

Maritime Leadership and Management

Introduction:

Summary of key research objectives:

- Identify the key leadership and management styles within the shipping industry to underpin a literature review for this research.
- Examine the significant areas of concern surrounding management and leadership of multi-cultural crew environments from the view point of five shipping companies with a UK base.

There is a dearth of literature on a shipping industry and leadership management within the UK context but adequate existing research on global trends in current scenarios. Accordingly, to fill this research gap, the present study analyses the shipping industry and leadership management on the pilot study scale by conducting both primary and secondary research in a systematic manner.

Introduction to leadership and management:

Leadership and management, as concepts have been heavily discussed and examined within the literature, both within a general context and in specific relation to their use within an organisational context. Previous research within this subject area has been conducted into industries including the military and the healthcare profession.

A review of the literature published surrounding this research area provides multiple definitions for the term leadership. One reason provided for this in the literature refers to the recognised difficulty experienced in defining this term. Barker (1997) cited in Houghton 2012 defines leadership to be the 'process of transformative change where the ethics of individuals are integrated into the mores of a community as a means of evolutionary social development'. Further definitions have defined a leader as 'a person who is appointed, elected or informally chosen to direct and co-ordinate the work of others in a group' (Fiedler 1995 cited in Saeed *et al* 2016). Furthermore, leadership has been regarded to be 'about encouraging team members to work together, assigning them tasks and assessing their performance, developing the knowledge base of the team as a whole, improving team members' skills and abilities, continuously motivating team members, planning and organising the execution of tasks and establishing a positive team atmosphere' (Saeed *et al* 2016).

Similarly, multiple definitions have been derived for the term management. Management has been simply defined as 'The organization and coordination of the activities of a business in order to achieve defined objectives' (Business Dictionary n.d). However, some authors, such as Peter Drucker have argued that the term management cannot be defined. Peter Drucker, a heavily recognised

author in management studies famously stated that 'Management, therefore cannot be defined or understood – let alone practiced' (Peter Drucker cited in Shenhar and Renier 1996).

Leadership

Leadership has been recognised to take multiple forms in terms of its style. Examples of these styles include authentic, autocratic, transformational, laissez-faire and transactional leadership. Each of these styles are documented to have their own unique attributes. Some leadership styles have been regarded to be more effective than others. For example, the laissez-faire leadership style is recognised to be a more 'hands off' approach by the leader and instead control is given the team (Hanzu-Pazara *et al* n.d). In contrast under the autocratic leadership style full control is held by the leader (Hanzu-Pazara *et al* n.d). It is important to note that there is no ultimate uniform style when it comes to leadership and as such different circumstances will suit different leadership styles. Therefore, it could be implied that determining a suitable leadership style will have to be considered on a case by case basis.

Within the literature, there has been a general emphasis on how a leader's skills are generated. It is generally accepted and portrayed that leadership is not a skill that individuals necessarily naturally possess, but can be acquired as a result of an individual's experience. Some authors have termed this, leadership as a practice. Findings published from a 2014 study examining the leadership profiles of masters on board oceangoing vessels recorded that overall the masters considered their leadership to be formed based on their experiences (Theotokas *et al* 2014).

Management

Management has been viewed as a complex entity. Management, itself has been regarded to be both a science and an art (Shenhar and Renier 1996).

The Merchant Navy case

Within, the Merchant Navy, it has been suggested that the leadership is split into two sections. Firstly, a leader can be found on-board the vessel, usually in the form of the Captain/Master and in some instances the Chief Officer (Chauvin *et al* 2013). In addition, a second source of leadership can be seen onshore, with shore-side personnel recognised to hold a degree of authority over a vessel, in particularly the vessels Captain (Chauvin *et al* 2013). However, based on the characteristics of the shore-side office it could be imagined that they may be perceived to be viewed as a manager rather than a leader.

The Department of Transport historically regarded good management of ships as ‘The efficient and safe operations of ships demands practicing good management *both* [our italics] on board and on shore... the total responsibility of the shipping company demands the close engagement on the part of the shore management...recommended that every shipping company operating ships to assign [13] a person on shore responsible for monitoring technical matters and matters of safe operations of the ships and for providing proper shore support ... emphasis is given to the need to provide to Captains and to Officers clear instructions...there must be close cooperation and repeated effective communication in both directions from ship to shore’ (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005).

Transformational Leadership

A key leadership style has been determined to be transformational leadership. Several authors have referred to this leadership style in relation to the shipping industry. The idea of transformational leadership has been present since the 1970s, when Burns first proposed the concept of Transformational Theory (Theotokas *et al* 2014). Under this theory, it has been regarded ‘that people follow a leader who motivates and encourages. The model introduces a leader who creates a vision, shares this vision with the followers and creates a leader-mentor relationship resulting in the creation of a strong bond with them. This leadership profile usually focuses on the “big picture” and on the worries and needs of the people’ (Theotokas *et al* 2014). However, Bass later substituted the term ‘transforming’ for ‘transformational’ (Delgado *et al* 2012). Transformational leadership has been regarded to be beneficial when working in a team. It has been stated that ‘Transformational leaders articulate goals of the team and vision of the organization that is congruent with values of crew members. Establishment and communication of a shared vision, which is of mutual interest for individuals in the team, can motivate crews’ desire to make extra efforts and achieve team success’ (Xiang n.d). Overall transformational leadership has been stated to provide ‘loyalty and cooperativeness’ (Xiang n.d). However, transformational and charismatic leadership deliver vital perceptions regarding the nature of efficient and effective leadership. But, the majority of the notions have apparently failed to provide the significant explanation about the charismatic leadership (Yukl, 1999; Bass et al., 2003; Avolio and Yammarino, 2013). Nevertheless, recent studies such as: Judge and Piccolo (2004), Anderson and Sun (2017) and Willis et al. (2017) tried to give a practical insights about transformational and charismatic leadership strategies and their trends through their research findings.

Summary

Whilst the concepts of leadership and management are generally regarded to be two largely separate entities, the literature has highlighted that some individuals struggle with the differentiation between the two concepts, especially when concerning leadership as a study. Observations from previous research has reinforced this lack of clarity in relation to distinguishing a leader particularly charismatic leader from a manager. Whilst some authors have proposed definition in order to combat this, some of these definitions have been scrutinised. Therefore, overall this has implied that a greater emphasis is needed in order to clarify these two concepts, especially concerning how these two concepts differ.

Legislation:

Since 1984, the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for seafarers (STCW) has been globally implemented. The aim of the STCW is regarded to be 'to promote safety of life and property at sea and the protection of the marine environment by establishing in common agreement international standards of training, certification and watchkeeping for seafarers' (International Maritime Organisation n.d).

Challenges:

Culture

Several researchers examining the concept of national culture have recognised and highlighted Geert Hofstede's cultural dimension model as a tool to explain culture. Hofstede's model initially proposed four dimensions, and later co-proposed a fifth and a sixth dimension, that should be considered when examining national culture within a society (Hofstede 2011). These six dimensions are; Power distance, Individualism vs collectivism, Uncertainty avoidance, Masculinity vs femininity, Long-term orientation vs short-term orientation and Indulgence vs restraint (Hofstede 2011).

In relation to leadership, national culture has been regarded to potentially affect communication. This has been noted to be in terms of 'how leaders interact with subordinates and how subordinates respond to their leaders' (Theotokas and Progoulaki 2007).

The influence of culture on a workplace could be envisioned to be an important factor for the Merchant Navy, given the fact that a large proportion of the world's merchant fleet are manned by multicultural crews. The MARCOM project conducted in 1999 indicated that approximately 80% of the world's fleet are manned by multicultural crews (Bocanegra-Valle 2010). The proportion of multicultural crews operating within the global labour seafarer market has been seen to have increase over recent years due to increased use of the flagging out strategy. Additionally, some shipping companies have sought to employ seafarers from developing and newly developing countries as they are generally on average paid less in terms of wages in comparison to seafarers from more traditional maritime nations.

Multicultural crewing is not unique to the maritime industry. Other industries including aviation and space travel are recognised to employ multicultural crews. However research published surrounding the presence of multicultural crews on board the international space station has identified challenges in relation to leadership being present. Several accidents within the industry have been

suggested to have occurred as a result of issues arising from multicultural crewing. Communicational issues between a multicultural crew has been suggested as a key component in the occurrence of human error related accidents within the sector (Progoulaki and Theotokas 2016). However, research conducted surrounding the potential issue of communication and multicultural crews have determined that this communicational issue is not limited to on board and can be additionally present between the vessel and the shore side office (Progoulaki and Theotokas 2016).

One well documented maritime accident is the Cosco Busan, a container vessel which collided with a subsection of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). The ship was damaged as a consequence of the accident which subsequently led to the discharge of approximately 53,500 gallons of oil into the bay (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). This had detrimental implications on the local economy and wildlife (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). Whilst several factors were attributed to contribute to the accident including the health of the pilot, communication was suggested to play a significant factor (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). The vessel was recognised to consist of an all Chinese crew, however at the time of the accident, a pilot from the San Francisco Bar Pilots Association was documented to be present on board to guide the vessel through the bay (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). Following the collision, an accident investigation report, utilising recordings from the vessels voyage data recorder, raised concerns about a lack of an information exchange between the master and pilot, both on the pilot's arrival and during the vessels navigation (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). Further concerns were raised about why the master did not become concerned about the pilots ability when the pilot asked the master the meaning of the red triangles displayed on the electric chart, despite the triangle being regarded to be a common symbol marking the bay's features (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). The master later detailed in an interview following the accident that he thought the pilot would have known the meaning of the triangles (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). Therefore it has been suggested that if the master was concerned about the pilot's ability, the master should have taken a more proactive approach in the navigation of the vessel (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). The report further implies that cultural variations between the master and the pilot may have 'made the master reluctant to assert authority over the pilot' (National Transportation Safety Board 2009). Failures were also identified on the part of the shipping company, Fleet Management, as it was suggested that there was an insufficient training of the crew in relation to adhering to the company's safety procedures (National Transportation Safety Board 2009).

A further example is the Bright Field, a bulk carrier which crashed into a river quay after the vessel lost engine power on the Mississippi River in December 1996 (Hayes 1998). Several injuries were

sustained following the accident, although no fatalities were reported (Hayes 1998; National Transportation Safety Board 1998). In addition, a few boats that were moored at the time of the accident suffered minor damage, and further damage was sustained to the quay itself, including to a hotel, shops and residential buildings (National Transportation Safety Board 1998). The Bright Field consisted of an all Chinese crew, but at the time of the accident an American pilot was also on board. Whilst undoubtedly the vessels loss of power was the main contributor leading to the accident, other factors including communication were noted to have been present (National Transportation Safety Board 1998). Accident reports highlight that the master was unaware of the pilots intended logistics for the voyage (National Transportation Safety Board 1998). The report additionally mentions that whilst the master and the pilot were communicating in English, the rest of the crew were communicating to one another in Chinese (National Transportation Safety Board 1998). As such, the master was unaware of the conversations taking place between the crew. A further paper which have mentioned this accident has examined the use of the word no. Pyne and Koester (2005) stated that 'The word "no" is a very impolite word to the Chinese. It is therefore the cultural practice of Chinese crews that they always answer "yes" – especially to an authority such as a pilot – even though they are well aware that the correct answer is "no"'.

Communication problems have also been observed between vessels. In 1995, the vessel the Royal Majesty grounded onto a shoal in Massachusetts (Pyne and Koester 2005). At the time of the incident, the Royal Majesty was nearby to several Portuguese fishing vessels (Pyne and Koester 2005). An unknown on board navigational issue led to the Royal Majesty sailing off course (Pyne and Koester 2005). When crew from the fishing boats tried to alert the Royal Majesty over radio about their position, this was ignored by the Royal Majesty's crew (Pyne and Koester 2005). The Royal Majesty's crew were unaware of the faulty navigational equipment on board and therefore believed they were in a different position (Pyne and Koester 2005). It is important to note that this call was made in English. However, subsequent calls made from the fishing vessels to the Royal Majesty, warning them of the appending danger were made in Portuguese (Pyne and Koester 2005). Therefore, due to the language barrier, these calls were not understood, subsequently leading to their grounding (Pyne and Koester 2005).

However communication problems arising from multiculturalism has not been limited within the industry to cargo carrying vessels (Theotokas and Progoulaki, 2007). In the case of the passenger ferry, the Skagerak, communicational challenges were experienced during the evacuation of the sinking vessel : when altering passengers, crew were communicating in both Danish and Norwegian (Pyne and Koester 2005). However, a few French passengers were present on board who due to the language difference failed to comprehend the crew's instructions (Pyne and Koester 2005). It has

been reported that the passengers believed that the crew were informing them of the ferry's arrival and as such went to prepare instead of joining the rest of the passengers at the assembly point (Pyne and Koester 2005). Whilst all members of the crew and passengers were rescued from the boat, this incident highlights the potential severity that can occur as a result of failing to understand instructions as a result of language differences (Pyne and Koester 2005).

The power distance between crew members has been observed to be the cause of accidents within the maritime sector. This was the case for the Bunga Teratai Satu, a container ship that grounded onto the Great Barrier Reef (Pyne and Koester 2005). The accident was determined to have been caused as a result of an able seaman's navigational error (Pyne and Koester 2005). Whilst the able seaman was noted to have several years of experience at sea and was used to plotting the ship's GPS position, he was not familiar with charting symbols (Pyne and Koester 2005). At the time leading up to the incident, the able seaman had been left to navigate on his own, whilst the mate made a personal phone call (Pyne and Koester 2005). The able seaman was unaware of the ship's dangerous course, and unfortunately by the time the mate returned it was too late to rectify the able seaman's mistake (Pyne and Koester 2005). Following the accident, 'accident investigators noted that there existed a strict hierarchy between the Pakistani senior officers and the Malaysian, Indonesian and Myanmar junior officers and crew' (Pyne and Koester 2005). Pyne and Koester (2005) further added that 'It was important in the national culture of the crew that the AB although he knew something was wrong -did not question the decisions of his superior'.

When sailing on board with a multicultural crew, it has been insinuated that one of the 'greatest challenges in dealing with a multicultural crew is leading in a way that effectively motivates and inspires those with different work-related values and beliefs' (Horck, 2008; Xiang n.d). Therefore, this highlights the importance for both leaders and managers to be culturally aware when sailing on board with or managing a multicultural crew.

Safety

Leadership and management, particularly leadership have been associated as important factors when considering the implementation of safety. Observed relationships between leadership, management and safety have been documented within the literature.

Leaders have been recognised to set and ultimately determine the safety culture exercised in the workplace (Lu *et al* 2016). Lu *et al* (2016) states that 'Prior studies have shown that employee's perceptions of leaders' and supervisors' commitment to safety can predict employees' willingness to raise safety issues in the workplace'. Therefore, the effectiveness of a leader's leadership will play a

critical part in determining the safety culture exercised. This can be envisioned to place a sizable emphasis on the need for leaders to exhibit effective and positive leadership skills in order to ensure a good safety culture is implemented within the workplace.

Safety could be said to be critical to the shipping industry, as it is widely publicised that approximately 70-80% of accidents within the industry are due to human error (Storgard *et al* 2013). According to Olsen (2017), 13-28% of maritime vessel accidents are collisions and these are caused by humans and technical problems. As mentioned earlier in this review, several accidents have been determined to be as a result of communication problems between multicultural crews. However it is important to note that communicational problems can also arise between crew of the same nationality. Therefore, a growing industry wide emphasis has been directed towards reducing this statistic. As such there have been several directives and policies in addition to the STCW convention, including SOLAS (Safety of Life at Sea) and the ISM (International Safety Management) code that have been implemented in order to address safety at sea.

In specific reference to leadership and management within the maritime industry, it has been determined that 'Management characteristics and leadership, at all levels in the organization both shore-side and shipboard, are regarded as major enablers and barriers with respect to the development of an efficient safety culture' (Oltedal and McArthur 2011). The importance of ensuring leadership qualities are held to ensure efficient safety on-board has been acknowledged by the Maritime and Coastal Agency.

Pressure from management, whether this is observed to be direct or indirect has been suggested to be associated with accidents within the sector. This pressure may be presented in the form of meeting deadlines and expectations set by the company, which in turn may led to crew substituting or even foregoing safety procedures on board in order to fulfil their set targets. Commercial and financial pressures on a company is likely to be a key reason for this perceived on-board pressure. Findings from a 2015 study examining safety culture within the workboat and offshore support vessel (osv) sectors, found that with reference to the offshore sector, commercial pressure was regarded by 78% of respondents to influence safety on-board (Pike *et al* 2015). This was suggested to be the case for the Torrey Canyon, a super tanker which discharged thousands of tons of oil over the coasts of Britain and France when it crashed in 1967 (Chauvin 2011). Chauvin (2011) states that 'The Captain of the Torrey Canyon chose the most direct and dangerous route to reach Milford Haven as fast as possible and to take advantage of a high tide coefficient that would make it possible for him to go to port; in fact if he did not seize the opportunity, he ran the risk of lying at anchor for five days before being able to go to bay'.

Similarly, the capsizing of the Herald of Free Enterprise in 1987, a ro-ro ferry on route from Zeebrugge to Dover, which led to the deaths of 188 people was determined to be as a result of being 'under pressure for more profit in an aggressive and competitive environment' (Chauvin 2011; Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). Several factors were identified in the post-accident investigation as potential reasons for the accident (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). The organisation's aim was reported to be to complete the crossing in the shortest time possible (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). Reports written following the accident detailed that there was pressure from management to reduce the amount of time the ship spent in port (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). This was suggested to be due to expected delays upon reaching Dover, and as such the boat was under pressure to set sail fifteen minutes earlier than planned (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). Additionally, due to the organisational pressure for hasty crossings concerns were raised following the accident as the boat was reportedly traveling at high speed generating large waves which subsequently led to water being taken on-board. This was heightened as the assistant bosun who was reported to be asleep at the time of sailing, failed to close the bow doors (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). During the investigation following the accident concerns were raised about the responsibility exercised by the shore side management (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). Overall, it was suggested that the pressure for fast crossings ultimately led to safety being overlooked (Gouliemos and Gouliemos 2005). This accident was noted to be a partial catalyst for the creation of the ISM code (Chauvin *et al* 2013).

The reporting culture exercised by crew members is an important factor determining safety. The willingness to report incidents on-board can be influenced by several factors. A 2015 study examining safety culture within the offshore industry found that a lack of trust, including the risk for potential repercussions following reporting affected the reporting culture (Pike *et al* 2015). In relation to leadership, how a leader is perceived on-board influences the on-board reporting culture. Oltedal and McArthur's (2011) research demonstrates that 'A leadership style where the manager is perceived as a good role model ensures and follows up that all work on-board is done in a safe manner, were positively related to increased reported frequency'. Add findings from helm operations survey.

Further findings from Pike *et al*'s 2015 safety study highlighted that the large majority of respondents that were surveyed within the OSV sector felt that their on board management was supportive of crew (Pike *et al* 2015). Similarly a further large percentage of the respondents surveyed would happily report any safety concerns they may have had due to their on board management being perceived to be accessible (Pike *et al* 2015).

Gender

Seafaring, as a profession can be seen to be prominently male dominated, with female seafarers only accounting for a very small proportion of the world's seafarers (1-2%) (Fjaerli *et al* 2017; Ortega *et al* 2015). In the context of the maritime sector, it has been recognised that women face more challenges in the sector compared to men (Ortega *et al* 2015). Various initiatives have been launched, including by the IMO with the aim of promoting the seafaring profession as a viable career for women worldwide (Ortega *et al* 2015). Furthermore, amendments to the STCW convention in Manila included a resolution aimed at the 'Promotion of the participation of women in the maritime industry' (Ortega *et al* 2015). Ortega *et al* (2015) states that 'participants at the Diplomatic conference on the STCW convention in Manila expressed their support to facilitate more women to participate in the maritime sector by developing long-and medium-term plans to integrate them in the field'.

Since 1990, women employee's % in maritime industry has been growing steadily, and however, due to the lack of statistics as well as lack of appropriate storage data system across the world, there was no accurate information on the women employees number (Khan *et al.*, 2017). However, still women representation is very tiny (2%) on global scale (Wu *et al.*, 2017). Women can potentially face leadership challenges on board as a result of their gender. Several studies have examined leadership variations in relation to gender (Ortega *et al* 2015; Kitada 2017). Whilst some researchers have reported that there are apparent leadership differences between men and women, other researchers have dismissed any gender differences in leadership (Ortega *et al* 2015). In terms of their leadership, women have been considered to be less competent leaders due to lacking 'the necessary managerial skills and traits' (Ortega *et al* 2015). Women have been additionally determined to be 'inherently less competitive, do not like taking unnecessary risks and more likely to let their emotions affect them in their decisions' (Ortega *et al* 2015). Some researchers have therefore implied that women therefore may not be suitable to be a leader in a competitive environment (Ortega *et al* 2015). However, this idea has been rejected by other researchers who believe women will strive as leaders within modern society (Ortega *et al* 2015).

Gender stereotyping has undoubtedly affected how women are perceived as leaders. This is partly due to stereotypes affecting how people, both men and women are judged. Whilst there has been some indication that with equality, men and women are now being seen more equally, this is not

always the case (Ortega *et al* 2015). Ortega *et al* (2015) states that 'Studies evaluating the assessment or evaluation of leadership behaviours have found that women who led in what was perceived to be a masculine manner, tended to be devaluated relative to male leaders'. In terms of how men and women evaluate their own leadership skills, it has been anticipated that 'men, as a result of high esteem in masculine tasks, will overestimate their actual competence. However, when it comes to feminine tasks, men are more accurate in their self-evaluation'. Women however, 'tend to underestimate themselves in masculine tasks and have more accurate expectations about the feminine and neutral tasks' (Ortega *et al* 2015).

Findings published from a study examining female seafarer's leadership on board, demonstrated that overall female officers were determined by their co-workers to be slightly superior leaders compared to men (Ortega *et al* 2015). When analysing their own leadership abilities, female officers scored themselves lower (Ortega *et al* 2015). A further study has found that there 'is a tendency in the maritime industry to have lower requirements for female leaders as compared to male leaders before being considered to be outstanding' (Fjaerli *et al* 2017).

Wellbeing

The wellbeing of an individual can be seen to be important, especially when considering this in relation to the workplace. An individual's wellbeing can be influenced by a number of factors within their surrounding environment. In the context of the workplace, wellbeing has been associated with job retention and job satisfaction. Aside from the physical demand associated with seafarers, it has been recognised that 'seafarers are also exposed to the stress factors in the working environment such as adverse weather conditions, noise, high job demands, shift work and isolation from family and friends' (Nielsen *et al* 2013).

Whilst a study carried out examined seafarer's welfare in relation to several work related factors, did not find a direct link between leadership and welfare on board, the researchers did suggest that there may be an indirect link between leadership and welfare related factors such as job satisfaction and retention (Nielsen *et al* 2013). The researcher has suggested that due to the nature and dynamics of authentic leadership, if authentic leadership is exercised on board, this could be associated with 'high levels of well-being through maintaining a favourable climate within the group that is characterised by positive attitudes between its members and a care for conflict resolution' (Nielsen *et al* 2013).

An individual's wellbeing can be influenced by several factors, including by the presence of bullying. The presence of / Instances of workplace bullying can have a detrimental effect on an individual's

wellbeing both physically and psychologically. Effects of bullying include but are not limited to fatigue, isolation and even suicidal tendencies (Nielsen 2013). With specific reference to seafarers, bullying has been regarded to be 'associated with musculoskeletal disorders, perceived stress, and posttraumatic stress disorder' (Nielsen 2013).

The potential for workplace bullying has been suggested to be heightened on board, due to the demanding and unique nature of the profession. Nielsen (2013) states 'Seafaring is a specific occupation characterized by small groups of employees working tightly together on a restricted physical area (vessels) over a prolonged time period. Together with the long-term isolation from the larger society and the family, these factors make it likely that bullying could represent a significant job strain in seafarers'. Furthermore, the risk for bullying to occur within the seafaring profession has been regarded to be as a result of stress stemming from the on-board environment (Theotokas *et al* 2014).

Findings published as part of a 2013 study examining bullying within the seafaring profession concluded that one out of ten respondents surveyed had encountered bullying whilst working on board (Nielsen 2013). This statistic included instances of permanent and long-term bullying (Nielsen 2013). A further 15% of respondents noted that they had witnessed instances of bullying on board (Nielsen 2013). Some respondents (3.5%) disclosed that they themselves had bullied other crew members whilst on board (Nielsen 2013). The overall results from the study imply that there is a considerable issue surrounding bullying within the seafaring profession (Nielsen 2013). However, despite this apparent issue within the sector, the researcher has noted that few studies have been conducted in this area (Nielsen 2013).

Summary

The literature review analysed and explored existing research related to Maritime Leadership and Management and associated issues such as gender ratio, multicultural differences, communication, safety, health and wellbeing. The majority of the research has concentrated on global maritime but not the UK context. While LR also illustrated that, women representation in the Maritime industry is only 2% and it is one of the research areas to need much focus desperately in current scenarios. On the other hand, most of the collisions caused by technical and human-made mistakes. However, there is no standardised, single origination to collect and store the data regarding all aspects of the maritime industry. These research gaps are strongly associated with Maritime Leadership and Management aspects but to address these at a regional level and more precise information would need to be collected.

References:

- ANDERSON, M. H. & SUN, P. Y. 2017. Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'full-range' theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, 76-96.
- AVOLIO, B. J. & YAMMARINO, F. J. 2013. Introduction to, and overview of, transformational and charismatic leadership. *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead 10th Anniversary Edition*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- BASS, B. M., AVOLIO, B. J., JUNG, D. I. & BERSON, Y. 2003. Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88, 207.
- DVIR, T., EDEN, D., AVOLIO, B. J. & SHAMIR, B. 2002. Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of management journal*, 45, 735-744.
- HORCK, J. 2008. Cultural and gender diversities affecting the ship/port interface. *Maritime education and training efforts to bridge diversity gaps. ISPIC, Bremen*, 19-21.
- JUDGE, T. A. & PICCOLO, R. F. 2004. Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89, 755.
- KHAN, M. S., DHARMARAJA, G., JOHNSON, B. & VAHED, R. 2017. Life of Female Seafarers: Stationed at the Port of Durban-A Study. *Paragon International Publishers*, 88.
- KITADA, M. 2017. Female Captains and Their Leadership: Human Factors in the Shipping Industry. *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education*. Springer.
- OLSEN, T. G. 2017. *Modelling of Technical, Human and Organisational Factors of Ship Collision Accidents using BBN*. NTNU.
- PYNE, R. & KOESTER, T. 2005. Methods and means for analysis of crew communication in the maritime domain. *the Archives of Transport*, 17, 193-208.
- THEOTOKAS, I. & PROGOULAKI, M. 2007. Cultural diversity, manning strategies and management practices in Greek shipping. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 34, 383-403.

- WILLIS, S., CLARKE, S. & O'CONNOR, E. 2017. Contextualizing leadership: Transformational leadership and Management-By-Exception-Active in safety-critical contexts. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.
- WU, C.-L., CHEN, S.-Y., YE, K.-D. & HO, Y.-W. 2017. Career development for women in maritime industry: organisation and socialisation perspectives. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 1-17.
- YUKL, G. 1999. An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The leadership quarterly*, 10, 285-305.

Bocanegra-Valle, A., 2010. Global markets, global challenges: the position of Maritime English in today's shipping industry [viewed 18 February 2015]. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ana_Bocanegra-Valle/publication/262177083_Global_markets_global_challenges_the_position_of_the_Maritime_English_in_todays_shipping_industry/links/00463536cddca6e981000000.pdf

BUSINESSDICTIONARY, n.d. Management [viewed 1 December 2016]. Available from: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/management.html>

CHAUVIN, C., 2011. Human Factors and Maritime Safety. *Journal of Navigation*, 64(4), 625–632

CHAUVIN, C. et al., 2013. Human and organisational factors in maritime accidents: Analysis of collisions at sea using the HFACS. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 59, 26–37

DELGADO ORTEGA, O. et al., 2012. MLQ analysis of leadership in short sea shipping.

EISENHARDT, W. and D. SEARS, 2001. The Role of Leadership Training in Maritime Education. *Proceedings of the 2nd General Assembly of IAMU 2-5 October, 2001 Kobe, Japan*: , pp.191–197

Fjaerli, B.A.B., S. Nazir and K.I. Øvergård, 2017. Gender Bias in the Perception of Outstanding Leadership in the Maritime Industry. In: KANTOLA, J. li., T. BARATH, S. NAZIR and T. ANDRE, eds. *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education*. Springer International Publishing, pp.359-372

GOULIELMOS, A.M. and M.A. GOULIELMOS, 2005. The accident of m/v Herald of Free Enterprise: A failure of the ship or of the management? *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 14(4), 479–492

HANZU-PAZARA, R., C. POPESCU and A. VARSAMI, n.d. The role of teamwork abilities and leadership skills for the safety of navigation. The 13th Annual General Assembly of the IAMU

HAUGHTON, C., 2012. The Leadership of Maritime Education and Training (MET) Institutions

HAYES, E.T., 1998. In the wake of M/V Bright Fields: a call for abandoning the Shipowner's Limitation of Liability Act. *Loyola Law Review*, 44(1), 135–154

HOFSTEDE, G., 2011. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1),

HUSEBØ, J., and N. NEDOPOKINA., 2012. How can leadership strategies be improved to prevent major accidents in shipping tanker operations?

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION, n.d. International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 [viewed 15 December 2016]. Available from: <http://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/HumanElement/TrainingCertification/Pages/STCW-Convention.aspx>

JONES, M., 2015. Nautical lessons for leadership. *The Business & Management Review* , pp.246–247

KANAS, N. and J. RITSHER, 2005. Leadership issues with multicultural crews on the international space station: Lessons learned from shuttle/Mir. *Acta Astronautica*, 56(9-12), 932–936

KITADA, M., 2017a. Female Captains and Their Leadership: Human Factors in the Shipping Industry. In: KANTOLA, J. I., T. BARATH, S. NAZIR and T. ANDRE, eds. *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education*. Springer International Publishing, pp.1265–1274

KITADA, M., 2017b. Female Captains and Their Leadership: Human Factors in the Shipping Industry. In: KANTOLA, J. I., T. BARATH, S. NAZIR and T. ANDRE, eds. *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp.1265–1274

LU, C.-S., C.-N. HSU and C.-H. LEE, 2016. The impact of seafarers' perceptions of national culture and leadership on safety attitude and safety behavior in dry bulk shipping. *International Journal of e-Navigation and Maritime Economy*, 4, 75–87

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD, 1998. Marine Accident Report Allision of the Liberian Freighter Bright Field with the Poydras Street Wharf, Riverwalk Marketplace, and New Orleans Hilton Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana December 14, 1996. Washington D.C: National Transportation

Safety Board [viewed 6 December 2016]. Available from:
<http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/MAR9801.pdf>

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD, 2009. Allision of the Hong Kong -Registered Containership M/V Cosco Busan with the Delta Tower of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge San Francisco, California November 7, 2007. Washington DC: National Transportation Safety Board [viewed 13 December 2016]. Available from:
<http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/MAR0901.pdf>

NIELSEN, M.B., 2012. Bullying in work groups: The impact of leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 54(2), 127–136

NIELSEN, M.B., K. BERGHEIM and J. EID, 2013. Relationships between work environment factors and workers' well-being in the maritime industry. *International Maritime Health* 2013

OLTEDAL, H.A. and D.P. MCARTHUR, 2011. Reporting practices in merchant shipping, and the identification of influencing factors. *Safety Science*, 49(2), 331–338

Ortega, O.D., K.I. Øvergård and V.Henden, 2015. Women Are Better Leaders Than They Think: Gender Differences in the Self-Assessment of Leadership Skills in the Maritime Industry. In M. Kitada, E. Williams and LL. Froholdt, eds. *Maritime Women: Global Leadership*, WMU Studies in Maritime Affairs 3. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer - Verlag, pp.201-216.

Pike, K. *et al.*, 2015. A Market Intelligence Report: 'The Impact of Crew Engagement and Organizational Culture on Maritime Safety in the Workboats and OSV Sectors.' Prepared for Helm Operations.

PROGOULAKI, M. and I. THEOTOKAS, 2010. Human resource management and competitive advantage: An application of resource-based view in the shipping industry. *Marine Policy*, 34(3), 575–582

PROGOULAKI, M. and M. ROE, 2011. Dealing with multicultural human resources in a socially responsible manner: a focus on the maritime industry. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 10(1), 7–23

PROGOULAKI, M. and I. THEOTOKAS, 2016. Managing culturally diverse maritime human resources as a shipping company's core competency. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 43(7), 860–873

PYNE, R. and T. KOESTER, 2005. Method and Means for Analysis of Crew Communication in the Maritime Domain. *The Archives of Transport*, XVII(3-4),

ROTTGER, S., S. VETTER and J.T. KOWALSKI, 2012. Ship management attitudes and their relation to behavior and performance. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 55(3), 659–671

SAEED, F. et al., 2016. A proposed quantitative methodology for the evaluation of the effectiveness of human element, leadership and management (HELM) training in the UK. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*

SHEA, I., I. SHEA., I. SHEA., et al., (2005). The organisational culture of a ship : a description and some possible effects it has on accidents and lessons for seafaring leadership

SHENHAR, A.J. and J. RENIER, 1996. How to define management: a modular approach. *Management Development Review*, 9(1), 25–31

Stogård, J., N.Berg and O.P. Brunila, 2013. Insight in Ship Crews. In: International Maritime Incident and Near Miss Reporting Conference. 2013, Kotka, Finland, June 11-12. [online] [viewed 23 February 2015]. Available from:

http://www.merikotka.fi/mimic/images/stories/Storgard_Berg_Brunila_InsightInShipCrews.pdf

SURUGIU, F. and C. DRAGOMIR, 2010. Leadership development training as method to increase seafarer competitiveness.(Report). *Annals of DAAAM & Proceedings*1443(2)

THAMRIN, H.M., 2012. The influence of Transformational leadership andOrganizational commitment on job satisfaction andEmployee performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*

THEOTOKAS, I. and M. PROGOULAKI, 2007. Cultural diversity, manning strategies and management practices in Greek shipping. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 34(4), 383–403

THEOTOKAS, I., I.N. LAGOUDIS and N. KOTSIPOULOS, 2014. Leadership profiling of ocean going ship masters1. *The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics*, 30(3), 321–343

XIANG, N., n.d. Transformational Leadership and Its Implication for Leadership at Sea. *International Association of Maritime Universities*