginning of my service I was assigned the duty and performed it under the superior officer.

What I did not know that the superior officer either did not know the rules properly and ended up relieving me during my shift. Due to unfortunate circumstances he also ended up breaking the rules by letting a private go to a holiday a day early. I only learned about the mistake afterwards when I was called to hearings, as I was the one assigned duty officers. However by following orders of my superior officer I also ended up breaking the rules. Throughout the hearings I was assured however that I was just a witness in the process and I had done nothing wrong as I was only following order and probably did not know better.

In the end both, me and superior officer, were penalized. Emotionally it felt unjust as clearly in my mind I have not done anything wrong. I was "just following orders". What I also learned for the first time that in a strict eye of law or organization rules it does not matter if you are right. Systems knows no flexibility. Emotionally decisions like these would not work for a very long time in an organization where people work voluntarily. But each of us can probably think of a situation where we did something just because we were told to do so.

In a way this has been the only truly bad leadership experience. Things like these are pretty typical in the military but I can imagine same kinds of situations are possible on the organization world also. It is unavoidable for subordinates to not suffer from mistakes of the leaders, but I believe the scope of them can be controlled by the leader. In my mind in a modern organization a leader works as a defensive buffer between the team and the organization. The leader creates a working environment where team members have the space to work peacefully without interruptions or matters that would otherwise distract team members. Great leader takes responsibility of their team but also of their own actions. For example: if a deadline is missed, in worst case the team might have not been aware of it, and the leader should bear responsibility. Of course if the leader is liked the team will also support their leader, so great leadership experience is the balance between leader and subordinates. Mutual trust is essential.

Manu's original story

I couldn't come up with a proper leadership example from any actual work experience because I have had the pleasure of having independent and lone jobs. Also, my bosses have been working on their own projects so I have not communicated with them much. Experiences have been pretty neutral. Luckily, I'm into airsoft. To give you some background information; it usually requires actual military style command structure to get anything done in bigger games with hundreds of persons on each side. People are divided in to squads led by squad leader, squads form companies led by company leader and so on. Still, everyone is there to have fun by their own will and cannot be forced to do anything like you could do in a real army. Point being that some actual leadership is needed to make people work together and get good results on the field.

The leadership experience I will talk about happened last summer in the biggest airsoft game organized called Berget. The squad (about 10 people) I was part of had 2 members that I knew from events before and all the others basically knew each other well and lived in the same city. I was the one with the most experience from Berget-games (attended over 5 events) and for most of the squad this was their first or second Berget. So I was the guy telling crazy action stories from previous events and getting everybody excited but on the same time I always said that most of the time we will just sit in the forest being eaten by mosquitoes. We had two peacekeepers from Afghanistan among us and one of them was an actual "squad leader", graduated from the Finnish army's RUK (reserve Officers training corps), so they were naturally our squad leader and the backup leader.

The game went as usual. There's always tons of excitement in the beginning, for the new players at least, but not actually so much action because different factions are just moving their troops, securing objectives and scouting around. Our squad also managed to land the worst missions possible: guarding the base, scouting swamps etc.

We saw no action in the first day and no one of us fired a single shot towards an enemy. I knew how irritating situation this can be because we all have spent around 500 euros for the trip and all the gear needed but what we get is a walk in a forest. But I also knew that this kind of slow start happens every year.

The second day started similar and I could sense that some of us were pretty fed up with the situation and demanded action. Being a Berget-veteran, I knew that the missions given us weren't that important and I also knew that we can perfectly well just walk towards the enemy base and find a battle for us whenever we want. I talked with the few of my closest friends about the matter and then I told our squad leader that some of us want action. He was very reluctant about the whole idea of abandoning our mission that came from his superiors which was natural for him of course because he was an actual squad leader from the army. Even when I tried to explain him that the mission given for us are just a filler because no actual missions were available and that real missions always have bigger forces, like whole platoons, on the move. He didn't listen; we follow the orders to the word.

I, being an ass that I am, started to constantly throw him and the whole squad some ideas about how we could see some battle. It was kind of a personal mutiny against the way we operated. Eventually some others started supporting my ideas and when the second day was coming to end the squad had almost split to half. Other half wanting action now, no matter what, and the other being a little hesitant about the idea of going rogue. There's was some real tension between us all because we were also feeling cold, tired and hungry etc. from the game and the environment.

Luckily our leader also saw this and understood what is happening and took immediate action. As we got back to our tent and started eating and prepping ourselves to get some sleep, he came to speak to us all and said that everybody clearly isn't happy and he wants to change that for tomorrow. He asked for honest opinions about the way he led and we operate and what can be done differently. We had many proposals and he listened them carefully and even wrote some stuff up. In the end, he promised us to get some action the first thing tomorrow, even if his superiors gave us some filler missions. He did this very humbly and considerately which clearly brought the squad back together and raised the morale of us all.

The following day went a lot better. We had some crazy battles just walking towards the enemy base and shooting everything on site but we also managed to handle some actual missions simultaneously. Eventually, our squad leader even let go of the strict control and nicely without any kind of fight let half of us to go on our own way sometimes.

We had tons of fun and the Berget-game, which I thought beforehand to be my last, happened to actually be the best one I have had. I think the others would agree with me also because we are going there this summer too with the same group.

Carlos' original story

My biggest personal leadership experience was between three and five years ago in my hometown. Each september, in the town's holidays a group of youngsters organize many events, concerts and activities for the citizens to enjoy during these couple weeks.

This group needs to collect a high amount of money (with no profit) from the hosting of other events and from the people in town. In the end, many events will be hosted and all needs to be handled properly and with responsibility so that they can be carried through. This work starts two years before the actual holidays.

In my case, I was the head of this group of 18 people, with some of them helping me with accounting tasks and so forth. Because of my position, it seemed like it was my due to know what the points addressed in the meeting were going to be, to plan meetings with local authorities and music and show representatives, I was the visible head for the people that wanted to communicate something with the group and I was accountable if something didn't go as planned.

It is a big duty for a person to undergo such pressure considering that I did those tasks in addition to some alternative freelance work and my full time studies at the university. I tried to delegate some tasks but in the end it all came back to me. The whole group was supposed to have some accountability in every activity we performed, however, being the "leader" of the group made that everyone would turn back to me to expose their problems or complications.

This also gave me some sort of power, because being the "node" through which all information flowed and having the highest responsibility in the group, gave me the authority to command during the meetings and distribute some tasks among the members.

Being the head of the group was a very demanding task that led to many challenges throughout those two years, but I remember it as a very positive experience that let me understand better about the leading position and the management of groups.

Alok's original story

It took just one meeting to shape my perspective of leadership. It was just one interaction for me to be fan of this leader.

I was fortunate enough to join a mega green field project right after completing undergraduate studies. It was a steel production plant in making from scratch with ambition of highest production capacity in the country. I had joined the project when it was still young. Land accusation was still in progress, but one could see a surge of peoples from all over the world working on different parts of the projects. Several business units needed to be installed which would work in coordination to yield final product. There were still some major hurdles and one could only hope at that point that the dots will somehow connect and plant will work some day!

We were a team of two hundred fresh graduates, trusted with the future of this project. The expectation of management were high with this massive recruitment, so were ours. Since everything

appeared in a mess at that time the organization was having tough time upholding the formal promises made to us on joining letter. Providing quality accommodation and arranging food and other recreational facilities was the responsibility of the organization. These responsibilities were tough to maintain as there were a lot of people involved and township was still in construction. Several meetings were conducted with concerned department over these issues, all to yield nothing. We decided to take this issue to the Executive Director of the project, partly unsure with this move as he was really busy man with overall responsibility of that huge project. We got reply of our mail by his assistant arranging a meeting with him a week later. This meeting gave me a chance to have an interaction with Rajesh Jha, the leader who inspires me most.

The meeting started at 7:00 PM and was scheduled to end at 7:30. He was the most alive and energetic person in room even though his schedule was way more harsh than ours. Perfect texture of voice representing authority and compassion at the same time. "I will not let my GETs (Graduate Engineer Trainee) suffer", he said with particular emphasis. However the problem wasn't that trivial and instead of brainstorming over the solution he made his intentions clear to us, pitched the organizational culture and value and motivated us to be the agents to realise vision of the organization. He asked us to come up with the solution and promised his support. "If you are facing the problem, come to me with the solution and I will implement it. It is you who takes responsibility of your problem" – I still value this! After this meeting our focus was on finding the solution to the issues instead of blaming the organization. The meeting ended at 8:30PM and nobody in that room looked tired from meeting stretching triple the time allotted to it. In my course of employment after that meeting, I took individual responsibility of bringing small changes which was too little to get attention of somebody significant but was affecting negatively, me and people around me.