Original Research   **Open Access**

Developing Critical Resilient Leadership Behavior Through Collaborative Management: A Logical Perspective

Friday Buradum Tende (Corresponding Author)
Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Email: tendeburadum@gmail.com

Abiye Okebiobramama Lawson
Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

Abstract

This study attempts to understand how collaborative management could enhance and improve organizational leadership and elicit resilient behaviors. Thus, collaboration and resilience are basic characteristics that can help any organization surmount unpredictably challenging situations, and even thrive in the process. A systematic review was used in which relevant theories were examined in line with this objective. It was found that; cultivating, developing, and refining collaborative efforts in organizational leadership, employee-employer relationships, and organizational success are key factors in the pursuit and actualization of predetermined organizational objectives. This outcome demonstrates that leading successfully in an unpredictable and change-prone environment is a huge task. Hence, for organizational leadership to survive and thrive, it has to develop the capacity to be adaptive, swiftly recover from setbacks, maintain relatively stable and functional health, and harness all its resources to remain in business. Therefore, an organization that collaborates on several fronts will create a resilient spirit to face and surmount unpredictably challenging situations if/when they arise. Thus, organizations that intend to succeed in this regard must promote cohesion, diversity, interdependence, inclusion, and social support through enthusiastic and enterprising capabilities.
Keywords: Collaborative management; Leadership; Teams; Team building; and Resilience.

1. Introduction

In building a team that will drive organizational objectives, collaboration is required to seal such a deal. In the same vein, collaboration requires sound leadership to maintain the pace of result-oriented activities. Hence, collaborative management is vital to building a formidable team of motivated staff. This is because, it gives room for all concerned to freely and equally bring all they can to the table (Hurley, 2011). It expedites active co-operation, emphasizing creative and innovative methods available in tackling challenges, thereby improving leadership practices (Mark, 2016). Powell *et al.* (1999), perceived that collaborative management helps organizational leadership and staff observe how to act in varying situations. Also, Sanaghan and Aronson (2009) revealed that collaborative management creates mindfulness about a possible conflict between collaborating workforce and units which makes for a mutually advantageous relationship. Interestingly, collaborative management induces goal congruence, critical thinking, and brainstorming. It offers various outlooks towards arriving at apt solutions. In the same vein, Thomson *et al.* (2007) noted that collaborative management tends to promote self-analysis, problem-solving, makes one look at a bigger picture, and helps in creating room for learning. By implication, it helps in pooling skillful talents, developing employees' skills, expedite solutions, increases adeptness, and improves job performance, and excitement (Hurley, 2011; Mark, 2016).

Goman (2017), proposed some crucial leadership behaviors that could help organizations optimize the full potential of their collaborative posture. These collaborative leadership behaviors are as follows: (1). Collaborative management is "silo-busting", as it diffuses knowledge-hoarding chambers (such as silo mentality). This moves to help organizational leadership to unify its goals and adequately promote a rewards structure that emphasizes cooperation, and collaborative success. (2). Collaborative management helps build trust amongst people who work together. It thus creates confidence or belief that one party relies on the integrity, honesty, and faith of the other. (3). Collaborative management promotes diversity. Here, it gives room for members at all levels to contribute and/or donate their skills and knowledge to create the "power of diverse thinking", and innovation. (4). Collaborative management helps to align the body language of team members. For instance, it promotes the body language of inclusion, which encompasses; genuine smiles, positive eye contact, open gesture and/or postures, arms held away from the body, legs placed where they could be seen, and facing people directly when they are talking. Similarly, Carter and Greer (2013) noted that engaging and encouraging leadership is supported by employees. The leadership

is effective and successful when the resilient leaders create a collaborative environment where the employees and managers can jointly solve problems that comes as a result of changes in the business environment (Veiseh *et al.*, 2014).

1.1. Research Questions

Based on the objective of this review, the following research questions were formulated:

i.   In what ways can organizational leadership develop resilient behaviors that will drive its mission in an uncertain business environment?

ii. In what ways can these resilient leadership behaviors be institutionalized to achieve the predetermined objectives of the organization?

2. Collaborative Management

Collaborative management is the process of engaging collective intelligence to deliver results across organizational boundaries when ordinary mechanisms of control are absent (Thomson *et al.*, 2007). It is applied to address growing organizational complexities especially on specific projects by way of devising a robust plan, coordinating, controlling, and monitoring activities across all units, sections, divisions, components, and fragments of the organization. Based on this submission, it can be pointed out that collaborative management is a necessary tool for building formidable teams. Collaborative management is an increasingly vital source of competitive advantage in today's highly networked, team-based, and partnership-oriented business environments. Yet few managers have been trained to manage collaboratively, especially those at more senior levels who climbed the organizational ladder in a different era. Collaborative management is definitive of a process as against the activities of leaders, and shares similarities with the servant and transformational leadership styles. It starts, according to David Chrislip and Carl Larson, in collaborative leadership, from the premise that if you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization or community (Wood and Gray, 1991). Collaborative management entails bringing collective intelligence to bear in delivering desired outcomes across organizational boundaries when simple mechanisms of control are lacking. It is rooted in the belief that when it has to do with tackling the kinds of novel, complex and multi-faceted challenges encountered by contemporary organizations; all of us could be more competent, creative, and smarter than any of us alone. It demands that leaders employ the power of influence rather than positional authority to engage and align people, focus their teams, sustain momentum, and perform. Here, success is a function of a workplace that breeds trust, mutual respect, and shared aspiration in which everyone can freely and maximally offer ideas to achieve collective goals.

As a modus operandi, managers must through high-quality conversation, pay keen attention to both relationship and result (Hurley, 2011). This, however, could be a challenge for leaders known to have achieved several milestones through the exertive/authoritative leadership model. This, of course, is not unconnected to the fact that most leaders (especially at top levels) lack training on how to employ collaborative management in their organizations. Worst still, the culture and reward systems in most organizations discourage collaboration. Consequently, the need to build leaders' collaborative capacity must work in tandem with the creation of a collaborative organizational culture. According to Hurley (2011), while this appears to be an incredibly challenging task, its vital role in business success cannot be downplayed. While collaborative management could come in handy in varying situations and has proven successful in several other business organizations where it is practiced; it is more often employed in community coalitions and initiatives, in community-based health and human service organizations, or alternative education. It has proven helpful in situations where no one individual is in control, or where there are intricate challenges that no individual is informed or powerful enough to handle. While this does not imply the absence of responsibility, it is a unique situation wherein all hands must be on deck for a veritable solution to be arrived at.

While the practice of collaborative management is divergent, Wood and Gray (1991) identified collaborative problem-solving and decision-making, open process, management of the process as against the group, and transparency; as some of the traits that characterize a good collaborative management process. As a practice of collaborative problem-solving and decision-making, a leader allows groups to brainstorm on a challenge, and come up with the appropriate steps to take; while assisting the groups focus their efforts on key areas. As an open process, leaders are not expected to solely come up with goals or policy direction. They work with, consult and carry their team along in the decision-making process. This ensures that all group/team participants own the process from the beginning to execution. Also, the process entails the planning, organizing, directing, and controlling of the processes agreed upon by all participants, instead of dictating what the group should do. Lastly, all of this must be done in such a way that creates trust amongst team members, and between the leader and the team. Transparency in data sharing and clarity in the decision-making process helps fosters this trust. It is worthy of note that, leaders may have to make the final decision at some point. However, collaborative management demands that such decisions are communicated to all critical stakeholders, especially group members, in time (Sanaghan and Aronson, 2009). Collaborative management gives organizations a competitive edge. As a plus to their competencies, managers should possess the ability to engender trust, manage varying interests, distribute responsibility and authority, drive and sustain top-notch synergy with their peers in the face of intense pressure for performance. Managers should be able to enshrine and entrench collaborative cultures in their organizations. Also, they should know how to put to good use their teams'/groups' collective intelligence, while taking advantage of the workers' unique capabilities to adapt to

changes and reinvent their processes speedily. In whatever context (be it industry-wide or in a social context), they must learn how to build multiplicative deals with business leaders or community leaders.

2.1. Collaboration Leadership and Resilience

Activating change that makes complex interactions among organizational members more resilient needs reprioritization in how people work together, organize, and invest and how they value and manage the organization. It takes multiple strands of activities, but there is structure. There are 'building blocks for resilience (Suryaningtyas *et al.*, 2019). Diversity – in value chains and markets, but also infrastructure and nature. With diversity, an enterprise can switch to an alternate supply chain for example in case of disruption, while diverse teams foster innovation and creativity. Diversity in for example energy supply or transportation systems buffers populations and the broader economy against disruption. Sustainable infrastructure and technologies – that are sustainable and robust, with wide tolerances and incorporating organizational system functions and that continue to operate despite fierce market competitions or market threat. Governance – with decentralized resolutions at diverse points linked via networks rather than a single, top-down epicenter of power. Offers that tasks and frontiers of authority are clear and defined, responses to shocks and tensions can be identified autonomously and implemented promptly at the most operative level, and coordinated and communicated through systems in a firm, decision making is then agile and the governance system itself can adapt to change. Decentralization and getting involved in making decisions builds the aptitude to self-organize and dynamically re-strategize, critical to resilience. Furthermore, companies, communities, or civic organizations can adjust their actions or remodel their procedures more readily and appropriately if people are steadily learning and can pinpoint new data/information and then correctly apply new information. With application to situation forecasting, for example, they gain foresight capacity and an improved chance of detecting and reducing emerging vulnerabilities.

Interestingly, collaboration can lend to each of these building blocks. To begin with, collaboration augments diversity. It brings a diversity of players together to work on problem-solving and change. Working collectively, they bring distinction in resources (which can be financial, social, and natural capital). Businesses can provide managerial expertise and financing streams. From collaboration, a wider array of possibilities and ideas may emerge for responding to stresses and disruptions, including options that work at the local level, closer to impacts that could be alternatives to or coordinated with actions at higher scales (Suryaningtyas *et al.*, 2019).

Again, in today's business environment, the very core of the survival of the organization depends on how it can sufficiently combine individual potentials of employees, available information at their willing disposal, and disposable organizational resources (Goman, 2017), for the growth of the organization. This can help organizations proactively reposition themselves and re-strategize to overcome unforeseen threats from the business environment (Giezen, 2013). This shows organizations can bounce back even in the event of these unforeseen crises (Gallopın, 2006). For instance, individuals in an organization make up the most important aspect of the organization, as such the resilience level of the workers would sum up to determine the organization's resilience. The industry and country an organization is situated in are not left out in this interconnectedness or dependence of resilience levels; they will largely also determine an organization's capacity to face and withstand turbulence. Consequently, it behooves organizations to build resilience by leveraging on their internal and external affiliations to cooperate in the face of difficulty (Gunderson, 2000; Hamel and Välikangas, 2003; Keong and Mei, 2010; Tende *et al.*, 2018). It is this alliance between an organization and other stakeholders such as employees, customers, suppliers, government, shareholders, community, and other major industry players, etc., that can help companies briskly adjust to new realities and keep the organization within a state of acceptable space amidst disturbances (Deniz and Arzu, 2015). Also, to build resilience, organizations must pay attention to three critical principles of resilience. They include leadership, organizational performance, and being change-ready (McManus, 2008). Thus, Akgün and Halit (2014) suggest that organizations must find a way to build the competencies and capabilities of their leaders, to obtain more effective and efficient outcomes from planning, especially at the tactical and operational levels (Grabher, 2002; Powell *et al.*, 1999). To better organizational performance, business owners will have to work on their image and relationship with shareholders, ability to attract talented employees, work at expanding their market share, and bringing to the barest minimum the cost of disruptions (Van *et al.*, 2015).

2.2. Theoretical Basis

On one side, to gain useful insight into the extent of studies undertaken within the domain of this study's interest, a thorough review of the main constructs, their sub-constructs, theories, knowledge gap, and empirical studies; was done in this section. The resource-based view (RBV) highlights the firm's means as the essential contributing factor of competitive gain and achievement. It works with two conventions in analyzing the foundations of competitive gain (Barney, 1991). First, this model assumes that corporations within an industry (or within a tactical group) may be diverse concerning the bundle of means that they are in charge of. Second, it holds that resource heterogeneity may carry on over time because the resources used to devise firms' strategies are not seamlessly mobile through organizations. Resource heterogeneity (or exclusivity) is considered a needed prerequisite for a resource package to warrant a competitive edge. The argument goes "If all firms in a market have the same stock of resources, no strategy is available to one firm that would not also be available to all other firms in the market. As the Chicago School tradition, the RBV is an efficiency-based explanation of performance differences (Barney, 1991) performance distinctions are viewed as derived from rent distinctions, attributable to resources having intrinsically different levels of efficiency in the sense that they enable the firms to deliver greater benefits to their customers for a given cost (or can deliver the same benefit levels for a lower cost) (Barney, 1991). The assumed

heterogeneity and rigidity are not, however, enough circumstances for persistent competitive advantage. Barney (1991) noted that frameworks are reliable once some terms are unambiguously defined. The RBV has developed very interesting contributions, among others, concerning imitation with the concepts of isolating mechanisms, time compression diseconomies, asset mass efficiencies, and causal ambiguity (Barney, 1991). Recently, much resource-based research has fixated on insubstantial assets, which include information knowledge, and dynamic capabilities (Barney, 1991).

On the flip side, Haight *et al.* (2002) considered thriving as self-realization. A thriving individual is making every moment count. The capacity to change smoothly gratifies the life expectancy and the components consistently change and impact one another. The three connecting factors in a thriving continuum. They are the individual, the human climate, the nonhuman climate. The significant attributes of Thriving reverberation those of FTT—social relatedness and physical/psychological capacity. Be that as it may, in the Thriving Theory, physical/intellectual capacity includes actual capacity and psychological/full of feeling capacity. On the positive side of the continuum of Thriving, social relatedness turns into connectedness with a contribution, connection, and a sharing of self. As the individual flourishes, there is an expanded capacity to focus on oneself and to keep up the ideal weight. In the intellectual/full of feeling capacity, there is an improved mindset state and importance to life, with the individual having a reasonable psychological capacity. Interpersonal ties, individuality, pride, engagement, and self-care are characterized as the past conditions of Thriving in more established grown-ups. Key credits of thriving are characterized as social connectedness, capacity to discover climate, transformation to actual examples, and positive intellectual/emotional capacity, and psychological resilience.

2.3. Empirical Insights
Thomson *et al.* (2007), conducted a study in Indiana; an empirical validation of collaboration and applied the mailing questionnaire methods. They found that the model that emerged from their analysis demonstrated an overall close fit with the empirical data. However, they failed to state the significance of collaboration and how it improves organizational expansion. On a similar note, Oppong-Banahene *et al.* (2014) conducted a study on the investigation on conceptualizing resilience: An investigation into project organizing. They applied the systematic reviewing and found that the investigation refined the research necessary to develop the concepts. They failed to point out how conceptualizing resilience could contribute to organizational growth. Lastly, Suryaningtyas *et al.* (2019) conducted a study in Indonesia. Their study investigated resilience and organizational performance using structural equation modeling. They found that resilience positively related to organizational performance. However, failed to state in specific terms.

2.4. Methodology
This study adopts the systematic literature review to identify, select, and critically appraise literature (Dewey and Drahota, 2016) in a bid to proffering viable solutions to the research questions stated above. Here, we device a means through which the principle stated before the review is achieved. Dewey and Drahota (2016) noted that the review should be transparent, with a comprehensive integration of search conducted over multiple databases and grey literature.

2.5. Final Thoughts
Cultivating, developing, and refining collaborative efforts in organizational leadership, employee-employer relationships, and organizational success are key factors in the pursuit and actualization of predetermined organizational objectives. This demonstrates that leading successfully in an unpredictable and change-prone environment is a huge task. Hence, for organizational leadership to survive and thrive, it has to develop the capacity to be adaptive, swiftly recover from setbacks, maintain relatively stable and functional health, and harness all its resources to remain in business. Therefore, an organization that collaborates on several fronts will create a resilient spirit to face and surmount unpredictably challenging situations if/when they arise. Thus, organizations that intend to succeed in this regard must promote cohesion, diversity, interdependence, inclusion, and social support. Again, in building a collaborative workforce, organizational leadership has to meticulously select individuals who have demonstrated enthusiastic and enterprising capabilities. These kinds of team members will seamlessly fit into vacuums where other members are lacking in requisite skills by being good organizational citizens. In essence, passionate skillful individuals from diverse fields and backgrounds should be selected with the view of complementing one another in the area where they lack such skills. Lastly, organizational leaders need to identify, understudy, and develop the areas of strength of the organization, and minimize the areas where they are relatively weak if they want to be resilient and remain so.

3. Limitations and Future Direction
Regardless of all the dimensions that were propounded by several researchers, especially the dimension put forward by Thomson *et al.* (2007); namely governance, autonomy, mutuality, and norm of reciprocity, none were specifically adopted and studied. Again, the study reveals collaborative management as one of the dynamics that can significantly induce resilient behaviors at work, thereby providing theoretical direction for future studies.

References

Akgün, B. and Halit, K. H. (2014). Organizational resilience capacity and firm product innovativeness and performance. *International Journal of Production Research,* 52(23): 6918–37.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resource and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management,* 17(1): 99-120.

Carter, S. and Greer, C. (2013). Strategic leadership: Values, styles, and organizational performance. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 20: 375-93. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812471724

Deniz, K. and Arzu, İ. (2015). Measuring organizational resilience: a scale development. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance,* 4(3): 456-72.

Dewey, A. and Drahota, A. (2016). Introduction to systematic reviews: Online learning module. *Cochrane Training*: Available: https://training.cochrane.org/interactivelearning/module-1-introduction-conducting-systematic-reviews

Gallopın, G. C. (2006). Linkages between vulnerability, resilience, and adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change,* 16(2006): 293-303.

Giezen, M. (2013). Adaptive and strategic capacity: Navigating megaprojects through uncertainty and complexity. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design,* 40(4): 723-41.

Goman, C. K. (2017). Six crucial behaviors of collaborative leaders. *Forbes*: Available: https://www.forbes.com/sites/carolkinseygoman/2017/07/11/six-crucial-behaviors-of-collaborative-leaders/?sh=1ea8ff3b8cbe

Grabher, G. (2002). The project ecology of advertising: Tasks, talents, and teams. *Regional Studies,* 36(3): 245-62.

Gunderson, L. H. (2000). Ecological resilience — in theory, and application. *Ecological States,* 1(31): 425-39.

Haight, B. K., Barbara, B. E., Courts, N. F. and Tesh, A. S. (2002). Thriving: A life span theory. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing,* 28(3): 14-22.

Hamel, G. and Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*. Available: https://hbr.org/2003/09/the-quest-for-resilience

Hurley, T. J. (2011). Collaborative leadership: Engaging collective intelligence to achieve results across organizational boundaries. Oxford Leadership, White Paper.

Keong, F. W. F. and Mei, L. Y., 2010. "Sustainable development: the effect of adopting green technology on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) business resilience and competitiveness." In *International conference on business and economic research.* pp. 15-16.

Mark, S., 2016. "Collaboration for resilience: How collaboration among business, government, and NGOs could be the key to living with turbulence and change in the 21st Century." In *Gland.*

McManus, S. (2008). *Organizational resilience in New Zealand. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis.* Civil Department, University of Canterbury.

Oppong-Banahene, K., Anvuur, A. M. and Dainty, A. R. J. (2014). *Conceptualizing organizational resilience: an investigation into project organizing. IN: Raiden, A.B. and Aboagye-Nimo, E. (eds).* Proceedings of the 30th Annual ARCOM Conference, Portsmouth. 795-804.

Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., Smith-Doerr, L. and Owen-Smith, J. (1999). Network position and firm performance: Organisational returns to collaboration in the biotechnology industry. *Research in the Sociology of Organisations,* 16(1): 129-59.

Sanaghan, P. and Aronson, N. (2009). *Deep lessons on collaboration: how collaboration really works.* Xlibris Corp: Bloomington.

Suryaningtyas, D., Malang, S. A., T., M., Eka, A. and Malang, I. D. W. (2019). Organizational resilience and organizational performance: examining the mediating roles of resilient leadership and organizational culture. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal,* 18(2): 1-7.

Tende, F. B., Achebelema, D. S. and Kpurubu, H. B. (2018). Impact of entrepreneurial spirit on the resilience of small and medium-size agribusinesses in Nigeria. *Sumerianz Journal of Business Management and Marketing,* 1(3): 79-87.

Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L. and Miller, T. K. (2007). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 19(1): 23-56.

Van, D. V. G. S., Essens, P., Wahlström, M. and George, G. (2015). Managing risk and resilience. *Academy of Management Journal,* 58(4): 971-80.

Veiseh, S., Mohammadi, E., Pirzadian, M. and Sharafi, V. (2014). The relation between transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly,* 5: 113-24. Available: http://jbsq.org

Wood, D. and Gray, B. (1991). Towards a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 27(2): 139-62. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886391272001