



Conceptualizing communicative leadership

Conceptualizing
communicative
leadership

A framework for analysing and developing leaders' communication competence

147

Catrin Johansson

*Department of Media and Communication, Mid Sweden University,
Sundsvall, Sweden*

Vernon D. Miller

*Department of Communication and Department of Management,
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA, and*

Solange Hamrin

*Department of Media and Communication, Mid Sweden University,
Sundsvall, Sweden*

Received 8 February 2013
Revised 28 May 2013
Accepted 10 July 2013

Abstract

Purpose – The concept of “communicative leadership” is used in organisations that analyse and develop leaders' communication competence. A scholarly definition of this concept is lacking, and the implications of leaders' communication and the development of communication competence for organisations are rarely discussed. The purpose of this paper is to create a theoretical framework around the concept of “communicative leadership”, which can contribute to future research and development of leaders' communication competence.

Design/methodology/approach – Three research questions were addressed: what communicative behaviours are central to leaders? How can “communicative leaders” be characterised? What is a “communicative leader”? Literature from the leadership and communication research fields was reviewed and related to these questions.

Findings – Four central communicative behaviours of leaders (i.e. structuring, facilitating, relating, and representing), eight principles of communicative leadership, and a tentative definition are presented. A communicative leader is defined as someone who engages employees in dialogue, actively shares and seeks feedback, practices participative decision making, and is perceived as open and involved.

Practical implications – A theoretical foundation to the practice of analysing and developing leaders' communication competence is provided, which is related to employee engagement and organisational performance.

Originality/value – Communicative leadership is a concept emerging from organisational needs, articulated by corporate and public organisation leaders. This article links its core constructs to academic quantitative and qualitative research in an integrated framework, which can guide further research and the development of leaders' communication competence.

Keywords Leadership, Communication, Communication competence, Communicative leadership, Leader development

Paper type Conceptual paper



This paper relates to the research project “Communicative Leadership – Analysis and Development of Core Competence”, funded by the Swedish Knowledge Foundation (Grant No. Dnr 2010-0226) and led by the first author between 2011 and 2013 at Mid Sweden University, DEMICOM·CORE, Department of Media and Communication, Sundsvall, Sweden.

Corporate Communications: An
International Journal
Vol. 19 No. 2, 2014
pp. 147-165
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
1356-3289
DOI 10.1108/CCJ-02-2013-0007

1. Introduction

The importance of communication to leadership has been stressed by a number of scholars over the years (Tourish and Jackson, 2008, Fairhurst, 2011, Barge, 1994). Although, for example, research on relationships between leaders and members show that communication is related to employee commitment and organisational effects (Abu Bakar *et al.*, 2010), and research on leaders' discourse illustrate how interactions contribute to shape the organisational environment (Fairhurst, 2007), scholars rarely theorise and discuss how leaders' communication abilities could be developed (Bolden and Gosling, 2006; Fairhurst, 2005). At the same time, promising work on communication competencies appears to have stalled in its development (Jablin *et al.*, 1994; Jablin and Sias, 2001). Thus, we still lack an inclusive framework, which collects and integrates theories and empirical research results and provides a foundation to further develop leaders' communication. In this paper we set out to formulate such a framework.

By introducing the concept of "communicative leadership", a concept that is widely used in Swedish national and multinational organisations, our ultimate goal is to integrate and consolidate research findings over the years, and provide a foundation for future research in leader communication development.

CEOs and other senior executives in all industries and countries consistently list good communication skills among the most important qualities necessary for organisational success (Barrett, 2006). Studies of what managers and leaders do at work illustrate that they spend 79 to 90 per cent of their time communicating every day (Mintzberg, 1973; Tengblad, 2006). In Sweden, organisations have embraced the concept of "communicative leadership" with reference to leaders who "engage others in communication" during the past decade.

The concept emerged in the late 1990s in response to a more complex business environment characterised by and demanding rapid change (Högström *et al.*, 1999), and a movement towards a more value based leadership (Eriksen, 1997). Although the concept of communicative leadership was not clearly defined, it evoked notions such as "dialogue and feedback", "communication that satisfies different needs", and "co-ordination and synergy" (Högström *et al.*, 1999, p. 8). Eriksen (1997), discussing communicative leadership in public institutions, comments that "[A] Communicative Leadership generally is characterized by greater openness and dialogue with the employees" (p. 164).

The concept of "communicative leadership" can be questioned, since leading others without communicating seems virtually impossible. However, connotations evoked by the concept seem to signify that leaders who are "communicative" are not just communicating, which all leaders and members do continuously, but that they are "good communicators" – thus there is a competence aspect of the that which implies that this communication competence can be developed.

In the scientific literature, the concept of communicative leadership has so far only been used to discuss the role of communication departments within organisations, and how communication professionals contribute to the external effectiveness by participating in leadership (Hamrefors, 2010).

However, our use of the concept focuses on the communicative behaviours leaders address in their day-to-day responsibilities. In the public sector, fulfilling objectives includes normative, ethical and moral judgment. Here, the organisational structure

institutionalizes “a procedure for common problem solving” (Eriksen, 1997, p. 166). Thus both leaders and subordinates “need to motivate why they think a certain measure need to be taken in order to bring along others” (Eriksen, 1997, p. 169). Accordingly, leaders’ communicative structuring and goal-setting includes sense-making processes, which create understanding and buy-in. In the business context, the distance between corporate management and employees needs to be bridged by leaders’ “close-up communication” and communicative relating behaviour in order to create trust and understanding, otherwise messages from the head office will go unheard (Högström *et al.*, 1999, p. 8).

In a popular report, Swedish private- and public-sector representatives acknowledge that when leaders actively engage in dialogue with employees by sharing information and involving them in decision making, there are profound influence on employee attitudes, wellbeing and performance (Nordblom and Hamrefors, 2007). For example, the Volvo Group has been analysing, evaluating and developing leaders’ communication since 2002, for the purpose of enabling leaders to foster employee engagement and business excellence. In this organisation, the concept of communicative leadership embraces a number of communication-based activities of organisational leaders in relation to their employees (dialogue, goal-setting and explanation of purposes, involvement in decision-making, creation of energy and commitment, performance evaluation and feedback, knowledge sharing, establishment of collaboration, implementation of decisions) with the overall purpose of creating organisational results and leading organisational change (Nordblom and Hamrefors, 2007).

Articulated by corporate and public organisation leaders, the concept of communicative leadership emerges from organisational needs. This article sets out to link its core constructs to academic literature in order to foster future research on leaders’ communication competence.

Three research questions were addressed:

- (1) What communicative behaviours are central to leaders?
- (2) How can “communicative leaders” be characterised?
- (3) What is a “communicative leader”?

Literature from the leadership and communication research fields was retrieved from databases, scholarly articles and books, reviewed and related to these questions.

2. State of the art – research on leadership and communication

In traditional leadership theories considering leaders’ traits, styles, contingency theory, charismatic, visionary, and transformational leadership, communication aspects are to a large extent overlooked and neglected (Bryman *et al.*, 2011). Most leadership theories do not see communication as constitutive of leadership, which is the position we take. Communication scholars, on the contrary, stress that leadership is enacted in communication processes: “[L]eadership occurs through the process of interaction and communication” (Barge and Hirokawa, 1989, p. 172). Studies underscore the importance of communication to organising, change management, and organisational performance (Simonsson, 2002; Smith and Plowman, 2010).

Two approaches to communication have been very influential: one approach focusing on transmission of information and the other focusing on the formation of

meaning (Fairhurst, 2001). Traditionally, communication was viewed as a simple, linear process in which a sender transmitted a message to a receiver, who then understood and acted on the message. In this vein, leadership communication has been defined as the: “controlled, purposeful transfer of meaning by which leaders influence a single person, a group, an organisation, or a community” (Barrett, 2006, p. 398). This view, called the “transmission view” of communication, has been guiding studies on leader-member exchange, for example studies on relationship maintenance and upward influence tactics and feedback (Fairhurst *et al.*, 2002).

2.1 From transmission to sense-making

From the 1980s onwards, the study of communication increasingly explores the dynamic co-construction of meaning between organisational actors. Communication in leadership processes is perceived as a circular and dynamic interaction where both leaders and employees actively participate (Kramer and Crespy, 2011). Studies centre on individuals making sense of unfolding conversations by constructing meaning (Barge *et al.*, 2008), and feedback on the understanding, not just the reception, of specific messages is advocated (Barge and Hirokawa, 1989). The view of communication as constitutive is closely related to the concept of discourse, which embraces the context surrounding human interaction (Jian *et al.*, 2008). Scholars studying leaders’ discourse seek to explain how leadership is enacted, and what cultural and contextual phenomena influence leadership in a particular setting at a given moment (Fairhurst, 2007, 2008). In the next two sections we discuss important, representative findings in these two traditions with the purpose of creating a foundation for an integrated approach to leader communication development.

3. Research on leaders’ communication behaviour

In the communication behaviour tradition, findings illustrate that leaders provide employees with a sense of purpose, direction, and identity (Miller and Monge, 1986; Fairhurst, 2001). They are responding to evolving work settings, employee needs, and actions of other leaders – all of which are explicit communication acts. The quality and timeliness of these communicative behaviours lead employees, managers, and outsiders to judge leaders as “effective” or “ineffective”. Individuals perceived as effective leaders enact sets of communicatively competent behaviours that are consistent and appropriate to their settings (Jablin *et al.*, 1994).

3.1 Leader-employee and leader-team communication behaviour

Leader communication behaviours have been studied as dyadic relations, between leaders and employees, and related to teams or units. We found support in the literature for the following four prominent leader communication behaviour categories, which are commonly identified arenas of activity and meaning and apply across a range of organisational contexts (Druskat and Wheeler, 2003; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010): initiating structure; facilitating work; relational dynamics; and representing the unit (see Table I).

In keeping with research addressing organisational communication competencies, we present sets of communication behaviours that appear most relevant for manager-employee level interactions and then managers’ interactions across the team or the work unit (Jablin *et al.*, 1994).

	Manager-employee level	Team or unit level
Initiating structure	Set goals and expectations Plan and allocate tasks	Define mission Set goals and expectations Plan and allocate tasks Select Sense-making
Facilitating work	Coaching and training Performance feedback	Coaching and training Performance feedback Problem solving Encourage self-management
Relational dynamics	Openness Supportiveness Conflict management	Openness Supportiveness Conflict management
Represent	Upward influence	Active monitoring Networking Manage boundaries Provide resources
Outcomes	↓	↓
	Role clarity Commitment Engagement	Cohesion Confidence Group processes
	↓	↓
	Performance	Performance

Table I.
Profile of central
communicative
behaviours

Note: See the Appendix for explanations of these central communicative behaviours

3.1.1 Initiating structure. At the manager-employee level, initiating structure consists of the manager’s planning and allocating tasks as well as setting goals and expectations for individual employees. When applied to a team or work unit, then initiating structure involves defining the mission of the unit, planning and allocating tasks to maximise coordination efficiencies, setting goals and expectations for the unit, selecting appropriate team members, and providing sense-making or interpretations of events for members (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010).

3.1.2 Facilitating work. At the manager-employee level, facilitating work involves coaching and training employees so that they have the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed. Performance feedback is an essential aspect of facilitating employees’ work so that they can improve (Jablin, 2001; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010). At the work unit level, effective leaders coach and train employees to operate in teams and units (Kozlowski and Bell, 2003). The effective manager also provides timely and relevant feedback to the unit so that they can modify their actions, if necessary. Effective managers also engage employees in problem solving, often in a participatory decision making fashion. They encourage independence and team self-management on appropriate matters (Druskat and Wheeler, 2003).

3.1.3 Relational dynamics. In keeping with a healthy communication climate, leaders at the manager-employee and unit levels are perceived to be “open” – that is, approachable for asking questions, good listeners, giving positive or negative feedback, and trustworthy (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Jablin, 1979; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010). They also demonstrate supportive behaviours and approach conflictful issues in a

constructive, respectful, even-handed manner. Leaders enacting these behaviours are viewed as considerate by individual employees and by the unit as a whole.

3.1.4 Representing employees and the unit. At the manager-employee level, it is important that managers are able to exert upward influence and be seen as capable of obtaining resources (e.g. supplies, rewards, leeway) from upper management (Jablin, 1979). Exceptions always arise and it is important for employees to believe that their manager is willing and capable of influencing others in the organisation. At the unit level, effective managers are perceived as actively monitoring the external environment for opportunities and threats (Druskat and Wheeler, 2003; Tompkins, 1993). Managers or team leaders are apt information seekers and have a balance of sources from which to again new knowledge as well as understand organisational operations and outcomes. Networking enables managers to develop information links and cooperative ties (Poole, 2011). Effective managers also manage their boundaries by leading the unit to co-operate with other units in a professional manner and protect the unit's mission. Perhaps, as a result of their monitoring internal and external environments and their networking actions, effective managers at the team level actively seek to provide resources (versus passively wait for resources) for their units.

These four sets of leader communication behaviours can be related to outcomes on different levels. In a review of "effective" leadership behaviour, Yukl (2012) arrives at categories that are somewhat similar to what we have proposed, including "clarifying", "problem solving", "supporting", and "networking". While these categories acknowledge the role of communication, the focus on leadership behaviours more generally downplays the importance of communication in constituting leadership interactions and processes.

3.2 Relevant outcomes of leaders' communication behaviours

There is no shortage of outcomes studied as associated with leader communication behaviours (Hiller *et al.*, 2011). The summations presented here are largely drawn from systematic reviews and meta-analyses (Hunter and Schmidt, 1990).

At the manager-employee level, effective leader communication is associated with employees having role clarity, commitment to the organisation, and acting in an engaged manner toward their work assignments (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Jablin, 1979). At the unit level, effective leader communication is associated with work unit cohesion, the unit's belief in their abilities or confidence, and effective internal group operating processes.

As a result of role clarity, employee commitment, and engagement; communicative leadership leads to higher levels of individual performance (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Kozlowski and Bell, 2003; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010). As a result of unit cohesion, confidence, and effective group processes; communicative leadership leads to higher levels of performance at the unit level (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Morgeson *et al.*, 2010).

The relevance of certain communicative leader behaviours is contingent upon the work setting – upon the demands for coordination within the unit and with other units, established patterns for production or task accomplishment, and unit or organisational culture to name a few (Fairhurst, 2001; Jablin, 1979; Redding, 1972). Thus, the communicative behaviours can be used for analyses and evaluations of leaders' communication, which necessarily also integrates situational, cultural, and other contextual aspects.

As research developed, focus shifted from leader behaviours and the positivist tradition of analysing relationships between factors and variables influencing these behaviours, and different outcomes or influences on individual (employee) or unit (organisation) level. The interpretive tradition of studying naturally occurring communication through observations highlighted the situatedness of leaders' communication, and advocated a shift from a leader-centric approach to an approach based on social constructionist theory.

4. Research on leaders' discourse

The concept of discursive leadership was developed by Fairhurst (2007) as a lens to analyse leadership in order to stress the social and communicative aspects and interact with scholarship in leadership psychology focusing on leader behaviours. Studies on leaders' discourse emphasise the significance of the organisational context for the development of interactions. For example, organisational roles and positions create different communicative challenges, and as a result a need for different communication competence and development areas (Taylor, 1999). Discursive leadership is a theoretically well-developed concept, which has an important function to embrace scholarly studies of leaders' discourse in different settings. Targeting processes of sense-making and sense-giving that are fundamental to leadership and studying them through actual acts of leadership rather than through surveys and experiments, this approach brings a rich understanding complementing traditional approaches (Simons, 2009).

5. The concept of communicative leadership

Studies on leaders' communication rarely integrate findings from the two traditions of leaders' communication behaviour and discourse. In order to advance research on leader communication competence and development we argue that it is necessary to integrate findings from both traditions. Accordingly, we propose that the concept, "communicative leadership", can function as a platform for research findings from both traditions.

Communicative leadership as a concept emerged in Sweden in the late 1990s (Högström *et al.*, 1999). According to the dictionary of the Swedish Academy, being "communicative" signifies persons who readily inform others of their thoughts, are openhearted, willing to talk, and share information[1]. Professionals' usage of the concept carries the underlying assumption that communicative leaders are better than or outperform non-communicative leaders in accomplishing organisational goals and motivating employees[2]. This is the rationale for programs and resources allocated in organisations for evaluating and developing leaders' communication skills[3]. For example, courses aim at training communication professionals to support, develop, and assess organisational leaders' communicative abilities[4]. Other training is leader-oriented[5].

5.1 Key principles of communicative leadership

Researchers have posited several elements to communicative leadership, in the sense of leaders engaging others in communication, although the term "communicative" is not explicitly mentioned. Proposing key "principles" of communicative leadership thus

involves a process of interpretation and organising of original works. In this process we integrated both research perspectives detailed above.

5.1.1 Communicative leaders coach and enable employees to be self-managing. In enacting this first principle, communicative leaders adopt a coaching persona, provide employees with compelling rationales for their job design as well as individuals and unit objectives, and seek their input when solving problems and making decisions.

Involvement in decision-making improves the understanding of the issues involved – and involvement strengthens employee commitment (Likert, 1961). When working on joint goals, people are less competitive and more collaborative. When people make decisions together, the social commitment to one another is greater and thus increases their commitment to the decision (Kanji, 2008; Miller and Monge, 1986).

5.1.2 Communicative leaders provide structures that facilitate the work. Communicative leaders create workable structures and processes that enable employees to accomplish their work, are responsive to feedback on unit structures and operations, and demonstrate a willingness to change. By articulating a vision, serving as an example for employees, and intellectual stimulation, communicative leaders provide guidelines and structure (Días-Sáenz, 2011). Communicative leaders act in an invitational manner by promoting discussions, and creating safe spaces for all employees to express themselves and be listened to. Reflexivity “represents a form of relationally responsive communication that emphasises managers inviting and fostering connection with others in conversations” (Barge, 2004, p. 71).

5.1.3 Communicative leaders set clear expectations. Communicative leaders convey priorities, ensure understanding of short-term objectives and long-term aims, and follow up to see if assistance is needed. Leaders collaborate with employees to set high performance goals as well as determine how work will be evaluated.

A communicative leader gives and seeks feedback. Communicative leaders give feedback that is specific, balanced, address recent events, delivered within an appropriate period of time, and is not connected to pay or financial reward *per se* (Cusella, 1980, 1987). Communicative leaders are also perceived to be receptive to feedback, approachable, and willing to listen. They actively seek out negative feedback from their peers and their employees to learn how they can improve their leadership. Feedback can have a powerful influence on employee attitudes and productivity (Jablin, 1979).

5.1.4 Communicative leaders are approachable, respectful, and express concern for employees. Communicative leaders are willing to listen, receive questions or complaints, and share appropriate information in a truthful and adequate manner. A communicative leader shows respect for individual employees, invests in their development, and encourages them to act to strengthen the work group (Derue *et al.*, 2011; Tengblad, 2006). A communicative leader promotes a positive climate in the group. Leader behaviour has “a major influence on the development of a positive or negative process” (Cunha *et al.*, 2009, p. 95).

5.1.5 Communicative leaders actively engage in problem solving, follow up on feedback, and advocate for the unit. Problems concerning personnel, work and strategy are rarely resolved quickly. Yet, communicative leaders pass on information and take on decision responsibilities. Leaders actively seek and share information with employees and same- and higher level managers to address issues. Successful networking with others in the organisation enables leaders to “collect valuable

information about the problems confronting the organisation and the actions that may be taken to solve them” (Barge, 1994, p. 19). Networking thus encourages leaders to expand their knowledge of the organisational environment, the needs of various units, and the capabilities of their members.

5.1.6 Communicative leaders convey direction and assist others in achieving their goals. Communicative leaders understand and convey to employees how their unit contributes to the organisation’s overall objectives (Fairhurst, 2005). They often engage their employees in daily conversation, relating unit actions to the larger scheme. A communicative leader listens, chats, and engages in conversation. Important leadership behaviours consist of everyday activities such as listening, and informal talk (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003).

5.1.7 Communicative leaders actively engage in framing of messages and events. Communicative leaders are aware that their framing of organisational objectives, processes and events are important to others and influence their sense-making, communication behaviours and actions. They consciously plan and seek feedback on their framing (Fairhurst, 1993, 2005).

5.1.8 Communicative leaders enable and support sense-making. Communicative leaders know that communication is an interactive process. They recognise that other organisational actors continuously make sense of information, events and behaviour of leaders and employees – both verbal and non-verbal. In keeping with this knowledge, they engage in dialogue, use stories and narratives, and support sense-making in formal and informal conversations (Balogun and Johnson, 2004, 2005).

5.2 Defining communicative leadership

The above principles highlight what we take to be a “communicative” enactment of leadership previously recognised in the literature. Summarizing and integrating findings from leader communication behaviour and leader discourse research, we tentatively state that:

A communicative leader is one who engages employees in dialogue, actively shares and seeks feedback, practices participative decision making, and is perceived as open and involved.

This definition comprises leader behaviours that are socially co-constructed and constituted in discourse, which enables and shapes leaders’ and members’ interactions.

Any set of leadership principles is driven by organisational needs in the era in which they are developed and by the current state of the art research knowledge. However, we note that our definition evokes Redding’s summary of research on “effective supervisors” (Redding, 1972, pp. 436-46), which states that the better supervisors tend to be more “communication-minded”; they are able to explain instructions and policies, are approachable and willing to listen to suggestions and complaints, are open in passing along information and in explaining the reasons “why” behind policies, and they are in favour of giving advance notice of impending changes. These threshold communication principles form expectations of all leaders, starting at the lowest levels to the highest levels, no matter how good information systems or corporate strategies are.

Leaders’ communication competence is a wider concept than leaders’ communication behaviour or discourse. McCroskey (1984) distinguished between

“understanding”, “ability” and “doing” (p. 264). Payne (2005) applied a three-component model of communication competence:

- (1) “motivation”;
- (2) “knowledge”; and
- (3) “skill”.

Steers *et al.* (2013) stress the importance of communication competence to leadership and effectiveness in general and in multicultural organisations in particular, and in their model (p. 194) include attention (What do I see or hear?), interpretation (What does it mean?), and message (How should I respond?). They also recognise the influencing factors in the communication environment to this process. In this perspective, improving communication involves three individual-level strategies:

- (1) expanding knowledge and understanding of cultural dynamics;
- (2) improving perceptual and critical analysis skills; and
- (3) enhancing the behavioural repertoire of applied communication skills.

We propose, based on previous empirical studies on leaders’ communication (Fairhurst, 2005; Simonsson, 2002), that four important individual prerequisites influence the communication behaviour of leaders:

- (1) communication awareness;
- (2) communication acquaintance;
- (3) communication attitude; and
- (4) communication ability.

Leaders who possess communication awareness are consciously planning and adapting their communication to individuals and teams. Communication acquaintance may be acquired through formal training and/or exercises in different types of communication courses, seminars and workshops. Leaders’ attitudes to communication also influence their communication behaviour. For example, individuals that regard communication as important, also devote time and resources to meetings and conversations. Communication ability is both related to individuals’ communication competence and the enactment of communication in a certain environment, which may enable or constrain communication.

6. Discussion

In this paper we have reviewed and discussed literature on leadership and communication with the purpose of building a theoretical foundation that can guide future research on leader communication development. Three distinct contributions to the field of leadership and communication are provided.

First, we propose that four central communication behaviours of leaders – i.e. structuring, facilitating, relating, and representing – cover the most important aspects of leaders’ communication behaviour within, between and outside organisational units. These behaviours are related to early notions of communicative leadership (Eriksen, 1997; Högström *et al.*, 1999) and integrate and consolidate research findings in leadership and communication research, both on

leaders' communication behaviour and discourse over the years. The behaviours contribute to the theoretical framework, which may function as a foundation for assessments of leaders' communication behaviours, and future research on leaders' communication competence.

Second, eight key principles of communicative leadership that emerged from research are formulated that are an amalgamation of knowledge from both quantitative and qualitative research traditions. Such "hybrid theorising" is rare, but is encouraged to create innovative theories (Jian *et al.*, 2008). Some of these principles were proposed in the 1970s, which contributes to consolidating our findings and illustrates that there are threshold principles of communicative leadership holding constancy across organisational settings over time. Thus, the theoretical contribution of the framework is firmly grounded in previous research, and provides a solid foundation for future developments of the concept of leader communication competence.

Third, we proposed a theoretically grounded definition of a "communicative leader", which can be empirically tested in future studies.

Together, the definition, behaviours and key principles form an integrated theoretical framework, which can guide future research on leader communication development. By using a concept already in use in practice, we also aim to develop a "practical theory" on speaking terms with organisational leaders and members, which serves the purpose of improving leaders' communication competence (Barge and Fairhurst, 2008). The communicative behaviours and principles for communicative leadership can aid HR and communication professionals in assessments and development of leaders' communication. When applied, behaviours and principles need matching with requirements of leaders' work design and context, since some may be more important than others in particular situations and settings.

Particularly, it is important to consider the role of the leader in the organisation. Previous research has focused on the communication of CEOs, middle managers and first-line managers. Leading organisations towards achieving strategic objectives is important for CEOs and organisational leaders in top management teams, who articulate the organisation's mission, vision, strategy and goals. Leaders' framing of messages have been illustrated to influence the implementation of organisational objectives and the extent to which mission statements are interpreted as "empty words" (Fairhurst *et al.*, 1997). Fairhurst (2005) discusses that individual managers can learn to develop framing skills and consciously use framing, but that developing this communication competence is influenced by both individuals' motivation, and the ability to see the co-constructed aspects of reality.

Thus, for CEOs and other leaders participating in top management, structuring and representing behaviours may be more important than developing and interacting behaviours. However, face to face communication is important for employee awareness of strategic goals, which is related to leaders' openness, listening, and careful articulation of strategic messages (Berson and Avolio, 2004). Communication systems, no matter how sophisticated, can never replace the richness of close personal communication and contact between top-level and frontline managers (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1995). Close contact is also fundamental to develop trusting relations (Smith and Blanck, 2002).

Middle managers' roles are also very important to consider in relation to the framework, and compared to team leaders, their representing behaviours are probably stronger. Their communicative behaviour and actions are both enabled and constrained by organisational conditions and relations to top managers. A key enabling condition is top management narrating the thought processes that have led to the formulation of the goals to be implemented. This is instrumental in helping middle managers make sense of how the present objectives are linked to past ones (Mantere, 2008). Also, when top managers do not evaluate and reward ideas of middle managers their motivation to promote ideas is undermined.

Middle managers link hierarchical levels, actively engage downward and upward communication processes and also communicate laterally with their peers. Balogun (2006; Balogun and Johnson, 2004, 2005) demonstrated that the impact of middle managers on outcomes of organisational strategy processes is considerable. This is explained by the fact that middle managers make sense of messages in different ways, based on their position, individual experience and motivation, and also impact on each other's sense-making processes (Beech and Johnson, 2005; Taylor, 1999). Middle managers may encourage divergence in interpretations across hierarchical levels (Beck and Plowman, 2009) – or they may contribute to develop a shared understanding in the unit through engaging lower-level managers and co-workers in dialogue (Thomas *et al.*, 2011).

Two interlinked discursive activities of middle managers contribute to sense-making:

- (1) “setting the scene”; and
- (2) “performing the conversation” (Rouleau and Balogun, 2011).

In these activities, middle managers draw on contextually relevant words, symbols, and values to engage organisational members in their day-to-day work. Thus, they actively engage in shaping how employees view the organisation and its values (Smith and Plowman, 2010). Networking – i.e. using the knowledge of the organisational political context and the motivation of others – also enables individual managers to pursue their objectives (Smith and Plowman, 2010). Networking is also part of the representing behaviours in the theoretical framework.

In this way the theoretical framework of “communicative leadership” has the ambition of accounting for leadership on top, middle and team levels while connecting to and providing a link to previous theories on communication competence, which we think need more development in future research. Particularly, linking the different principles and behaviours to different leader roles and organisational contexts will need further empirical and theoretical attention.

Focusing on communicative leadership, there is one important caveat, however. The concept can once again, as when leadership research first emerged, conceal the co-constructed nature of communication, and the role of co-workers in communication. Our proposed framework and set of principles can be accused of being leader centric and treat employees as passive followers (Heide and Simonsson, 2011). We do want to stress that the enactment of communicative leadership is related to the relationship with employees with different backgrounds and experiences, as well as the organisational context (Day, 2011). Thus, it is important in future developments of

this framework, to study and discuss relational, and contextual aspects of leader communication competence.

In sum, it is our hope that the proposed framework highlights the need for studying leaders' communication and development of communication competence and draws attention to this field. As the proliferation of leadership concepts, theories and practitioner-oriented material on leadership is vast and fragmented (Collinson and Grint, 2005), we see the need for consolidation and integration, and a common platform for scholars in order to establish more integrated and cumulative theories on leadership communication and communication competence development. We believe it is imperative that scholars continue to expand our knowledge of both theoretical and practical implications in this field.

Notes

1. See Svenska Akademiens ordbok (SAOB), available at: <http://g3.spraakdata.gu.se/saob/>
2. See www.sverigeskommunikatorer.se/Forskning-Fakta/Nyheter/2009/Darfor-arkommunikationen-sa-viktig-for-Volvo/
3. See www.stockholm.se/OmStockholm/Budgetforslag-2012/Verksamheter/Staden-som-arbetsgivare/Chefssatsningar/
4. See www.abilitypartner.se/kommunikativt-ledarskap.aspx
5. See www.effect.se/coaching/kommunikativt-ledarskap.asp

References

- Abu Bakar, H., Dilbeck, K.E. and McCroskey, J.C. (2010), "Mediating role of supervisory communication practices on relations between leader-member exchange and perceived employee commitment to workgroup", *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 77 No. 4, pp. 637-656.
- Alvesson, M. and Svingen, S. (2003), "Managers doing leadership: the extra-ordinarization of the mundane", *Human Relations*, Vol. 56 No. 12, pp. 1435-1459.
- Balogun, J. (2006), "Managing change: steering a course between intended strategies and unanticipated outcomes", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 29-49.
- Balogun, J. and Johnson, G. (2004), "Organizational restructuring and middle manager sensemaking", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 523-549.
- Balogun, J. and Johnson, G. (2005), "From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: the impact of change recipient sensemaking", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26 No. 11, pp. 1573-1601.
- Barge, J.K. (1994), *Leadership: Communication Skills for Organizations and Groups*, St Martin's Press, New York, NY.
- Barge, J.K. (2004), "Reflexivity and managerial practice", *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 71 No. 1, pp. 72-98.
- Barge, J.K. and Fairhurst, G.T. (2008), "Living leadership: a systemic constructionist approach", *Leadership*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 227-251.
- Barge, J.K. and Hirokawa, R.Y. (1989), "Toward a communication competency model of group leadership", *Small Group Behavior*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 167-189.
- Barge, J.K., Lee, M., Maddux, K., Nabring, R. and Townsend, B. (2008), "Managing dualities in planned change initiatives", *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 364-390.

- Barrett, J.D. (2006), "Strong communication skills a must for today's leaders", *Handbook of Business Strategy*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 385-390.
- Bartlett, C.A. and Ghoshal, S. (1995), "Changing the role of top management – beyond systems to people", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 73 No. 3, pp. 132-142.
- Beck, T.E. and Plowman, D.A. (2009), "Experiencing rare and unusual events richly: the role of middle managers in animating and guiding organizational interpretation", *Organization Science*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 908-924.
- Beech, N. and Johnson, P. (2005), "Discourse of disrupted identities in the practices of strategic change: the major, the street-fighter and the insider-out", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 31-47.
- Berson, Y. and Avolio, B. (2004), "Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: a case study of a telecommunication firm", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 625-646.
- Bolden, R. and Gosling, J. (2006), "Leadership competencies: time to change the tune?", *Leadership*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 147-163.
- Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds) (2011), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Collinson, D. and Grint, K. (2005), "Editorial: the leadership agenda", *Leadership*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 5-9.
- Cunha, M.P.E., Cunha, R.C.E. and Rego, A. (2009), "Exploring the role of leader-subordinate interactions in the construction of organizational positivity", *Leadership*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 81-101.
- Cusella, L.P. (1980), "The effects of feedback on intrinsic motivation", in Nimmo, D. (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 4*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ, pp. 367-387.
- Cusella, L.P. (1987), "Feedback, motivation, and performance", in Jablin, F.M., Putnam, L.L., Roberts, K.H. and Porter, L.W. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 624-678.
- Day, D.V. (2011), "Leadership development", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 37-50.
- Derue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.G., Wellman, N. and Humphrey, S.E. (2011), "Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: an integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp. 7-52.
- Días-Sáenz, H. (2011), "Transformational leadership", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 299-309.
- Druskat, V.U. and Wheeler, J.V. (2003), "Managing from the boundary: the effective leadership of self-managing work teams", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 435-457.
- Eriksen, E.O. (1997), *Kommunikativt ledarskap. Om styrning av offentliga institutioner (Communicative Leadership. Managing Public Institutions)*, Daidalos, Göteborg.
- Fairhurst, G.T. (1993), "Echoes of the vision. When the rest of the organization talks total quality", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 331-371.
- Fairhurst, G.T. (2001), "Dualisms in leadership research", in Jablin, F.M. and Putnam, L.L. (Eds), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication. Advances in Theory, Research and Methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 379-439.
- Fairhurst, G.T. (2005), "Reframing the art of framing: problems and prospects for leadership", *Leadership*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 165-185.

- Fairhurst, G.T. (2007), *Discursive Leadership: In Conversation with Leadership Psychology*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Fairhurst, G.T. (2008), "Discursive leadership – a communication alternative to leadership psychology", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 510-521.
- Fairhurst, G.T. (2011), "Discursive approaches to leadership", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 495-507.
- Fairhurst, G.T., Cooren, F. and Cahill, D.J. (2002), "Discursiveness, contradiction, and unintended consequences in successive downsizings", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 501-540.
- Fairhurst, G.T., Jordan, J.M. and Neuwirth, K. (1997), "Why are we here? Managing the meaning of an organizational mission statement", *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 243-263.
- Hamrefors, S. (2010), "Communicative leadership", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 141-152.
- Heide, M. and Simonsson, C. (2011), "Putting coworkers in the limelight: new challenges for communication professionals", *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 201-220.
- Hiller, N.J., DeChurch, L.A., Murase, T. and Doty, D. (2011), "Searching for outcomes of leadership: a 25-year review", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1137-1177.
- Hunter, J.E. and Schmidt, F.L. (1990), *Methods of Meta-analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.
- Högström, A., Bark, M., Bernstrup, S., Heide, M. and Skoog, A. (1999), *Kommunikativt ledarskap – en bok om organisationskommunikation (Communicative Leadership – A Book on Organizational Communication)*, Sveriges Verkstadsindustrier, Industrilitteratur, Stockholm.
- Jablin, F.M. (1979), "Superior-subordinate communication: the state of the art", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 86 No. 6, pp. 1201-1222.
- Jablin, F.M. (2001), "Entry, assimilation, disengagement/exit", in Jablin, F.M. and Putnam, L.L. (Eds), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication. Advances in Theory, Research and Methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 732-818.
- Jablin, F.M. and Sias, P.M. (2001), "Communication competence", in Jablin, F.M. and Putnam, L.L. (Eds), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication. Advances in Theory, Research and Methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 819-864.
- Jablin, F.M., Cude, R.L., House, A., Lee, J. and Roth, N.L. (1994), "Communication competence in organizations: conceptualizations and comparison across multiple levels of analysis", in Thayer, L. and Barnett, G. (Eds), *Emerging Perspectives in Organizational Communication*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 114-140.
- Jian, G., Schmisser, A.M. and Fairhurst, G.T. (2008), "Organizational discourse and communication: the progeny of Proteus", *Discourse and Communication*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 299-320.
- Kanji, G.K. (2008), "Leadership is prime: how do you measure leadership excellence?", *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 417-427.
- Kozlowski, S.W.J. and Bell, B.S. (2003), "Work groups and teams in organizations", in Borman, W.C., Ilgen, D.R. and Klimoski, R.J. (Eds), *Handbook of Psychology*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, pp. 333-375.
- Kramer, M.W. and Crespy, D.A. (2011), "Communicating collaborative leadership", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 1024-1037.

- Likert, R. (1961), *New Patterns of Management*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1984), "Communication competence: the elusive construct", in Bostrom, R.N. (Ed.), *Competence in Communication*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Mantere, S. (2008), "Role expectations and middle manager strategy agency", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 294-316.
- Miller, K.I. and Monge, P.M. (1986), "Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: a meta-analytic review", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 727-753.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973), *The Nature of Managerial Work*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.
- Morgeson, F.P., DeRue, D.S. and Karam, E.P. (2010), "Leadership in teams: a functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 5-39.
- Nordblom, C. and Hamrefors, S. (2007), "Communicative leadership. Development of middle managers' communication skills at Volvo Group", Business Effective Communication, Swedish Public Relations Association, Stockholm.
- Payne, H.J. (2005), "Reconceptualizing social skills in organizations: exploring the relationship between communication competence, job performance, and supervisory roles", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 63-77.
- Poole, M.S. (2011), "Communication", in Zedeck, S. (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 249-270.
- Redding, W.C. (1972), *Communication within the Organization: An Interpretive Review of Theory and Research*, Industrial Communication Council, New York, NY.
- Rouleau, L. and Balogun, J. (2011), "Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discursive competence", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 953-983.
- Simons, T. (2009), "Discursive leadership: in conversation with leadership psychology", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 162-164.
- Simonsson, C. (2002), *Den kommunikativa utmaningen (The Communicative Challenge)*, Lund University, Lund.
- Smith, A.D. and Plowman, D.A. (2010), "Everyday sensegiving: a closer look at successful plant managers", *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 220-244.
- Smith, P. and Blanck, E. (2002), "From experience: leading dispersed teams", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 294-304.
- Steers, R.M., Nardon, L. and Sanchez-Runde, C. (2013), *Management Across Cultures: Developing Global Competencies*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Taylor, S.S. (1999), "Making sense of revolutionary change: differences in members' stories", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 12 No. 6, pp. 524-539.
- Tengblad, S. (2006), "Is there a 'new managerial work'? A comparison with Henry Mintzberg's classic study 30 years later", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43 No. 7, pp. 1437-1461.
- Thomas, R., Sargent, L.D. and Hardy, C. (2011), "Managing organizational change: negotiating meaning and power-resistance relations", *Organization Science*, Vol. 22 No. 11, pp. 22-41.
- Tompkins, P.K. (1993), *Organizational Communication Imperatives: Lessons of the Space Program*, Roxbury, Los Angeles, CA.
- Tourish, D. and Jackson, B. (2008), "Guest editorial: communication and leadership: an open invitation to engage", *Leadership*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 219-225.
- Yukl, G. (2012), "Effective leadership behavior: what we know and what questions need more attention", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 66-85.

Manager-employee level

Team or work unit level

Initiating structure

Plan and allocate tasks refers to the extent to which the manager proactively develops employee assignments and provides clear role definitions. Planning and allocating are often measured by employee reports of the manager's organising skills and designing employee roles to work in concert with each other, and defines job tasks and priorities, responsibilities, and authority

Set goals and expectations refers to the extent to which the manager defines targets for quality and productivity and maintains clear standards of performance. The managers' competence in setting goals and expectations are often measured by employee reports of the manager's setting realistic, challenging goals and communicating what is expected of the individual output

Define mission refers to the extent to which the manager develops and articulates a clear team or unit mission. Managers' defining mission behaviours are measured by employee understanding of their unit's purpose or goals or their manager's vision

Plan and allocate tasks refers to the extent to which the manager proactively arranges assignments and standardises operating procedures. Planning and allocating tasks are typically measured by employee or upper management's reports of the unit's standard operating procedures, how various roles are designed to work smoothly together, and the manager's working with the team to develop the best approaches to work

Set goals and expectations refers to the extent to which the manager defines targets for unit quality and productivity and maintains clear standards of performance throughout the unit. Managerial setting goals and expectations are typically measured by employees' and managers' reports of the manager's setting realistic, challenging goals and communicating what is expected of the unit's output

Select refers to the extent to which the manager hires, identifies, or accepts members who are competent, have a mix of skills, and work well together. Selecting unit members is often measured by employees' or upper management's reports of employees' "fit" to the unit and how the composition of the team matches its assigned tasks

Sense-making refers to the extent to which the manager facilitates the team's understanding of internal or external events. Sense-making is measured by employee reports of their interpretations of ambiguous information or events in and outside the organisation

Facilitating work

Coach and train refers to the extent to which the manager helps employees develop skills necessary to succeed in their jobs. Coaching and training are often measured by employee reports of managerial helpfulness in learning new tasks, suggestions on new ways for performing tasks, and opportunities provided to improve job skills

Coaching and training refers to the extent to which the manager assists unit members' skill development and team problem solving capabilities. Coaching and training are often measured by employee and managers' reports of managerial helpfulness in learning new tasks and giving suggestions for improving task performance, the overall assessment of unit skill level, and reports of learning from past experiences

(continued)

Table AI.
Leader communication
behaviours

Manager-employee level	Team or work unit level
<p><i>Performance feedback</i> refers to the extent to which managers give regular, constructive, timely, clear, and useful appraisal of employees' work. Performance feedback is often measured by reports of the manager's recognition of their work contributions, balance in giving positive and negative appraisals, and giving evaluations in a professional, respectful tone</p>	<p><i>Performance feedback</i> refers to the extent to which managers give unit members regular, constructive, timely, clear, and useful appraisal of their work. Performance feedback is often measured by members' reports of the manager's review of relevant performance results, recognition of their work contributions, balance in giving positive and negative appraisals, and giving evaluations in a professional, respectful tone</p>
<p><i>Relational dynamics</i></p> <p><i>Openness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager is perceived as being receptive to feedback and employee opinions as well as the extent to which the manager relays adequate and truthful information. Openness is often measured by employee reports of how easy it is to approach the manager and the manager's willingness to listen in a non-defensive manner</p> <p><i>Supportiveness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager acts in a considerate manner toward employees, takes an interest in their wellbeing, and facilitates their work. Supportiveness is often measured by employee reports of the manager's helpfulness, aid in work processes, and being counted upon when needed</p> <p><i>Conflict management</i> refers to the extent to which managers address personal and performance disagreements and issues in a professional, constructive manner. Conflict management is often measured by employee reports of the manager's interaction style as forcing, problem solving, or <i>laissez-faire</i> or the display of respectful, open communication and question asking behaviours</p>	<p><i>Problem solving</i> refers to the extent to which the manager seeks multiple perspectives and new ways of solving problems or participates with team members in diagnosing and addressing work issues. Problem solving is measured by employees' or managers' reports of manager creativity, seeking others' perspective, and participatory decision making style</p> <p><i>Encourage self-management</i> refers to the extent to which the manager facilitates team members to become responsible for determining methods, procedures, and scheduling. Encouraging self-management can be measured by employees' or managers' reports of the manager making the team responsible for most work-related decisions, assigning tasks, and assessing unit performance</p>
<p><i>Openness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager is perceived as being receptive to feedback and employee opinions as well as the extent to which the manager relays adequate and truthful information. Openness is often measured by unit members' reports of how easy it is to approach the manager, the manager's willingness to listen in a non-defensive manner, and the veracity of managerial disclosures</p>	<p><i>Openness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager is perceived as being approachable regarding diverse opinions, welcoming and answering questions, and relaying adequate and truthful information. Openness is often measured by unit members' reports of how easy it is to approach the manager, the manager's willingness to listen in a non-defensive manner, and the veracity of managerial disclosures</p>
<p><i>Supportiveness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager acts in a considerate manner toward all unit members, takes an interest in their wellbeing, and facilitates their work. Supportiveness is often measured by unit members' reports of managerial helpfulness, aid in work processes, and able to be counted upon when needed</p>	<p><i>Supportiveness</i> refers to the extent to which the manager acts in a considerate manner toward all unit members, takes an interest in their wellbeing, and facilitates their work. Supportiveness is often measured by unit members' reports of managerial helpfulness, aid in work processes, and able to be counted upon when needed</p>
<p><i>Conflict management</i> refers to the extent to which the manager addresses work unit issues in a professional, constructive manner. Conflict management is often measured by unit members' reports of: the manager's interaction style as forcing, problem solving, or <i>laissez-faire</i>; the display of respectful, open communication and question asking behaviours; and helping the team develop solutions to task and relationship-related problems</p>	<p><i>Conflict management</i> refers to the extent to which the manager addresses work unit issues in a professional, constructive manner. Conflict management is often measured by unit members' reports of: the manager's interaction style as forcing, problem solving, or <i>laissez-faire</i>; the display of respectful, open communication and question asking behaviours; and helping the team develop solutions to task and relationship-related problems</p>

Table AI.

(continued)

Manager-employee level	Team or work unit level
<p><i>Representing employees and the unit</i> <i>Upward influence</i> refers to the extent to which the manager is perceived as being able to secure resources for individuals and the unit from upper management. Upward influence is often measured by employee reports of the manager's ability to deliver resources for the unit and to shape upper management's opinions and actions</p>	<p><i>Active monitoring</i> refers to the extent to which the manager vigilantly scans the internal and external environments for information and events that might influence the unit's production or profitability. Active monitoring is typically measured by managers' and their managers' reports of time demands related to the position and managerial skills in this area</p> <p><i>Networking</i> refers to the extent to which the manager builds relationships with important constituents inside and outside the organization for the purpose of information gather, coordination of current projects, and future cooperative ventures. Networking is often measured by managers' reports of contact breadth and frequency of interaction</p> <p><i>Manage boundaries</i> refers to the extent to which the manager protects the unit from the encroachment of supplies, personnel, and assignments from others as well as the extent to which the manager leads the unit to cooperate with other units in a professional manner. Manage boundaries is measured by employees' and managers' evaluations of managerial behaviour.</p> <p><i>Provide resources</i> refers to the extent to which the manager is perceived as being able to secure resources for the unit from upper management. <i>Provide resources</i> is typically measured by employees' and managers' reports of the manager's ability to deliver resources for the unit and to shape upper management's opinions and actions</p>

Table AI.

About the authors

Catrin Johansson (PhD, Uppsala University) is Professor in the Department of Media and Communication at Mid Sweden University. Catrin Johansson is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: Catrin.Johansson@miun.se

Vernon D. Miller (PhD, The University of Texas at Austin) is an Associate Professor in the Departments of Communication and Management at Michigan State University.

Solange Hamrin (MA, Mid Sweden University) is a PhD student in the Department of Media and Communication at Mid Sweden University.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.