



Walden University
ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies


Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies
Collection

1-1-2009

Leadership as role and relationship in social dynamics: An exploratory study seeking a leadership archetype

Brian W. Bridgeforth
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Brian W. Bridgeforth

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. William D. Steeves, Jr., Committee Chairperson,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Duane Tway, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Carol Wells, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Gary Gemmill, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Denise DeZolt, Ph.D.

Walden University
2009

Leadership As Role and Relationship in Social Dynamics:
An Exploratory Study Seeking a Leadership Archetype

by

Brian W. Bridgeforth

M.B.A., University of Phoenix, 2002
M.A., University of Phoenix, 1998
B.S., Viterbo College, 1994

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Applied Management and Decision Sciences:
Leadership and Organizational Change

Walden University
March 2009

UMI Number: 3355025

Copyright 2009 by
Bridgeforth, Brian W.

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3355025
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

Previous research on leadership as archetype considered archetype as metaphor and not as it is understood in other literatures as a collectively accepted and defined role within and across cultures. Archetypal theories are posited as useful because they help us understand universal aspects of human behavior; however, empirical research demonstrating archetypal thinking and behavior remains rare. Accordingly, this phenomenological study investigated whether a leadership archetype exists as a shared cognitive template and if so, what characteristics define it. The theoretical framework used to examine the phenomenon of leadership combined leadership theory, philosophy of the mind, Jungian psychology, social constructionist theory, and neuro-linguistic programming. Data were collected in semi-structured interviews from a convenience sample of 10 Midwestern subjects belonging to professional and social organizations and having an expressed interest in leadership. Interviews were coded and sequentially analyzed using a semiotic–phenomenological method that included thematic descriptions, reduction, and interpretation. Results failed to identify an archetypal view of a leader, but identified choice and attribution as key elements in selecting leaders and accepting their leadership. These findings suggested an explanation of leadership as a group consensus that emerges through a dynamic process rather than solely from leader behavior. Implications for positive social change result from the study’s contribution toward further understanding of the psychology of leader selection and follower behavior. Given the multiplicity of existing leadership models, the insights gained from this research contribute to the scholarly literature highlighting group-dynamic influences and can lead to improvements in leadership training and leadership development outcomes.

DEDICATION

To the participants of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I sit here and reflect on the effort involved to complete this magnum opus, I know no man is an island unto himself. I would not be writing these words if it were not for the contribution, commitment, and sacrifice of more people than I may ever acknowledge in my lifetime. A short list is the teachers, students, and colleagues with which I have worked and learned. Significant amongst colleagues are the librarians who searched with me or for me the catalogue of knowledge to put this work together. Because I cannot name everyone I endeavor to name a handful here that have done all three. I mention them according to the gift given me during this journey. To those not specifically mentioned, please pardon my omission.

First, I thank the participants of this study. Without your contribution, obviously, this study would not have been possible. Your willingness to share your stories, work through the reduction process, and wait for the results is appreciated. Having come through this process with you, I learned more about leadership from you than my years searching the literature or my own practice. Thank you.

Second, I thank Dr. William Steeves, Dr. Duane Tway, Dr. Carol Wells, and Dr. Gary Gemmill, my committee, for their individual and collective commitment to the process and outcome of this journey. Each shared wisdom, conversation, and patience. I recall the rudimentary beginning with which I eagerly and proudly began this journey. I consider the breadth, depth, and potential of the final product. It has been a journey. I thank each of you for challenging me to rise above my own ambitions and achieve something more than I dreamed I could accomplish.

Third, I thank my wife, Pamela Amundson, for her sacrifice so that I could achieve a dream. Choosing to invest in education and pursue a new career came with a hefty price. The one the student pays pales by comparison to that of the spouse. There were the countless nights I was working late or in which you slept alone. There were the many holidays you and the kids spent alone because I was attending a residency. There was the three weeks in the summer of 2004 I was in Bloomington at IU. There was the maintaining the house, caring for the girls, and so many other chores that you accomplished alone so that I could have a few hours to read, write, or edit. There was the silent acceptance of the roller coaster ride of my maturation during the last six years. Most telling was your believing in me when I lost faith in myself. There were times I was tempted to quit. You would benefit if I had because there would be no more sacrifice to make. Each time you encouraged me to stay the course. Although I do not mention every sacrifice, I do recall them all. Your actions since the day we met have been unconditional love and acceptance. The sacrifices like yours make accomplishments like this one possible and probable. Thank you my friend, my love, my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Problem Statement	2
Background of the Problem	5
Purpose Statement.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	15
Nature of the Study.....	16
Research Questions	17
Theoretical Framework of the Study	18
Assumptions.....	20
Scope and Delimitations of the Study.....	20
Definition of Terms.....	22
Summary.....	24
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	26
The Phenomenon of Leadership as Social Construction	27
The Phenomenon of Leadership as Pattern.....	28
Images of the Attractor: Testimony in Social Discourse	37
The Assumptive Components: Insights Into The Collective Unconscious	44
Existence	45
Necessity.....	46
Origin	49
Function	54
The Bridge Between Social And Subjective Realities.....	57
Expression.....	58
Cognition.....	62
Observing the Unity of Expression and Cognition.....	65
Summary.....	69
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHOD	71
Research Questions	71
Research Design.....	71
The Researcher's Role	76
Participant Selection	77
Preparation Considerations	78
Data Collection	80
Data Analysis	82
Procedural Step 1: Description	83

Procedural Step 2: Reduction.....	84
Procedural Step 3: Interpretation.....	85
Verification.....	87
Validity and Reliability.....	87
Summary.....	89
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	90
Data Collection.....	91
Data Recording	91
Data Analysis and Descriptions	92
Participant 1	93
Participant 2	96
Participant 3	98
Participant 4	101
Participant 5	104
Participant 6	107
Participant 7	110
Participant 8	113
Participant 9	116
Participant 10	120
Participants' Unified Description of Leadership	124
Summary.....	135
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	137
Conclusions	137
Research Question 1.....	137
Research Question 2.....	163
Research Question 3.....	164
The Research Method	164
Social Change Implications	166
Recommendations	170
Summary.....	173
REFERENCES	176
APPENDIX A: CONTACT LIST	191
APPENDIX B: CALL FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS.....	213
APPENDIX C: FACILITY CONTACT LIST	215
APPENDIX D: FACILITY COOPERATION REQUEST	217
APPENDIX E: CONSENT FORM	219

APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	221
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	230

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Participant Responses to Interview Questions	128
Table 2. Participants' Responses Regarding Competency (Technical Skills).....	131
Table 3. Participant Responses Regarding Character (Social Skills)	133

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Expression as representation of cognition as experienced illustrating the triune nature of each.	63
Figure 2. Mapping Eye-accessing Cues (Adapted from `The User's Manual for the Brain PowerPoint® Overheads` by Bob G Bodenhamer and L Michael Hall (ISBN 9781899836512) reproduced by permission of Crown House Publishing Limited).	67
Figure 3. The elements and process of the emergent attribution of leadership in social dynamics.	143
Figure 4. The three relative interdependent variables and their relations comprising and influencing individual and collective perceptions of change.	153
Figure 5. The process of choice relative to the accessing, creation, and negotiation of leadership schemata.	154
Figure 6. Socially constructed reality as the oscillating experience of change and choice.	157

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Hammurabi, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Columbus, Lincoln, Ghandi, Churchill are all long-remembered leaders. Such role models, heroes, or subjects of legends of cultures past symbolize what we understand today as leadership (Burns, 1978; Harter, 2003). In contrast, the leadership of recent times is lamented for its absence (Bennis & Nannus, 1985), and when observed, it is described as a crisis of mediocrity or irresponsibility of those in power (Dalton, 2004; Weathersby, 1998). Barker (2001) explained the phenomenon of leadership as an industry with an agenda to sell training and education, which, in turn, fosters an agenda for research. According to Fiedler (1973), in spite of the “billions of dollars” that had been spent on leadership development programs, they had produced “little measurable return” in the way of desired results (p. 238). More than three decades later, Bennis (2004) reiterated the same concern when he cited a Business Week annual survey of executive education pointing out that organizations spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year sending tens of thousands to leadership training and development programs annually. “That’s a significant investment in an activity that may or may not produce authentic leaders, or even better managers. For all the money spent on them, we still don’t know if leadership programs work. Nor do we know which ones are successful” (Bennis, 2004, p. 35).

Burns (1978) noted that leadership was one of the most observed and yet least understood phenomenon on earth. Plato labeled leadership an enigma (Wood, 2005). The study of leadership remains conflicted because the existing construction of knowledge

regarding leadership is a shambles, and collective understanding has not advanced (Rost, 1991). Further, theories and propositions about leadership continuously trade places in popularity (Watt, 2003). Burns (1978) proposed the need for a school of leadership, intellectual and practical, with standards for assessing past, present, and potential leaders. Barker (1997) argued that leadership training was an impractical ambition in the absence of knowing what leadership is. Training and assessment is relative to a definition or conceptualization of leadership (Watt 2003). Bass (1990) contended, “there are as many definitions of leadership as there are people who have attempted to define it” (p. 7). Smith, Mantagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) also noted that a universally accepted definition has yet to be agreed upon (p. 7). According to Husserl (1931), in order to define anything, there must be revelation of the nature of the thing in terms of its intentionality to consciousness. To define leadership, Barker (2001) called for a metaphysical and phenomenological study, which is absent from the literature. Integrating Barker (2001) with Jung (1956, 1959, 1960), Husserl (1931), and Lanigan (1988) a metaphysical and phenomenological study is expected to contribute to defining and teaching leadership by revealing the role and relationship of leadership in experience relative to a possible archetype and its characteristics from a follower perspective.

Problem Statement

Earlier research on leadership as archetype rested on the ontological assumptions of existence and defined archetype as metaphor. Researchers, however, have not yet questioned the assumption by seeking the existence of a leadership archetype in the Jungian (1956) sense. This dissertation addressed the problem by inquiry into the

existence of a leadership archetype, whether or not it does exist, and if so, the identification of its characteristics.

Discernment of an Archetype

To examine and define the construct of archetype this research, in addition to Jung (1956, 1959), drew on Husserl (1931), Cherry and Speigel (2006), Rapaille (2006), and Kets de Vries (2007). Archetype is defined from two perspectives—inherited and imprinted. Husserl and Jung (1956) represent the inherited perspective. Cherry and Speigel, Rapaille, and Kets de Vries represent the imprinted perspective. To appreciate the variation in definition between the two perspectives examination of the role and relationship of archetype in the human psyche is required.

The inherited perspective argues that archetypes are part of our genetic material and consequently are part of the structure of the psyche and serve a functional role in existence and survival. Husserl (1931) advanced the idea of phenomenology as both the philosophy and science of consciousness. Phenomenology presupposed that objectivity and subjectivity are synonymous. The evidence of this synonymy, for Husserl, is that consciousness contains within it, the breadth and depth of objective possibility, of which consciousness itself must be contained. In other words, appreciation of the objective world is through identification of essence, which lies in the subjectivity of intentionality. The mind, according to Husserl, in his description and discussion of intentionality, conveys that consciousness is toward oriented—it looks for things to which to gravitate. Husserl's explanation left the question, what characteristics motivated the attribution of existence, unanswered. It is the suggestion of this researcher that, to answer this question,

one must look to Jung's (1959) collective unconscious. The collective unconscious is a common collection of genetically stored and passed images experienced as an involuntary unconscious response when stimulated by perception of and identification with an external object or event.

In contrast, the imprinted perspective defines archetype as, symbolic representations of the meaning of lived experience (Cherry & Spiegel, 2006; Kets de Vries, 2007; and Rapaille, 2006). These symbolic representations are culturally shared and culturally perpetuated. These symbolic representations are found in the relationship between psyche and experience rather than an element of the structural composition of the psyche.

Hogenson (2001) examined the Baldwin effect, the intermingling of both inherited and imprinted perspectives, as influence to Jung's thinking. The inherited perspective has to do with the nature of instinct in cognition relative to context whereas the imprinted perspective involves socially based learning through evolutionary time that remains stable over long periods of time. Hogenson was definitive in his conclusion that Jung's original theory of archetypes as being inherited remained when he stated,

On the face of it, one is tempted to assume, as I believe many do, that Jung is proposing that the all important governing images, or archetypes, are really rather complete inner or mental representations of various states of affairs encountered over evolutionary time. But this would be mistaken. Rather, it seems to me that Jung takes very seriously the notion that the archetypal is always imbedded in a context, and that context is equally important as any structure that may be provided by the archetypes (p. 600).

For the purposes of this study, and with reliance primarily on the work of Jung, an archetype is defined as an unconscious representation in the psyche common among the collective by which individuals define, identify with, and respond involuntarily or unconsciously to an external stimulus, as embodiment or manifestation, of that representation.

Background of the Problem

Jung (1960) examined the antinomy of energy as role and relationship with respect to the nature of the psyche and its development. These opposing points of view of this role and relationship are as motion and force when actual and as a state or condition when potential. Actual psychic energy wrote Jung was demonstrated by instinct, willing, attention, wishing, and the capacity for work whereas potential energy is attitude, aptitude, and possibilities. Jung's stated purpose for identifying this antinomy and examining it through comparison contrast was to resolve the two opposing philosophic perspectives by integrating them. Jung argued, "The antinomy must resolve itself in an antinomian postulate, however unsatisfactory this may to our concretistic thinking, and however sorely it afflicts the spirit of natural science to admit that the essence of so-called reality is of a mysterious irrationality" (p. 23). The theoretical approach to this work is a similar strategy guided by a similar rationale. In this work, the antinomy of the fundamental nature of leadership as role and relationship in social dynamics is the question of its existentialism as described by two meta-theories. This antinomy is comprised from four shared assumptive components, which are also antinomies: (a)

existence (objective reality vs. subjective reality), (b) necessity (requisite vs. derivative), (c) origin (inherited vs. imprinted), and (d) function (manifest vs. latent).

The first metatheory posits that the phenomenon of leadership is objective reality and is necessary for social action (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2004; Yukl, 2002). The second metatheory posits that the phenomenon of leadership is subjective reality and serves as a latent function of social action (Barker, 1997, 2002, 2006; Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Goepfinger, 2002; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dulkerich, 1985). The second metatheory is in the minority and has remained largely ignored or dismissed (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Bennis, 1999). While the second metatheory remains anticipating research interest, its counterpart, after more than a century, has failed to achieve consensus about the nature the leadership phenomenon. Consequently, the second metatheory warranted further consideration. Identification and acceptance of a combination of components from both metatheories may yield a new understanding of leadership, contributing to the determination of if an archetype exists.

The Phenomenon of Leadership as Objective Reality

The phenomenon of leadership as a central preoccupation in human affairs is the focus of continuous and extensive discussion and study. When Bass (1990) stated, “all social and political movements require leaders to begin them” (p. 8), he contended that matters of societal functioning, maintenance, and development tend to originate with, and depend upon, an act of leadership. The seminal work of Stogdill (1974), and Bass’s (1981, 1990) subsequent revised and expanded compilations of the work of Stogdill, are representative of the literature in offering encyclopedic references to the history of

academic research on the constructs of leader and leadership. Both authors compiled histories of formal research that assumed the phenomenon of leadership to be based in objective reality and to be necessary to the existence, function, and development of society. These compilations included the concepts, theories, typologies, taxonomies, speculations, and dichotomous debates up to the time of publication. For Stogdill and Bass (1981, 1990), the phenomenon of leadership was assumed to be based in objective reality, since their compilations included studies of leadership and group processes, personality, compliance induction, affect, effect, behaviors, persuasion, power, goal achievement, role differentiation, structure initiation, and various combinations thereof. Further, Bass (1985) and House and Aditya (1997) sampled the dichotomous study of leadership during the last half century and listed autocratic versus democratic approaches, directive versus participative decision-making, tasks versus relationships, and initiation versus consideration. Yukl (2002) and House and Aditya reviewed and or referenced reviews of literature pertaining to a wide spectrum of constructs that examined the phenomenon of leadership. These literary works spanned myths and legends, the studies of animal social structure, pecking orders, dominance, cross-cultural comparisons, power, legitimacy, task competence, authority, values, style variations, and exchange theory. To these lists, one may add works conducted on situational theory (Hersey, 1984), service theory (Greenleaf, 1977), and motivational theories such as “power need” theory and contingency theory (Northouse, 2004).

The phenomenon of leadership has also been examined in terms of human traits identified as inherent in individuals possessing leadership. Fleishman et al. (1991)

completed a meta-analysis of 65 systems, and their analysis identified 499 traits of leadership according to Barker (2001). Trait studies have included age, height, weight, appearance, fluency of speech, intelligence, dominance, introversion, extroversion, confidence, initiative, persistence, emotional control, cooperativeness, needs and motivations, values, self-esteem, and charisma. Concurrently, behavioral studies have included the use of power and authority, contingent reinforcement, leader-follower interaction, and task competence. Yukl (2002) cited the Ohio State and Michigan Leadership Studies in which behavioral effectiveness and critical incidents were the focus. Likewise, Bass (1990) interpreted leadership behaviorally. Bass summarized leadership as appearing to be “a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his or her capacity to carry cooperative tasks to completion” (p. 77).

According to Lord, De Vager, and Alliger’s (1986) meta-analysis of personality and leadership perception, dominance was identified as a significant trait. Weber (1947/1964) implied that dominance is synonymous with leadership, describing the followers of leaders as “those subject to authority” (p. 359). Also, dominance-by-power is the foundation of leadership legitimacy in Hersey’s (1984) situational leadership model. Bass’ (1985) transformational/transactional leadership model offered leadership as arising from managerial (i.e., superior–subordinate) authority. Yukl (2002) acknowledged dominance as a requisite of the phenomenon of leadership, summarizing most definitions of leadership as a process of intentional influence exerted by one person over a group or organization to structure, guide, and facilitate relationships. Bonstetter (2000) argued

that, even in our enlightened times, when we demonstrate respect, trust, and acknowledge the importance of emotional intelligence, the dominance model of managerial leadership is in play—appropriate and necessary—in social systems that fall in the lower categories of Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs. Barker (1997, 2002) identified the origins of the dominance model of leadership as the feudal model arising with the hierarchical system of kings, lords, and governors of the Middle Ages. Others point to the foundation of the dominance model of leadership as predating the feudal period.

Dominance is a trait, according to McClelland’s achievement motivation theory (House & Aditya, 1997). Coupled with submission, dominance is a learned behavior (Burns, 1978), which either voluntarily or by force establishes hierarchy. Hierarchy, as the establishment and perpetuation of structure, enables control. Howard (2000) repeated the identification of the reptilian portion of the brain (i.e., fight or flight) as dominating in animals and early humans. In an environment where survival is the predominate focus, those who dominate are more likely to survive than those who do not.

The phenomenon of leadership as based in objective reality and necessary for social action remains a question. While Burns (1978) argued the validity of the assumptions that (a) leaders make history through the occurrence of social action, (b) the masses act through leaders, and (c) social action is a reflection of the crucibles of social and economic deprivation, the argument awaits demonstration. A demonstration Barker (2001) had suggested is not forthcoming until the traditional paradigm is replaced with an alternate point of view. Barker wrote, “. . . just as geocentric theory was based on the understandable but incorrect perception of the sun and the stars circling the earth,

leadership theory has been based in the understandable but incorrect perception of a cause-effect relationship between the leader's abilities, traits, actions and leadership outcomes" (p. 478).

The Phenomenon of Leadership as Subjective Reality

The second metatheory suggests that the phenomenon of leadership is based in subjective reality and serves as a latent function of social action. This challenges the veracity of the associated cause-effect relationship between leadership and social action that underlies the first and dominant metatheory. The phenomenon of leadership as based in subjective reality argues that, given the complexity of social dynamics, leadership is beyond the actions of one person, i.e., the leader. Authors contributing and advancing the second metatheory have described the phenomenon of leadership as a false ideal arising from a mistaken attribution of cause and effect (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985), a myth serving a latent social function (Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Goepfinger, 2002), a myth (Wood, 2005), or an artifact of individual relations and group social action (Barker, 2006). The premise of this minority metatheory is the assumption that collective social action has more to do with outcomes than the influence of a superior over a group of subordinates. Bass (1990) introduced and categorized this alternative under the question of leadership being a derivative of social action, and therefore a collective social myth, and dismissed it. Barker (2002) criticized Bass's rejection for relying on the dominant paradigm as being self-evident, and consequently, the continued selected view of the future. Barker further suggested that Bass' choice was likely a reflection of vested interest in traditional thinking.

The idea of false ideal arising from a mistaken attribution of cause and effect was proposed by Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985). These authors argued that while the concept of leadership, as a perceptual element, had explanatory value contributing to individual and collective sense-making, the attribution of cause-effect relationship, i.e., performance is the result of leader actions, is in the romantic perceptions of followers rather than reality. This sense-making attribution arises from the challenge of the structural complexity of social dynamics a complexity that is greater than any one single observer can comprehend. The introduction leading to this conclusion was a review of literature, which criticized the scientific deficiencies plaguing theory and research up to that time. Then, as segue to a review of attribution theory and its relevance to understanding the phenomenon of leadership, the authors proposed that the imagery and mythology typically associated with the leadership concept is evidence of the mystery and mysticism, which is imbued to it. To test the hypothesis of the study, Meindl et al. statistically analyzed the results from two distinct approaches. In the first approach, three independent archival studies of the literature were undertaken. In the second, three evolving experimental studies, involving a consistent vignette offering an alterable range of possible outcomes, were conducted. The researchers concluded: "The results of our analysis suggest that the faith in leadership is likely to exceed the reality of control and will be used to account for variance that is in fact uncontrollable" (p. 99).

One alternate to the false ideal arising from a mistaken attribution argument is the proposition that leadership is a myth serving a latent social function (Gemmill, 1986; Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Goepfing, 2002). Gemmill acknowledged the governing

assumption that, because there is a word *leadership*, there must be a reality it describes or denotes and then the author proposed a denial, stating that “. . . it is a matter of personal preference and value judgment as to what empirical referents are connected to the label ‘leader’ role or ‘leadership’” (p. 17). Detailing his challenge Gemmill pointed out, “exactly what the underlying existential needs or problems are that the concept of the leader role is meant to address has never been clearly articulated” (p. 18). Moreover, Gemmill posited that the need is to repress uncomfortable subjective experience that emerges when group members attempt to work together. In other words, in the face of fear, as response to uncertainty and ambiguity and emerging feelings and impulses, people unconsciously collude to dispel the subjective experience by projection onto a leader role. Gemmill and Oakley suggested leadership was a label for “a myth that functions to reinforce existing social beliefs and structure about the necessity of hierarchy” (p. 1). Moreover, its consequence is the teaching and perpetuation of learned helplessness amongst societal members at large, invoking a sense of despair and encouraging hero or messiah seeking. In a similar vein, Goepfinger (2002) viewed the leadership literature as investigative reporting by victims in which subjects assign responsibility to the leader to escape accountability.

The literature of the last ten years expands the attack on the accepted view and raises the ontological question, “[W]hen is it leadership, and when is it something else?” (Barker, 2006, p. 5). Bennis (1999) shifted from his previous pro-traditional perspective on leadership when he stated that the traditional view of leadership oriented to hierarchy (i.e., top-down) is an inappropriate and dangerous idea. Wood (2005) identified the

leadership literature as perpetuating the 'great man' myth. Barker (2002) proposed the phenomenon of leadership as duality of process and relationship. Under this paradigm, the process model has three key characteristics. First, the phenomenon of leadership is a function of the social system, the dynamics of individual needs and wills. Second, the phenomenon of leadership is adaptation and evolution through dynamic exchange and interchange of values. Third, rather than a structure, the phenomenon of leadership is an emergent process. The relationship aspect of the model presented the phenomenon of leadership as manifesting through the dynamics of social and political interactions within a context of collectively held, shared individual values, and common purposes that may not be achieved. In summation, leadership is a derivative of social action of "it is what everyone is and does" (Barker, 2006, p. 4).

Assumptive Components of Leadership Theory Guiding Research

Examination of both metatheories as an integrated whole of the examined literature yielded four assumptive components. These assumptive components are: (a) existence, (b) necessity, (c) origin, and (d) function. All four await empirical investigation. These components were identified as central to establishing and focusing an inquiry into the phenomenon of leadership.

This research accepts the component of existence on the premise that the existing social order believes, promotes, and perpetuates the leadership phenomenon, and possibly, although indirectly, an archetype. Given the failure of the traditional perspective to demonstrate empirically that the phenomenon of leadership originates in the leader, the component of origin is both objective and subjective reality. As objective reality, the

leadership phenomenon is a derivative of individual relations and group social action. As subjective reality, the leadership phenomenon is a socially constructed reality by attribution through symbolic communication. The component of necessity is the survival impetus of the individual and species. This impetus perpetuates and morphs from the physical to the psychological to the social through inheritance and imprinting. The component of function, as purpose or role, is a construct that remains to be determined. Each component is subject to revision as understanding develops. However, one certainty is the conception of leadership as phenomenon is at present, so culturally ingrained that the existing social order would be challenged to abandon the concept altogether.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this exploratory research was to examine the conscious interpretation of the leadership experience to identify a possible archetype. As explained, the leadership literature may be divided into one of two metatheories. The premise of the first metatheory is that leadership is existential. The premise of the second metatheory is that the phenomenon of leadership, as an erroneous attribution of cause and effect, is a myth. While this research acknowledges both premises as credible, it declines to accept either metatheory as singular truth. While both premises assume or acknowledge a predisposition to the phenomenon of leadership as experience, the complexity and confusion in the literature, arising from the multitude of definitions, conflicting theories, and contradicting research results suggests a failure to ascertain the fundamental nature of the phenomenon of leadership as a psychological and social construct. The argument of predisposition implies an archetype. Evidence of multiple archetypes as social imprint

has been advanced by Crothers (1992), Cherry and Spiegel (2006), and Kets de Vries (2007). Crothers offers archetypes of political leadership through the lens of political culture. Cherry and Spiegel examine social patterns through the lens of metaphor. Kets de Vries offered eight managerial roles as archetypes. Consequently, the antecedent to this present study was that integration of the two metatheories, by means of a theoretical framework, is basic to achieving understanding of the phenomenon of leadership.

Significance of the Study

Fiedler (1973) described the problem of both the experience of leadership and the failure of leadership training and development as seeking the emulation or molding an assumed one best-type of personality and behavior or style pattern. In other words, given that no two groups are the same, there is no one leadership ideal. While this researcher acknowledged Fiedler's conclusion regarding practice as accurate, a proposition of this study was that an archetype was potentially identifiable. This study was an effort to identify an archetype by discovering, in Husserl's (1931) words, the fundamental nature of the thing, i.e., the phenomenon of leadership. Identification of an archetype would change the born versus made debate. That is, if an archetype were congenital, the debate shifts from either or to a question of what provokes the manifestation of and identification with the archetype. Moreover, appreciating the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership in terms of the four assumptive components may offer alternate viable insights into social patterns in history. For example, why a specific "leader" was chosen and accepted by a cultural group. Finally, leader and follower

behavior relative to a given context of social events may yield insights to a competency model that represents the act(s) of leadership.

Nature of the Study

This exploratory study rested on the proposition that the qualitative method of phenomenology is the most appropriate for three reasons. First is focus. The phenomenological method is singly concerned with ascertaining “the thing itself” (Husserl, 1931, p. 255). Phenomenology is the study of the objective in subjective experience (Creswell, 1998; Giorgi, 1985; Moustakas, 1994; and Moran, 2000). “It presents a ‘new way’ of viewing what is genuinely discoverable and potentially there but often is not seen” (Sanders, 1982, p. 357). Second, the emergent themes and underlying essences of a phenomenological study may serve to validate (or repudiate) and potentially compliment quantitative research findings (Sanders, 1982). The potential for validation or repudiation arises from the philosophical orientation in which phenomenology is employed. Unlike other quantitative and qualitative methods, a researcher employs the phenomenological method from a presuppositionless philosophical perspective guided by the belief that incontestable knowledge is intuitively ascertainable rather than from a perspective that proposes to hypothesize or know a priori (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994). As delineated by Husserl, this presuppositionless orientation requires Epoche. Epoche was defined by Husserl as the bracketing of beliefs, assumptions, biases, and prejudices to open oneself to experience. Third, to question the nature of leadership, Barker (2001) cogently argued for a study that “must be phenomenological and metaphysical and not merely quantitative” (p. 470). This call remains unanswered. To

answer this call, a unique design building upon past phenomenological approaches was required. Modification of method was perceived to be acceptable given unlike quantitative approaches and some qualitative methods that have singular approaches there are variations in the design and execution of phenomenology. These variations arose with philosophical differences beginning with Heidegger (Moran, 2000) and lastly by Lanigan (1988). These two authors and the philosopher Merleau-Ponty (1968) are the key variations in methodological design choices. Heidegger's method is hermeneutic. Merleau-Ponty (1968) proposed that to study the thing itself is to study the structure of a thing or experience as perceived in the mind. Lanigan (1988) provides a method built on Merleau-Ponty's ideas. These approaches serve sufficient ends. However, given the propositional nature and structure of the metaphysical argument advanced in chapter 2, it is necessary to extend Lanigan via an accepted means or method to support it in everyday lived experience. To that end, Bandler and Grinder's (1975, 1976, 1979) Meta-model and eye-accessing cues are integrated. The Meta-model and eye-accessing cues are defined in chapter 1 and expounded in chapters 2 and 3.

Research Questions

Examination of the leadership literature from a metatheory perspective yielded four assumptive components presently accepted without conclusive empirical investigation. Given these components are central to an inquiry into the nature of the phenomenon of leadership the present study was focused on the following exploratory questions.

1. Is social action a result of the phenomenon of leadership or is the phenomenon of leadership a derivative of social action? In other words, is there an archetype?
2. If there is a leadership archetype, what is the associated cognitive visual, auditory, or kinesthetic representation?
3. If yes, what elements of the leadership archetype are identifiable in and through social dialogue?

Theoretical Framework of the Study

This research required the exposition of a theoretical framework that detailed the elements originating the four assumptive components and enveloped the respective interdependencies amongst them. A theoretical framework of 12 propositions, derived from the literature, is delineated in chapter 2. This theoretical framework is a multi-disciplinary literature review presenting a logic argument about the substance, context, and content of the phenomenon of leadership.

The propositions of substance examine the phenomenon of leadership in terms of pattern and topics in social discourse. Chaos theory provided metaphorical insight into the nature and structure of the phenomenon of leadership as pattern in social dynamics. To understand chaos theory and the four components of the strange attractor this author relied upon Mandelbrot (1977), Gleick (1987), Briggs and Peat (1989), and Williams (1997). Applicability of chaos theory to social scientific study was supported by Parsons and Shils (1951), Bendix (1954), and Bridgeforth (2005). Having established the theoretical basis for pattern observation in social reality, identification of specific

elements or topics observed and discussed in social discourse was appropriate. It is this author's conjecture that the theoretical leadership literature describes facets of the phenomenon of leadership rather than the phenomenon of leadership itself. Nonetheless, by isolating the most common subjects within this literature insight into common topical references shared in social discourse is achievable. This body of literature was represented by Weber (1947/1964), Bass (1985), Greenleaf (1977), Burns (1978), Hersey (1984), Conger (1989), House and Aditya (1997), and Northouse (2004).

The propositions about content examine alternative ideas about the nature and structure of leadership individually and collectively in terms of the assumptive components of existence, necessity, origin, and function. Two alternatives of inheritance and imprinting are examined. Inheritance is identified as a genetically passed unspoken, universal psychological need or archetype amongst the human animal according to Jung (1956, 1959), Campbell (1959), Schutz (1967, 1970), and Weber (1968). Imprinting is the implantation and perpetuation of meaning interpreting perceived reality as explained by the theory of social construction according to Berger and Luckman (1966), Schutz (1967, 1970), Weber (1968), Bateson (1972), and Gergen (1999).

The propositions about context are examined through a model of expression and cognition along with their mutual relationship. Insight into the existence, composition, and development of cognition respective to brain maturation is offered by Husserl (1931), Sartre (1940), Ryle (1949), Jung (1959), Campbell (1959), Merleau-Ponty (1968), Casey (1976), Murray (1987), Zimbardo and Gerrig (1996), Guenther (1998), Howard (2000), and Moran (2000). The triune nature of expression and its constructive elements was

derived from examination of Britan (1931), Jung (1956), Bandler and Grinder (1975, 1979), Lanigan (1988), Damasio (1994), Hobson (1994), Gleitman and Newport (1995), and Howard (2000).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in conducting this study:

1. An archetype of the phenomenon of leadership exists in the human psyche as an unconscious phenomenon, and characteristics of this archetype are identifiable.
2. Individuals are aware of their experiences, and their lived experience is shared, limited, and related to their respective pre-cognition of an archetype.
3. The researcher need not be a Jungian psychologist/psychoanalyst to perform the investigation. Rather, given the research design, sufficient preparation in cognitive psychology and skill in communication analysis is required.
4. The database created by the semistructured interviews of this research was adequate in capturing the respondents' experiences, and thus conveyed an accurate portrayal of their lived experiences from which identifying an archetype would be possible.
5. This research will be controversial/iconoclastic and seminal.

Scope and Delimitations of the Study

To complete this study a self-selected cross-section of adults from the Western Wisconsin and Southeastern Minnesota region of the Midwest United States whom believed they had experienced the phenomena of leadership, were interested in

understanding its nature and meanings, were willing to participate in a video- and audio-recorded interview, and could articulate the experience was sought. A letter of invitation briefly explaining the study, request participation, and contact information through which to respond, was addressed to professional associations and social organizations with an explicit and publicly stated interest in leadership. The metropolitan areas of La Crosse, Wisconsin; Madison, Wisconsin; Rochester, Minnesota; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and St Paul, Minnesota were targeted (Appendix A). Given that no one isolated demographic group is necessarily representative of the larger population, variation of the sample was the primary objective. The use of professional associations and social organizations resulted in a sample representing a variety of employment contexts. Consequently, the participants predominately related to leadership as an organizational (managerial) phenomenon rather than as a generic social phenomenon. This may have introduced an anticipated but unintended bias into the study. The 10 participants resided in the La Crosse, Wisconsin; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and St Paul, Minnesota areas.

This study utilized semistructured interviews. Miles and Huberman (1994) indicated that data quality is relative to the researcher's skills in protocol development and interviewing skill. Consequently, the validity of the study was limited to the reliability of the interview protocol. Participant perceptions and interpretation of the interview questions and experience might have influenced cognitive processing and contributed to variance amongst responses. As a shared process of exploration and introspection, the degree of rapport between the researcher and participant could have influenced the depth of information shared as well as the degree to which responses were

co-constructed rather than elicited or discovered. Rapport between researcher and participant is subjective and contextual, and therefore, the outcome of the potential degree of influence and related consequence is indeterminate.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in this study and are defined as follows:

Archetype: an unconscious representation in the psyche common among the collective by which individuals define, identify with, and respond involuntarily or unconsciously to an external stimulus, as embodiment or manifestation, of that representation (Jung, 1956, 1959).

Bifurcation: “any abrupt change in the qualitative form of an attractor or in the system’s steady state behavior, as one or more parameters are changed” (Williams, 1997, p. 448).

Directed thinking: adaptive in orientation and replicating reality endeavoring to act in response producing innovation (Jung, 1956).

Eye-accessing cues: observable lateral eye movement (LEM) that occurs relative to activation of different parts of the brain (Bandler & Grinder, 1979; O’Connor & Seymour, 1990).

Fantasy thinking: free of subjective tendencies e.g., directionless, associative, ambiguous (Jung, 1956).

Fractal: a family of irregular and fragmented patterns observable in the complexity of nature (Mandelbrot, 1977).

Logical semantical relations: “The consistent judgments which native speakers make about the logical relations reflected in the sentences of their languages” (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, p. 26).

Lyapunov exponent: a logistic equation that measures or quantifies SDIC by depicting the average rate of convergence (negative) or divergence (positive) of two neighboring trajectories in phase space (Williams, 1997).

Meta-model: a model of transformational grammar for studying the form, structure, and logical semantical relations of human communication according to the rules of a given group of native speakers (Bandler & Grinder, 1975).

Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP): the study of the structure of subjectivity, the components of perception and behavior, as comprised through three tenets (a) all behavior is the result of neurological processes; (b) all neural processes are represented, ordered, and sequenced into models and strategies through language and communication systems; and (c) cognition is comprised of processes for organizing the components of a system i.e., sensory representations, to achieve specific outcomes (Dilts, Grinder, Bandler, & DeLozier, 1980).

Sensitive dependence on initial conditions: that which becomes, is dependent on what is and in which, a small change can and may produce large effects (Gleick, 1987).

Social system: interaction between two or more goal orientated actors functionally enjoined in a situation oriented toward and respondent to other actors in an interdependent collective sharing common values and consensus of normative and cognitive expectations (Parson & Shils, 1951).

Socially constructed reality: the human relations and activities "that we recognize as having being independent of our own volition" (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 1).

Strange attractor: a hidden internal behavior guiding the apparent external one resulting in the revelation of new, more complex levels of order through time lacking a universal singular manifestation (Gleick, 1987; Williams, 1997).

Transformational grammar: the identification and modeling of universal patterns in human language systems (Chomsky, 1957).

Summary

This chapter presented the basis for the structure of the present study. Based on the researcher's review of the current state of leadership research, two metatheories were identified. The first metatheory posited that the phenomenon of leadership is an objective reality and is necessary for social action. The second metatheory posited the phenomenon of leadership is a subjective reality serving a latent social function. A third approach positing acceptance of a blend of components from both metatheories was suggested as foundation and focus to the study. This alternative suggests that the common core explaining the phenomenon of leadership may be found as an archetype. A metaphysical frame was introduced that could house a research method for identifying a potential archetype and its characteristics. Upon this background the scope and nature of the study was described along with a definition of terms.

Chapter 2 provides the necessary theoretical context and framework exploring the substance, content, and context of the search for an archetype. The substance of the search explores the manifest role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership as a

chaotic strange attractor originating in a latent archetype. The content of the search examines the assumptive components of existence, need, origin, and function as potential unconscious testimony of an archetype. The context of the search for an archetype examines the structures of expression and cognition.

Chapter 3 accounts the research design of the study beginning with the research questions of the study. The accounting entails both the rationale for choosing semiotic phenomenology as research method and details the design considerations involved in developing the method. Design considerations included the researcher's role, participant selection, pre-collection considerations, data collection, and analysis and verification procedures.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the 10 semistructured interviews conducted. Each of the 10 participants is reviewed in four parts. These parts are the context, representational systems communicated, themes, and description. The chapter closes with a unified description of the participant responses and the key themes that emerged.

Chapter 5 finishes the study. The chapter presents a summary of the findings from two perspectives. First, the chapter answers the three research questions. Second, an alternate paradigm examining the emergence of leadership in social dynamics is offered. The chapter ends with exposition of the potential social significance of the findings along with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents a theoretical framework that proposes that the functional manifestation of the phenomenon of leadership originates in a latent archetype. A literature search was performed using EBSCO (Business Source Premier, PsychInfo, and Soc Abstracts), ProQuest, and Dissertation Abstracts International for works utilizing the subject and key word terms of: leadership, phenomenology, myth, social myth, fantasy, social fantasy, requisite, societal requisite, existential, phenomenon, emergence, social construction, archetype, chaos theory, strange attractor, and or hero in combination. These searches yielded work that speculated and debated the nature of leadership from a philosophic perspective (i.e., Barker, 2002; Antonakis, Cianciolo, and Sternberg 2004) as well as works that discussed the phenomenon of leadership in terms of an archetype. However, this researcher was unable to locate scholarly research seeking the existence of a leadership archetype or employing the phenomenological method in the study of the phenomenon of leadership. Of the existent archetypal dissertation studies examining the phenomenon of leadership (e.g., Crothers, 1992; Edwards, 2002; Sheldon, 1998; Wahlstrom, 1997), an archetype is assumed and accepted as existing according to a previously accepted works. These works seek to observe or verify the existence of the archetype rather than questioning its existence. The work of Crothers (1992) is distinct in that its focus is on the five archetypes of political leadership through the lens of political culture. Cherry and Spiegel (2006) examined leadership through the lens of metaphor. Given the inconsistency between these works reliance upon the assumption of an

archetype from this inquiry into the existence of an archetype, these studies are not examined further in this chapter.

This chapter explored three sets of theoretical framework for establishing the content, context, and substance of the search for an archetype. The first set explored the macro perspective as the (a) structure and (b) composition of the phenomenon of leadership as pattern suggesting links to an archetype. The structure of the phenomenon of leadership was presented as pattern through the lens of chaos theory. Variable composition and pattern replication may be observed in the literary discourse about theory and competencies associated in the literature with the phenomenon of leadership. The second set explored the micro perspective examining the four assumptive components (a) existence, (b) necessity, (c) origin, and (d) function as indicative of a possible archetype in the collective unconscious. Although examined from competing points of view, the recognition of all four assumptive components in both meta-theories suggests possible and practical testimony of an archetype. The third set explored the meso perspective as the structures of (a) expression and (b) cognition as the bridge between the manifest and the unconscious. The structure of expression contributes to the content of socially constructed reality. The structure of cognition is the context of subjective reality.

The Phenomenon of Leadership as Social Construction

As with observation of the daily events of life both modern or investigation of historical events, if one examines the broad expanse of literature, one can and will learn of the phenomenon of leadership as a plethora of style with impact upon local and global

events varying in magnitude. “Leadership is an emergent phenomenon lacking appreciable and employable definitions in various cultural, organizational, social, and interpersonal influence situations” (G.B., personal communication, 3/5/2005).

Researchers have inquired and explored the phenomenon of leadership offering theory and conclusions to the point of contradiction and confusion (Barker, 2001; House & Aditya, 1997). To date there is no universally accepted working definition of leadership. Similarly, no universally agreed upon conception of the role and relationship of leadership in social affairs appears to exist. The examination of the phenomenon of leadership as a socially constructed reality requires a different theoretical lens.

The Phenomenon of Leadership as Pattern

This present research proposes the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership as a chaotic strange attractor. The proposition that chaos theory is an appropriate and beneficial approach is not new. Stacey (1992), Wheatley (1992), Jenner (1994), Johnson and Burton (1994), Levy (1994), Thietart & Forgues (1995), Denton (1998), Anderson (1999), Daneke (1999), Dooley and Van de Ven (1999), Marion (1999), Mathews, White, and Long (1999), Cooksey (2001), Dolan, Garcia, and Auerbach (2003), and Solow and Szmerekovsky (2006) offered expositions on the possibility of applying chaos theory to the study of social systems. In contrast, there are no empirical studies examining the application of chaos theory to leadership. Rather, this specific subset of literature is metaphorical or speculative. Writers (Burns, 2002; Fairholm, 2004; Keene, 2000; Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Maron, Seers, Orton, & Schrieber, 2006; Stacey, 1992; Sullivan, 2004; Walters, 2006; and Wheatley, 1992) have proposed

metaphorical application of chaos theory and the strange attractor concept to the phenomenon of leadership. Similarly, Van Eenwyk (1997) and Conforti (2003) have speculated Jungian archetypes as strange attractors. Of the leadership as attractor metaphor applied to leadership literature, there is one significant consistency. The metaphor is not thoroughly explained in terms of the four comprising elements of the strange attractor. If one is to associate the metaphor or to move beyond to investigation, one must detail the composition of the attractor. Galbraith (2004) offered caution about applying this hard science through metaphor to the study of a social phenomenon. Johnson and Burton (1994) criticized the application of chaos and complexity theories from the physical sciences to the social sciences.

Johnson and Burton (1994) cited three limitations and concluded that the application of chaos and complexity theory was likely to remain metaphorical rather than become practical. First, the structural equations of social systems are unknown. Second, Johnson and Burton's system complexity and the dynamic of the structural equations inhibit identification of all possible variables and consequently the accuracy of the equations to describe the system. Moreover, parameter values and structural equations likely change over time, resulting from learning and adaptation. Third, by definition, chaotic models simulate low dimensional systems bounded in phase space to an attractor. Each of Johnson and Burton's objections is solvable. Through solution to these objections, testimony of a strange attractor binding and bounding social interaction may be found. It is the intent of this framework to suggest that patterns are recognizable amongst social events across time; that these fractal patterns support the idea of a latent

archetype as explanatory to the abundance of variation and consequence of the phenomenon of leadership.

Bridgeforth (2005b) offered a model to recognize the four components of chaos theory in social systems and offered the identification of dimensionality and the variables of purpose, strategy, people, systems, structure, and process. This structuring allows for potential quantification and provides for the change of the behavior of the system in phase space in time. In total, dimensionality is limited to four. Second, not all variables subject to or influenced by learning and adaptation change simultaneously. Therefore, the static-dynamic nature, the Lyapunov exponent, of social systems is accounted. Third, it is the conjecture of this researcher that the phenomenon of leadership is the strange attractor that binds and bounds the system. There is a degree of system stability, which keeps it bounded. There is also dynamics that keep the pattern non-periodic. Given the complexity of the undertaking, this present research is limited to offering the theoretical argument. To that end, a general introduction to chaos theory is offered.

Chaos Theory and the Strange Attractor

Mathematical in orientation, chaos theory culminated from a convergence of inputs from multiple disciplines of the physical sciences. According to Gleick (1987), chaos theory is the science of becoming rather than being. This definition is recognition of the temporality of information and the unpredictable nature of the future. Williams (1997) described chaos theory as observing patterns in seeming randomness. This simultaneous existence and hence, observance of, order within randomness is the result of three principles: self-organization, complexity, and emergence. Self-organization is the

activity of a self-propagating system, without outside influence, morphing from seeming irregularity into more complex structures. The structures can be spatial, temporal, or functional and vary in time duration (Williams, 1997). Examples are flocking birds, schools of fish, weather patterns such as hurricanes, as well as economic, which is social activity. Self-organization is a central feature of complexity. Williams defined complexity as a type of dynamic behavior that never reaches equilibrium, given many independent agents perpetually interact, seeking mutual accommodation in any of many possible ways. Through this process, the agents spontaneously organize and re-organize themselves into ever larger and more involved structures over time (Williams).

Emergence is the revelation of new, more complex levels of order through time (Williams). The occurrence of self-organization, complexity, and emergence is relative to a strange attractor. The strange attractor was so labeled because of its lack of a universal singular manifestation, and thus leaves its composition and structure unknown and not fully understood by researchers. Defined by the concept of being recursively referential—a hidden internal behavior guiding the apparent external one (Gleick, 1987), strange attractors are characterized by the four constructs of sensitive dependence on initial conditions (SDIC), fractals, bifurcation, and the Lyapunov exponent.

Sensitive Dependence on Initial Conditions

SDIC has been defined as that which becomes, is dependent on what is in which a small change can and may produce large effects (Gleick, 1987). The term and concept was coined by Lorenz, a meteorologist, for his accidental discovery while attempting to predict weather patterns. Lorenz's discovery came as a result of searching for the cause

of considerable variation between two sets of output from the same set of formulas when repeating a series of calculations on a computer. The variation was in the input to the second iteration—three decimal places in contrast to six decimals originally. While challenging to quantify historically or sociologically, qualitative speculation is in evidence. For example, Bendix (1954) examined the origination and evolution of the industrial age in England, Russia, and the United States. The developmental path taken in terms of managerial ideology, technological change, and rate of increase in production capacity were all demonstrated as being unique to the cultural and natural resource heritage of the society under study. Examination of the four assumptive components proposes the suggestion of a hero need in the human psyche with orienting of the archetype occurring during the birth experience. The speculation being that the birth experience is the initial conditions of emotive and psychological development in the human maturation process and that this process is sensitively dependent upon that experience.

Fractals

Mandelbrot (1977) introduced fractals as a family of irregular and fragmented patterns observable in the complexity of nature. Gleick (1987) described fractals as, “a way of seeing infinity” (p. 98). “A fractal is a pattern that repeats the same design and detail or definition over a broad range of scale. Any piece of a fractal appears the same as we repeatedly magnify it” (Williams, 1997, p. 237). Examples of fractals in nature are landscapes, mountains, coal and rock, soil, viscous fingering, flow patterns, clouds, lightening, galaxy distributions, vegetation, coral reefs, as well as the circulatory,

nervous, and respiratory systems of living organisms (Gleick; Mandelbrot; Williams). There are two types of fractals—deterministic and natural (Williams). Deterministic fractals are mathematical and theoretical, and consequently exact replications across scales. Natural fractals are those patterns observable in nature. Natural fractals incorporate randomness or noise as an element in the same composing rules as deterministic fractals. The most useful, noted Mandelbrot, “involve chance and both their regularities and irregularities are statistical” (p. 1). Succinctly, fractals are patterns of self-similarity across scales.

“Nature forms patterns. Some are orderly in space but disorderly in time, others orderly in time but disorderly in space” (Gleick, 1987, p. 308). Pattern formation and analysis are as much a discipline of research in the social sciences as they are in the physical sciences (Bridgeforth, 2005b; Parsons & Shils, 1951). Leadership theory is one such subset that either observes or prescribes a pattern similarity across scales. Burns’ (1978) conception of transformational-transactional leadership theory approaches the phenomenon of leadership as a one-to-many relationship along national and international scales, and originating in the many-to-one developmental relationship of the leader. Bass (1985) inverted these relationships to propose this theory of leadership as a one-to-one relation at the local level, with developmental relationship being future tense. Weber (1947/1964) and Weber and Eisenstadt (1968) examined the patterns of social dynamics to formulate his theory of charismatic leadership. Greenleaf’s (1977) servant leadership theory prescribes a singular structure and pattern to be replicated across scales under the assumption that doing so fosters the mentorship of future leaders. Finally, Hersey’s

(1984) situational leadership is a four-part model in which the leader-follower relationship pattern follows prescribed rules according to the follower's necessary development.

Fractals are multidimensional patterns of replicating self-similarity across scales (Briggs & Peat, 1989). Consequently, fractals are patterns of order hidden in seeming randomness. For example, a living organism such as a tree is comprised of fractals of length, angle, thickness, and time. Additional, often cited examples of fractals within living systems are skeletal structures, circulatory systems, respiratory systems, nervous systems, and neural systems. Bridgeforth (n.d.) speculated that consciousness was a fractal strata of seven layers—genetic, cellular, organ, system, mind, being, and social—of increasing complexity. Fractals are also cognitive realities, according to Briggs and Peat (1989), who cited as examples the Bronze Age, Celtic art, Shang ritual vessels, visual motifs of the West Coast American Indians, mazes and labyrinths, iterative language games of children, and chant patterns of allegedly primitive people. Briggs and Peat (1989) went so far as to speculate, “Nature’s true archetypes may well lie closer to Ruelle’s strange attractors and Mandelbrot’s fractals than to Platonic solids” (p. 110). Study of Jung’s (1959) catalogue of archetypal images reveals distinct fractal patterning. The challenge here is to identify the possible dimensions of social dynamics. Speculation might begin at the cognitive level with personality, intelligence, ideology, and learned behavior. Similarly, speculation of fractals within the social milieu of culture might begin with myth, philosophy, religion, science, academia, and art.

Bifurcation

Bifurcation is “any abrupt change in the qualitative form of an attractor or in the system’s steady state behavior, as one or more parameters are changed” (Williams, 1997, p. 448). Briggs and Peat (1989) described bifurcation as the window of forking paths—a vital instant when something small is swelled by iteration to a size so great the system takes off in a new direction. Mathematically, bifurcation is period doubling or repetitive splitting into two branches (Gleick, 1987). Over time, explained Briggs and Peat, cascading points either provoke fragmentation to chaos, or stabilize a new behavior through a series of feedback loops that couple the new state to its environment. The time duration for this cascading to occur can vary from a fraction of a second to millions of years. Bifurcation points are organic, in that each is a milestone in a systems evolution, explained Briggs and Peat. In this researcher’s words, there is a static-dynamic pattern to the behavior. There is a degree of system stability, which keeps it bounded. There is also dynamics that keep the pattern non-periodic. In a word, bifurcation is change. The connection from organic to social is self-evident in the pattern of the human race mimicking and replicating that which it finds in nature both internally and in the external environment. Consequently, it is speculated that careful study of societal development will identify bifurcation points in human history at the macro, e.g., cultural, local, political, levels. Similarly, case studies of the histories of organizations and industries will also reveal significant bifurcation patterns in terms of events and timing. In common will be identification of the phenomenon of leadership as provoking or responding to the change associated with events. Similarly, at the individual level, bifurcation points can

and may be observed relative to stages of emotional and cognitive development of an individual's relationship with the archetypes in the psyche (Conforti, 1999; Van Eenwyk, 1997). Identifying these points and cascade patterns as well as the agents involved will likely contribute to developing the application of chaos theory to the social sciences as well as advance understanding of the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership in social dynamics.

The Lyapunov Exponent

The Lyapunov exponent is a logistic equation that measures or quantifies SDIC by depicting the average rate of convergence (negative) or divergence (positive) of two neighboring trajectories in phase space (Williams, 1997). In strange attractors, the number of exponents is relative to the number of dimensions, and at least one is positive. In social dynamics, the behaviors, as manifestation of motivational force, of individual constituents are allegorical to trajectories. This motivational force would be response related to the stimulus affect of the archetype when triggered at the individual level and the degree of agreed upon social proof at the group level. Consequently, variation of motivational forces amongst and between individuals indicates that one Lyapunov exponent is positive. The Lyapunov exponent may prove to be the greatest of all four challenges. Researchers must search for a valid and reliable means of measuring motivational force at the individual and collective levels to illustrate trajectories and their convergence or divergence. Van Eenwyk (1997) implied that the catalogue of archetypes, as motivational forces, comprise the Lyapunov exponent. Conforti (2003) suggested the composition of the archetypal field constructs the Lyapunov exponent. The literature, as

testimony of social discourse, suggests the phenomenon of leadership entails the six common umbrella variables of change, influence, credibility, systems, politics, and power (Burns, 1978; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; Miller, 1978; Mintzberg, 1985; Senge, 1990; Pfeffer, 1992; Weber, 1947/1964; and Yukl, 2002).

Images of the Attractor: Testimony in Social Discourse

Pfeffer (1977) proposed the argument that leadership is a phenomenological construct; leaders are symbols of personal causation of social dynamics. Pfeffer rested on conclusion of the literature that “there are few meaningful distinctions between leadership and other concepts of social influence” (p. 105). Pfeffer’s underlying definition of attribution theory was “the study of attribution is a study of naïve psychology—an examination of how persons make sense out of the events taking place around them” (p. 109). Gemmill (1986) used Pfeffer’s argument to explain the need satisfaction created by the discomforts of group social interaction through the projection process. Pfeffer’s argument anticipated cognitive and social variables, e.g., traits, skills, or behaviors by which individuals assess role and relationship competence. Assessment of competence is a relative measure of satisfying or exceeding imprinted and inherited expectations. Expectations can and may be one in the same, as will be explained (a) expression is the extroversion of cognition; and (b) cognition is sense making of the relationship between perceived objective reality and our subjective experience. Meaning, the social imprint has its roots in the inherited. What are the expectations or competencies humans consciously testify to when assessing the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership?

Analysis of Weber (1947/1964), Burns (1978), Hersey (1984), Bass (1990), Bennis (2000), Barker (2001), Yukl (2002), and Adler (2006) revealed change as choice to alter some need/want deprivation to some degree of satisfaction. Weber defined the leadership process as beginning and ending with individual follower perception of collective social action in response to the leader with the leader self-appointing during a state of distress with the intent to satisfy the need state experienced by the relative social state. Burns conceived of leadership “as the tapping of existing and potential motive and power bases . . . for the purposes of achieving intended change” (p. 448). Hersey described leadership as growth and development catalysts through commitment to and involvement in planned change. In similar tone, Bass described leaders as agents of change, wherein interaction “involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (p. 19). Bennis saw change as a constant—a metaphysics—of the modern social context. Barker wrote explicitly that, “if there is no need for change, there is no need for leadership” (p. 491). Yukl identified change as one of the most important and challenging of leadership responsibilities. Adler expressed hope as the new synonym of leadership. Hope, according to Adler, is the human quality of possible attaining or creating a more desirable state of affairs in the future.

Analysis of Weber (1947/1964), Burns (1978), Bass (1985, 1990), Conger (1989), Merlevede, Bridoux, and Vandamme (1997), Bennis (2000), Goleman, Boyatzes, and McKee (2002), Kouzes and Posner (2002), and Yukl (2002) suggested that influence is the act of stimulating without apparent force or authority. Bass stated that influence

implies a reciprocal relationship not necessarily characterized by domination, control, or induction of compliance by leader to those led. Bennis identified influence as a communicative referring to it as management of meaning. Goleman, Boyatzes, and McKee and Merlevede, Bridoux, and Vandamme referred to influence as the social and communication skills under the umbrella of emotional intelligence. The greatest of these types demonstrate charisma—adept ability, be it gift or learned skill, to inspire orally and nonverbally (Bass; Burns; Conger; Kouzes & Posner; Weber). Yukl referenced survey questionnaire studies that demonstrate influence behaviors are distinct constructs. Yukl cited numerous studies demonstrating influence behaviors as eleven distinct communicative behaviors. These eleven tactical patterns are rational, apprising, inspirational appeal, consultation, exchange, collaboration, personal appeal, ingratiation, legitimating, pressure, and coalition.

Analysis of Bennis and Nannus (1985), Bennis (1989, 2000), Tway (1994), Bass (2000), and Kouzes and Posner (2002) proposed that credibility is the belief of the observer in the trustworthiness of an actor derived from the actions thereof. Kouzes and Posner defined credibility as character earning trust and confidence. Bass defined credibility as trust earned through demonstrations of character in relation to the group. Tway defined trust as “the state of readiness for unguarded interaction with someone or something” (p. 132). Bennis and Nannus and Bennis identified trust as comprising four ingredients, that is, constancy, congruity, reliability, and integrity.

Analysis of Miller (1978), Deming (1982), Tracy (1989), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Senge (1990), Hammer and Champy (1993), and Sholtes (1998, 1999) suggested

that systems is a term definable as a group of interacting, interrelated, or interdependent units or elements forming a complex whole that operates in unison toward a common objective. Miller and Tracey defined systems as the appreciation for the composition and interdependent construction and behavior of systems. Bennis and Nanus (1985) identified the leader as social architect—one who understands the interdependent organization and its interactions. Senge (1990) indicated that people create their own reality and that changing that particular reality required appreciation of patterns, and offered a set of archetypes to diagram events.

Von Bertalanffy (1968) offered the Kantian maxim, “Experience without theory is blind but theory without experience is mere intellectual play” (p. 101), as thematic to understanding and leading learning, development, and improvement. Systems theory and thinking entered everyday operations through quality management and Process Reengineering (Deming; 1982; Hammer & Champy, 1993). Sholtes (1998, 1999) identified the themes of systems thinking as six observable behaviors. These behaviors include:

- The ability to think in terms of systems and knowing how to lead systems
- The ability to understand the variability of work in planning and problem solving
- Understanding and leading learning, development, and improvement
- Understanding people and motivational factors to behavior
- Knowing the interdependence and interaction between systems, variation, learning, and human behavior and how each affects the others
- Giving vision, meaning, direction, and focus to the organization (p. 21).

Sholtes (1998, 1999) defined the ability of systemic thinking and knowing as appreciating and analyzing the interdependent nature of the context, be it individual,

group, organizational, or societal behavior. Systems thinking, according to Sholtes, is the competence of navigating both self and a group through the details of the big picture.

Analysis of Greenleaf (1977), Burns (1978), Hersey (1984), Bass (1990), Pfeffer (1992), Yukl (2002), and Banuto-Gomez (2004) defined power as the appropriate exercise as authority or control influence in a given social context. Burns stated that power lies in the context of human relationships of motives and resources, in which two or more persons engage with one another through mutual persuasion, exchange, elevation, and transformation. Pfeffer (1992) wrote of power as the politics of influence, in which dominance, authority, and power are interrelated. As an ability or capacity to act, power may achieve dominance, which, in turn, establishes authority, which enhances power or other variations of the three (Bass; Yukl). Bass and Yukl discussed studies into six types of power, of which utilization of one or more of three (i.e., information, referent, and expert) may attain authority status and consequently dominance, while the remaining three (i.e., reward, coercive, and legitimate) can and are determinants of continued existence of dominance, authority, and power. Hersey's leadership practice recommendation prescribed degrees of power reliance to achieve results. Greenleaf advocated the moral principle that the only legitimate authority followers willingly grant should be a proportional response to the leader's evident service. Bass described power as role differentiator identifying power as a determinant of appropriateness when discussing the responses to power holders and the consequences of their respective actions. Generally, stated Bass, the more-powerful group members have more appeal and exercise greater influence amongst a group than less powerful members exercise. In contrast,

followers shy away from authority figures that excessively rely on or use reward and coercion power. Yukl emphasized context when drawing attention to organizational position and the relations between the individuals involved as determinant factors of power. However, “followers can evaporate a leader’s mask of power merely by disbelieving in it. Authority does not reside with those who issue orders; rather authority lies within the responses of the persons to whom orders are addressed . . . We willingly give up our power to buy freedom from risk, responsibility, and accountability” (Banuto-Gomez, p. 147).

Analysis of Mintzberg (1985), Bass (1990), Greene (1998), Douglas and Ammeter (2004), Bedian and Day (2004), Treadway et al. (2004), and Z (n.d.) defined politics as the art and science of competition for authoritative direction or control of a group, organization, and or social system. Mintzberg recognized politics as a technically illegitimate power system in terms of its means and ends, namely, game playing. Mintzberg identified 13 games played in four arenas within organizations and offered the summary judgment that one must play to succeed. Bass interpreted the literature on organizational politics as cooperation-seeking through coalition formation and negotiation as member self-interest competes for control to shape the organization’s culture. Mirroring Mintzberg’s recognition and summary judgment, Greene offered *The 48 Laws of Power*, a text of historical cases that serves as a guide to political competence. Douglas and Ammeter reported literature seeing political (social and networking) skill as a critical competency in the modern organization. Treadway et al. stated that leader political skill is the most appropriate and potentially useful predictor of influence. Z’s

publication, *The Black Book of Executive Politics*, is an abridged version with similar content—the modern setting rather than historical example. Treadway et al. identified three elements—comprehension of social cues and attribute accurately behavioral motives of others; influence and control of people and situations with ease; and build networks and garner social capital to elevate self-status and provide resources. The challenge with this concept is the question of ethics raised by Bedian and Day, equating potential behaviors to acting as a chameleon.

Three propositions are suggested from a macro perspective - in terms of role and relationship in society -

1. Chaos Theory (Gleick, 1985; Mandelbrot, 1977; and Williams, 1997) is a theoretical lens for understanding the phenomenon of leadership as role and relationship in social dynamics with connection to Jung's (Conforti, 2003; Jung, 1959; Van Eenwyk, 1997) conception of archetypes.
2. The theoretical literature (e.g., Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; Hersey, 1984; House and Aditya, 1997; Northouse, 2004; and Weber, 1947/1964) offers insight into variables that comprise the phenomenon rather than describe the phenomenon itself.
3. Analysis of a sample of the scholarly and practitioner literature suggests five competencies—change, systems, credibility, influence, power, and politics—(Adler, 2006; Banuto-Gomez, 2004; Bass, 1985, 1990; Barker, 2001; Bedian, 2004; Bennis, 1989, 2000; Bennis & Nannus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger, 1989; Deming, 1982; Douglas & Ammeter, 2004; Goleman, Boyatzes, and

McKee, 2002; Greene, 1998; Greenleaf, 1977; Hammer & Champy, 1993; Hersey, 1984; House & Aditya, 1997; Kouse & Posner, 2002; Merlevede, Bridoux, and Vandamme, 1997; Miller, 1978; Mintzberg, 1985; Pfeffer, 1992; Sholtes, 1998, 1999; Senge, 1990; Tracy, 1989; Treadway, Hochwarter, Ferris, Kacmar, Douglas, Ammeter, & Buckley, 2004; Tway, 1994; Weber, 1947; Yukl, 2002; and Z, n.d.) describing social expectations of leadership that may offer insight into an archetype.

At a macro level, the phenomenon of leadership is allegorical to the computational revelation of a strange attractor. Consistent with the definition of an attractor being a hidden internal behavior guiding the apparent external one, and the four characterizations of strange attractors, the suggestion in this work is that archetypes, as defined by Jung (1956), are strange attractors in social dynamics. This speculation and circumstantial evidence at the macro level is supported with testimony at the micro level with respect to the four assumptive components of leadership. It is anticipated and expected every distinct group will have a distinct culturally based quantitative and qualitative assessment of each of the five competencies. Consequently, the values assigned and their relations to each other must be assessed group to group.

The Assumptive Components: Insights Into The Collective Unconscious

Chapter 1 introduced the recognition that there are two metatheories sharing four assumptive components in common about the phenomenon of leadership. The literature indicates the phenomenon of leadership is accepted as both an objective and subjective reality. The literature suggests the phenomenon of leadership as social and cognitive

reality is interrelated in two respects. The first is that the phenomenon of leadership as socially constructed reality is a collective representation of expression, which is the extroversion of cognition. The second is that the commonality of the four assumptive components, as representation of cognition, unintentionally testifies to a possible archetype. It is upon this argument that the four assumptive components of the phenomenon of leadership are examined and the two perspectives are compared side by side without distinction. The examination of the four assumptive components here is purely from the opposing literary points of view.

Existence

The one commonality amongst the multiplicity of definitions identifying and describing leadership is the ontological assumption of existence. Gemmill (1986) acknowledged and criticized the ontological assumption that because there is a word the thing must exist. As counter, Gemmill proposed rather than existential, that the conception of leadership is a myth. The challenge as to when leadership began to exist arises on how one defines the word. For example, as previously discussed in Chapter 1 if one defines leadership according to hierarchy and dominance, then leadership has existed as long as groups (Van Vugt, 2006). In contrast, the modern western usage and meaning of the word and its global expansion was first adopted into the American lexicon with the advent of the industrial age according to Bendix (1954).

The opposite of acceptance that leadership is an existential reality was discussed in Chapter 1 under the metatheory of the leadership phenomenon as subjective reality. As discussed, proponents of the subjective reality subscribe to the proposition of leadership

as a collective social fantasy. Fantasy is individual and societal (Campbell, 1959; Jung, 1956). The connection, Campbell explained, is how the fantasy establishes credibility for the subject and the corresponding resolution as biologic processes. Weber (1947/1964) described how fantasy as a social process is the expression of hope, either from the relief of pain to the enhancement of joy. Leadership communicates hope, as it is a survival mechanism or tool indirectly bringing about conditions to initiate change or to maintain the continued acceptance of a state of affairs, whichever serves the survival instinct at the time. Where the fantasy is of such an extent as to provide a possible resolution and ensure a safer and stronger sense of survival, action follows. The fantasy as a manifestation of self-fulfilling prophecy becomes truth in which credit is allotted to someone or something greater than the subjects in the social act of fulfillment (Meindl et al., 1985). Quoting Thomas Mann, Campbell argued for the requisiteness of myth, writing: “The myth is the foundation of life, the timeless schema, the pious formula into which life flows when it reproduces its traits out of the unconscious” (p. 18).

Necessity

The inquiry into the assumptive component of necessity asks why the belief in the existence of the phenomenon of leadership exists. Maslow (1943) examined motivation as originating in need. The metatheory of the phenomenon of leadership as objective reality assumes an objective or directive need at the social level. For example, Bass (1990) contended that matters of societal functioning, maintenance, and development tend to originate with, and depend upon, an act of leadership when he stated, “all social and political movements require leaders to begin them” (p. 8). The metatheory of the

phenomenon of leadership as subjective reality assumes a psychological need. For example, Gemmill (1968) posited that the need is to repress the subjective discomforts that emerge when group members attempt to work together. Specifically, in the face of fear, as response to uncertainty and ambiguity and emerging feelings and impulses, people unconsciously collude to dispel the subjective experience by projection onto a leader role. These suppositions do not, however, convey the root need inherent in the human psyche.

Synthesis of Gerth and Mills (1946), Jung (1956), Campbell (1959), Meindl et al. (1985), and Wahlstrom (1997) offers the suggested commonality of a hero need. The *hero need* is either a need to be a hero or a need for a hero. Wahlstrom discussed the hero mythology in the modern organizational setting. Meindl et al. explored the romance of leadership, suggesting that the current conception is a re-write of the god myth. These discussions and conclusions are understood from the context of history. Jung (1956) described the hero as that quasi-human being, which we seek in visible human form, who symbolizes the ideas, forms, and forces that grip and mold the soul. Weber's (1947/1964) definition of the charismatic leader's credibility offered that leadership influence resides in the acceptance and faith of followers—those in a self-perceived state of distress. While it is the follower's responsibility to perceive the call and quality of the mission, and respond appropriately, authority diminishes, if not extinguishes, upon failure of the exercise of leadership to benefit the led. The degree of grace is relative to the size of and agreement between followers and the resolution toward or dissolution of the state of distress. If the leader's offering is misaligned with followers' ambitions, values, and

norms, there will be no acceptance or state of grace. The size and agreement of the group of followers is the determinant of collective social action, which in turn determines the miracle, success, or failure to achieve. Succinctly stated, success raises stature; failure is ruin (Gerth & Mills).

In both forms, the hero need is an evolving psychological state. The need to be a hero is modified throughout maturation of the individual, initially through nurturing and then socialization, according to Campbell's (1949) exposition of the hero's journey. The need for a hero is evidence of desiring resolution of cognitive dissonance on an individual to group scale (Gerth & Mills, 1946; Weber, 1947/1964). According to Weber, scale of leader and follower identification and related social action are each a multivariate determination. Factors include, but are not limited to, perceived level of deprivation on the individual and collective social levels, the measure of value identity to the sense of deprivation, and the ideology identifying purpose and appropriateness of strategy and tactics (Weber). The perception of deprivation stimulates the need for a hero and the perception of that person who will absolve the need. The number of social system subjects experiencing the perception of deprivation determines the potential size of the group. Out of this potentiality, conflict ideology, strategy, and tactics identify leader, size of the group, and its potential force. For Weber, force is the power exchanged between leader and followers for the responsibility of the outcome. Variation amongst factors determines the scope of conflict that will manifest as the social system seeks deprivation alleviation amongst varying constituents (Weber).

Origin

A rudimentary analysis of the breadth of the leadership literature both empirical and practical identifies the commonly held assumption that the leadership phenomenon originates in the leader. Barker (2001) raised question with this assumption when he asked, “What motivates people to modify their self-interest to work collectively toward common goals? . . . Motivation theorists believe motivation is internally generated by need . . . Does this mean that the source of leadership is internal?” (p. 484). Inquiry into origin brackets this assumption and synthesizing (Barker, 2001; Bateson, 1972; Berger & Luckman, 1966; Campbell, 1959; Gergen, 1999; Jung 1956, 1959; Kuhn, 1970; Schutz, 1967, 1970; Senge, 1990; Weber, 1947/1964) examines origin as a question of inheritance and imprinting. Regardless of inherited or imprinted, if there is a hero need in the human psyche, there are two questions that must be asked and answered. Where does it reside in the psyche? How does it manifest?

Jung (1959) identified instincts, while vague and indefinite by nature, as primordial and “specifically formed motive forces which, long before there is any consciousness and in spite of any degree of consciousness later on, pursue their own inherent goals” (p. 53). Jung labeled these motive forces archetypes. Jung’s conception of archetypes may be understood using the Mandelbrot set (Gleick, 1987) as theoretical metaphor. The Mandelbrot set, considered the most complex object in mathematics, is a unified catalogue of images that self-replicate similarity across scales (Gleick). Jung’s theory of the collective unconscious is a similar construct in that it is a universal unified catalogue of images, referred to as archetypes. Similar to the Mandelbrot set containing

some degree of individual variation at the local level, “the archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear” (Jung, p. 5). Similar to the infiniteness and complexity of the Mandelbrot set, “there are as many archetypes as there are typical situations in life. Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic constitution . . . as forms without content representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action. When a situation occurs which corresponds to a given archetype, that archetype becomes activated and a compulsiveness appears, which, like an instinctual drive, gains its way against all reason and will” (Jung, p. 48). Created from the primal material of revelation, the purpose of these images is to attract, to convince, to fascinate, and to overpower (Jung).

Jung (1959) is explicit in his conclusion that instinct—the collective unconscious and its composition of archetypal images—is exclusively the result of heredity. Campbell described genetic memory in terms of boundedness or innate releasing mechanisms (IRM). An IRM is an inherited structure in the nervous system known in generic terms as instinctual response to stimulus (i.e., instinct). The human psyche is unique in that fantasy or mythology, as a relationship between cognition and communication, can and does imprint IRMs into human consciousness. “All instinctive behavior is culturally conditioned and what is culturally conditioned in all of us is instinct” (Campbell, p. 48). For example, Campbell described the origins of the basic need for control amongst humans as originating in the awakening of the survival instinct during the moment of birth. The commencing lung operation through blood congestion

and a sense of suffocation stimulates a brief seizure of terror as one of our first indelible imprints that recurs physically in moments of terror throughout life. Bandler and Grinder (1975) used the label *anchoring* to describe this process. Anchoring is the indelible imprint of response and felt need by the brain and body kinesthetically. Goldman (1997) reviewed empirical reports and clinical studies examining the question of birth trauma and memory, citing it as an understood, accepted, and connected phenomenon since the early works of Freud. Approaches to study have been psychoanalysis, body-oriented therapy, reliving the birth experience, and hypnosis. Goldman concluded that, given the consistency of results within each approach respectively and across the aggregate, the literature indicates that early life experience is permanently stored and influences neurological development, personality, perception, as well as later social relations. According to Bandler and Grinder, modification of this natural imprint is subject to conscious choice relative to frame of mind.

In contrast, constructionist theory argues that, as thinking, communicating, and interacting beings, we create our objective reality from our subjective paradigms (Bateson, 1972; Berger & Luckman, 1966; Gergen, 1999; Kuhn, 1970; Schutz, 1967, 1970; Senge, 1990; and Weber, 1947/1964). According to Berger and Luckman and Gergen, reality and knowledge derives from, lives, and dies through the interaction between one or more individuals within an environmental context. Through this interaction, humans as individuals, groups, and cultures create, attach, accept, traditionalize, and modify labels, symbols, and meanings; and that which Kuhn identified as paradigm—an unprecedented achievement, open-ended enough to allow and

accommodate redefinition of challenges, and drawing a sufficient number of followers as enduring adherents. In other words, while subjective reality is subordinate to social action, the latter manifests through the interplay of cognition and communication amongst and between a defined set of actors comprising a system.

The synthesis of Weber (1947/1964), Jung (1956), and Campbell (1959) explains the social construction of leadership as the human and societal development process of inheritance and imprinting. Weber described charismatic leadership as a unilinear cycle of the rise, perpetuation, routinization, and discontinuation. This is a process beginning and ending with individual follower perception of need, the leader, and collective social action in response to the leader. The leader self-appoints during a state of distress. The intent is to satisfy the need state experienced by the relative social state. This reorientation may result in a radical alteration of attitudes and directions of action with a completely new orientation toward the different problems and structures of experience (Weber). For Jung and Campbell, the study of myth through time is the study of human and societal development, in which the socialization experience contributes to how we frame and reframe our respective perception of events in cognition and contribute to the social construction of reality. Under Campbell and Jung's interpretations, human cognition references and utilizes history to anticipate expectancies and derive confident judgments regarding action choice. These scholars run parallel to Weber (1947/1964) and Schutz (1967, 1970) on theory and observation regarding social exchange and action. It is a story of the interplay and exchange of communicated cognition (change and choice) evolving the human psyche as individual and as a social collective (Schutz; Weber).

Under this theory, mythology grows out of and is the vessel of individual and societal development, as reason and communicative exchange grows over time. Jung and Campbell proposed that communication and cognition are autocatalytic in their mutual development.

There are four unintended and three intended statements that reflect a constructionist perspective. Weber (1947/1964) characterized social dynamics as the routinization process, which derives from the increasing pressures of follower needs flowing through the interdependence within societal structure. For Burns (1978), achievement of societal change is dependent on the interdependence of leadership and social action. “Leaders and followers are engaged in a common enterprise; they are dependent on each other, their fortunes rise and fall together, they share the results of planned change together” (Burns, 1978, p. 426). Bass (1990) concluded that all social and political movements, regardless of scale, require leaders to begin them. Moreover, Bass (1990) stated that findings suggested leadership appeared to be acquired status through active relations among members of a group, in which the leader demonstrates the capacity to carry cooperative tasks to completion rather than merely possessing some combination of traits. Bennis (1999) argued the role of social dynamics in leadership identification, writing that, “great leaders are made by great groups that create the social architecture of respect and dignity” (p. 79). Similarly, Fielding and Hogg (1997) examined social identity and self-categorization, concluding support of the notion that the more people identify with a group, the more they confer leadership as a role onto those prototypical of the group. Barker (2001) described the phenomenon of leadership as a

continuous social process experience, in which trait and behavioral attributes of the leader combine with the social context to govern and guide the initiation and limitation of leader and follower behaviors identified as social action. Through this experience, explained Barker, transformative change occurs, that is, the integration of an individual's ethics into the mores of a community as a means of evolutionary social development. Bridgeforth (2005b) identified the law of reciprocity dictating leadership, as act or actor will be reflective of its environment. In sum, leadership is a social construction (Barker, 1997, 2001; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1999; Eisenstadt, 1946; Gemmill, 1986; Gemmill & Oakly, 1992; Goepfinger, 2002).

Function

The inquiry into the assumptive component of function asks what role the phenomenon of leadership serves. Function is defined by Merton (1968) as existing in two forms. "*Manifest functions* are those objective consequences contributing to the adjustment or adaptation of the system which are intended and recognized by participants in the system; *Latent functions*, are those which are neither intended nor recognized" (p. 105).

Analysis of Weber (1947/1964), Burns (1978), Hersey (1984), Bass (1990), Bennis (2000), Barker (2001), Goepfinger (2002), Yukl (2002), and Adler (2006) revealed change as choice to alter some need/want deprivation to some degree of satisfaction is the manifest function of the phenomenon of leadership. Weber defined the leadership process as beginning and ending with individual follower perception of collective social action in response to the leader with the leader self-appointing during a

state of distress with the intent to satisfy the need state experienced by the relative social state. Burns conceived of leadership “as the tapping of existing and potential motive and power bases . . . for the purposes of achieving intended change” (p. 448). Hersey described leadership as growth and development catalysts through commitment to and involvement in planned change. In similar tone, Bass described leaders as agents of change, wherein interaction “involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (p. 19). Bennis saw change as a constant—a metaphysics—of the modern social context. Barker wrote explicitly that, “if there is no need for change, there is no need for leadership” (p. 491). Yukl identified change as one of the most important and challenging of leadership responsibilities. Adler expressed hope as the new synonym of leadership. Hope, according to Adler, is the human quality of possible attaining or creating a more desirable state of affairs in the future.

Likewise, the literature presented a diversity of insights into individual (Jung, 1959; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985) as well as group motivations, which has been interpreted as satisfying a latent function (Banuto-Gomez, 2004; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1999; Barker, 2001; Gemmill, 1986; and Goepfinger, 2002). At the individual level, Burns (1978) defined the phenomenon of leadership as action to reconcile by way of multiple variables of need resolution the byproduct of dissonance nurtured in the individual through socialization. In contrast, Bass (1985) stressed variables of symbolism, mysticism, imaging, and fantasy, proposed that the phenomenon of leadership is the act of influencing social action for the purposes of present needs

gratification as identified solely by Maslow's (1943) hierarchy. At the group or societal level, the latent function is fulfilled according to Gemmill (1986) who identified the phenomenon of leadership as the manifestation of stimulus to pacify the need to assuage the discomforts of group socialization through projection according to attribution theory. Similarly, Goepfinger (2002) offered that the phenomenon of leadership is an emergent reality of group process, in which individuals assign responsibility to one in order to escape accountability en masse. Banuto-Gomez (2004) shared this assessment, writing that, "we willingly give up our power to buy freedom from risk, responsibility, and accountability" (p. 147).

From a micro perspective, in terms of possible testimony of an archetype, three propositions are surfaced.

1. The phenomenon of leadership is an emergent social construction—a collective representation of cognition created through shared expression (Barker, 1997, 2001; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1999; Gemmill, 1986; Gemmill & Oakly, 1992; Goepfinger, 2002; and Weber, 1946).
2. There is an unspoken universal psychical need amongst the human animal—a hero need (Campbell, 1959; Jung, 1956, 1959; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985; Wahlstrom, 1997; and Weber, 1947, 1968).
3. The phenomenon of leadership is an element of cognition so ingrained in society that we, the existing social order, would be challenged to abandon the concept altogether (Banuto-Gomez, 2004; Barker, 2001; Bass, 1985; Bennis,

1999; Burns, 1978; Gemmill, 1986; Gemmill and Oakley, 1992; Goepfinger, 2002; and Jung, 1959).

Each assumptive component is reducible to a single question with seeming divergent responses that may actually share a common answer. Of existence, is the phenomenon of leadership an existential reality or fantasy? Of necessity, is motivation a required inducement or is it pre-existing? Of origin, does the phenomenon of leadership reside in the leader or is it in the collective consciousness of those in the experience? Of function, is the purpose of the phenomenon of leadership to invoke change or is it to satisfy individual and group discomfort associated with changing experience? The responses acknowledge the phenomenon of leadership as being from a seeming difference in the fundamental nature of the phenomenon. This seeming difference is understandable as, the phenomenon of leadership is an emergent reality in which we, a group, share our individual expressions regarding perceiving and relating our experiences to our individual histories and understanding of which, the collective unconscious is a part.

The Bridge Between Social And Subjective Realities

A presupposition of this theoretical framework is that chaos theory can and may explain the phenomenon of leadership, as the combination and constraint of participant behaviors by an archetype that acts as a strange attractor. This phenomenon is observable in the form of the functional role of the phenomenon of leadership as manifesting in the form of representation through symbolic expression. Having set forth both the macro and

micro examinations it is necessary to bridge the two from the meso perspective. That bridge is the interdependent and autocatalytic nature of expression and cognition.

This piece of the theoretical framework integrates phenomenology (Husserl, 1931; Lanigan, 1988; Merleau-Ponty, 1968), social construction (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Gergen, 1999), cognitive psychology (Casey, 1976; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Zimbardo & Gerrig, 1996), and neuro-linguistic programming (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Battino & South, 2005; Watzlawic, Bevela, & Jackson, 1967) to offer theoretical insight into cognition, expression, and their shared function bridging the objective and subjective realities. Although there is variation between the four in terms of presentation of presuppositions, there is there is conceptual overlap amongst them. Specifically, cognitive psychology has adopted constructionist and phenomenological principles and NLP is a specialization within the field. The purpose and content of this section is to examine and expound the structures of expression and cognition and their relationship one to another.

Expression

According to social construction theory, social reality is a constructed experience negotiated through shared expression of individual cognition (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Gergen, 1999).

“Social change must always be understood as standing in a dialectal relationship with the ‘history of ideas’ . . . all symbolic universes and all legitimization are human products; their existence has its base in the lives of concrete individuals, and has no empirical states apart from these lives” (Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 128).

In other words, as the literature points out, social reality is a shared representation, the product, of the collective cognitive schema, both conscious and unconscious, derived through extroversion of cognition through expression. That is, through interaction and mutuality of cognition of ambitions, values, and expectancies, humans create, attach, accept, traditionalize, institutionalize, and modify labels, symbols, and meanings into cultural patterns. Succinctly, social reality originated from a common root and evolves through time. The philosophical method of semiotic phenomenology and the theoretical tools of neuro-linguistic programming are approaches for examining expression as symbolism to ascertain meaning and the constructive interplay of cognition.

Hermeneutic semiotic phenomenology is a method of inquiry into the speech act as descriptive of phenomenon (Lanigan, 1988). Hermeneutic semiotic phenomenology recognizes context dependence as the key feature of linguistic communication. Lanigan relied on the earlier works of Wilden (1980) and Edie (1970) in his proposition that communication is the descriptive label for the ecosystem of the reversible relationship between an organism and its environment, both of which exist in a mutual context, and of which language is the more sophisticated. Under this rubric, language is defined as an analogue system constituted (code) of relative semantics (capta), syntactics (data), and pragmatics (acta). More specifically, the relations are as follows. Where language is a function of structure (syntax) and use (pragmatics), semantics is meaning. Where language is a function of content (semantics) and use (pragmatics), meaning is in syntactics. Finally, when language is a function of structure (syntax) and content (semantics), pragmatics conveys meaning. Upon this foundation, Lanigan explained

Merleau-Ponty (1968) as turning, “the freedom of the phenomenological method . . . to the service of existential ontology in a rigorous attempt to locate meaning in the human situation” (p. 45).

Neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) is a psycholinguistic model for understanding and modeling subjective experience (Bandler & Grinder, 1975). The basis of this cognitive-behavioral model of mind is constructivism that utilizes representation as a notational system for describing subjective internal experience (Hall & Belnap, 2004). This model identifies three mechanisms as key to creating and expressing representations (a) generalization, (b) deletion, and (c) distortion (Bandler & Grinder). Adapting the definitions and explanations of Casey (1976), Guenther (1998), Murray (1987), Ryle (1949), Sartre (1940), and Zimbardo and Gerrig (1996) relates these three mechanisms to the constructive elements of cognition. Generalization is the process by which elements or pieces of an individual’s model detach from the original experience and morph into representing an entire category of experience (Bandler & Grinder). This process is reflective of a reliance primarily on recall in cognition (Guenther; Murray). Deletion is the process of excluding dimensions of experience to allow selective attention to certain ones (Bandler & Grinder). Deletion is primarily a function of perception (Zimbardo & Gerrig). Distortion is the process allowing controlled shifts in the experience of sensory data (Bandler & Grinder). Distortion occurs primarily in or through the imagination (Casey; Murray; Ryle; Sartre). NLP offers two tools for discerning internal representational experience—the Meta-model and eye-accessing cues.

Through the Meta-model, it is possible to reconnect language—an approximation of the speed, variety, and sensitivity of human thought—with experience (O’Conner & Seymour, 1990). The core of the Meta-model is the recognition that “language is both a representational system and the means or process of communicating our representation of the world” (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, p. 45). The Meta-model used Chomsky’s (1957) transformational grammar model as foundational and is a verbal model for listening to the form, as opposed to the content, of communication (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, 1979). Bandler and Grinder (1975) relied on Chomsky’s identification of universals of well formedness, constituent structure, and logical semantical relations, i.e., completeness, ambiguity, synonymy, referential indices, and presuppositions (Bandler & Grinder, 1975). There are two fundamental juxtaposed but interdependent ideas in this model. Bandler and Grinder (1975) explained that all communication contains both surface and deep levels, the latter of which is altered by generalization, deletion, and distortion at the surface level. This, suggested Bandler and Grinder, in theory, can and may allow communicators to manipulate the deep level of experience through surface level expression. Gibbs’ (1995) exposition of idioms explained and illustrated the meaningful expression of generalized, deleted, and distorted cognition. Structurally, the Meta-model seeks to reverse and unravel the deletions, generalizations, and distortions of expression through a series of questions (O’Conner & Seymour). According to O’Conner and Seymour, in the expression of language unspecified nouns, unspecified verbs, predicates, comparisons, judgments, nominalizations, modal operators of possibility or necessity,

cause and effect, universal quantifiers, and complex equivalents are all indicative of deletion, generalization, and distortion.

Cognition

Cognitive psychology is the scientific study of one of the most difficult mysteries human beings have ever endeavored to explore—the human mind and how it processes information (Levitin, 2002). This field of inquiry asks questions regarding consciousness, perception, imagination, memory, intelligence, language, neurology, the interdependency between emotion and reason, as well as processes in terms of electro-chemical patterns. Rather than solely individual in its approach to these topics and related questions, cognitive psychology seeks a systemic perspective—the relations amongst as well as the emergent properties of mind. Historically, theory and discussion regarding consciousness is from one of three perspectives—the perceptual model, the hypothetical model, and the lingual-semantic model (Casey, 1976; Guenther, 1998; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Sartre, 1940; and Zimbardo and Gerrig, 1996). These three models discuss and describe the component elements of consciousness respectively. Specifically, the perceptual model discusses perception; the hypothetical model relates to imagination; and the lingual-semantic model is descriptive of recall. Combined they reveal consciousness as a triune in structure.

Synthesizing the theory and research of cognitive psychologists, philosophers of consciousness and phenomenology, neurologists, and linguistics yields a model of expression representative of the structure of cognition, which is reflective of brain development (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, 1979; Britan, 1931; Casey, 1976; Damasio,

1994; Gleitman & Newport, 1995; Guenther, 1998; Hobson, 1994; Howard, 2000; Husserl, 1931; Jung, 1956, 1959; Lanigan, 1988; Merleau-Ponty, 1968; Moustakas, 1994; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Sartre, 1940; Taylor, 1999; Zimbardo & Gerrig, 1996).

Summarized in Figure 1, the model illustrates that, at any given time, Husserl's (1931) intentionality bonds the three elements of cognition as one of two types of thinking.

These two types manifest through a triune expression reflective of the process of cognition and its composition (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Casey; Guenther; Jung; Murray; Ryle; Sartre; Zimbardo & Gerrig).




Figure 1. Expression as representation of cognition as experienced illustrating the triune nature of each.

Integration of the perceptual model and the hypothetical model with the lingual-semantic model suggests cognition is triune (Casey, 1976; Guenther, 1998; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Sartre, 1940; Zimbardo & Gerrig, 1996). The perceptual model discusses perception; the hypothetical model relates to imagination; and the lingual-

semantic model is descriptive of recall. Perception as sensation, organization, and identification is the apprehension of objects and events in the external environment (Zimbardo & Gerrig). Imagination is spontaneous and analogical. That is, it is constructed, alterable, or projective metaphor (Casey; Murray; Ryle; Sartre). Murray described this as the AS-IF model. The term recall denotes that the human mind does not have memory in the traditional use of the word (Guenther, 1998). Rather, recall is descriptive of the cognitive derivation of a plausible rendition of past events in the aggregate rather than the details. The lingual-semantic model (AS-AS) is applicable as a model of comprehension and productivity in which consciousness may rephrase a situation anew (Murray). Expression is a means to observing intuition, intentionality, and the structural patterning of cognition (Bandler & Grinder, 1975).

Husserl (1931) used the word intuition to describe how essence presents to consciousness presupposing intentionality governed perception. That is, consciousness is fixated in the mind in a deliberate way (Moustakas, 1994). Intentionality is born from Noesis and Noema—the relations of the physical world with the psychical. Noesis conveys meaning, is inherent, and perfectly self-evident while Noema is its correlate in consciousness—the conveyance that phenomena are perception dependent (Husserl, 1931). Casey (1976) offered initial support to this argument, suggesting intentionality grounds the phenomenon of imagining possessing a group of six fundamental features.

Cognition is the interdependency amongst the three composing elements and their interplay, subject to mutuality, manifest as one of two types of thinking—directed thinking and fantasy thinking (Jung, 1956). Jung described the variation between them as

their nature in terms of seeming purpose or lack of it. Directed thinking replicates reality, endeavors to act on it in response to it, produces innovation, and is adaptive in orientation. In contrast, abstaining from reality, fantasy thinking is free of subjective tendencies (e.g., directionless, associative, ambiguous). Jung noted that Freud considered fantasy thinking as the opposite of directed thinking. In other words, fantasy thinking originates in the mind and awakens the perception, whereas in directed thinking, it is progression of perception to endopsychic association to motor end.

Observing the Unity of Expression and Cognition

As an emergent property of being, expression is a means to observing intuition, intentionality, and the structural patterning of consciousness. According to Jung (1956), imitative in sound or action of the elements, expression is symbolic of emotively felt response to real occurrences as it developed in our primordial being and in their echo in modern humans. Expression takes three forms—(a) kinesthetic, (b) emotive, and (c) symbolic (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, 1979). From brain research, it is reasonable to offer the conjecture that form of expression evolved with the brain, i.e., kinesthetic with reptilian, emotion with the limbic system or mid-brain, and symbolic with the cerebral cortex (Britan, 1931; Damasio, 1994; Gleitman & Newport, 1995; Hobson, 1994; Howard, 2000; Taylor, 1999). Moreover, like that which they represent, the three are inseparably conjoined (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Damasio).

Bandler and Grinder (1979) illustrated, as a matter of inheritance, automatic kinesthetic response as reflective of cognition, specifically stating, “you will always get an answer to your questions insofar as you have the sensory apparatus to notice the

response . . . they will always give you the answer non-verbally, whether or not they are able to consciously express what it is” (pp. 17-18). While there is a multitude of kinesthetic indicators of cognition observable, eye-movement patterns or eye accessing cues offers the clearest and most verifiable revelation of which element(s) of cognition are being employed in processing, according to Bandler and Grinder. These cues indicate visual, auditory, and kinesthetic sensation. There are two types: (a) eidetic–remembered and (b) constructed. Combined, as illustrated in Figure 2, the human eye has six positions or movements (i.e., up left, up right, lateral left, lateral right, down left, or down right) observable.

Vc = Visually constructed images

Vr = Visually recalled (eidetic) images

Ac = Auditory constructed sounds or words

Ar = Auditory remembered sounds or words

K = Kinesthetic feelings (also taste and smell)

A = Auditory sounds or words as internal dialogue




Figure 2. Mapping Eye-accessing Cues (Adapted from `The User's Manual for the Brain PowerPoint® Overheads` by Bob G Bodenhamer and L Michael Hall (ISBN 9781899836512) reproduced by permission of Crown House Publishing Limited).

Bandler and Grinder reported these six as a pattern sufficiently consistent internationally to suggest that, “It may be a neurological bias that is built into our nervous system as a species” (p. 35).

Six propositions were offered to explore the bridge of expression and cognition between social and subjective realities.

1. Expression is the representative manifestation of cognitive processes (Bandler & Grinder, 1975a; Battino & South, 2005; Casey, 1976; Guenther, 1998; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Sartre, 1940; Watzlawick, Bevela, & Jackson, 1967; and Zimbardo & Gerrig, 1996).

2. Expression is triune—Kinesthetic, Emotive, and Symbolic (Bandler and Grinder, 1979; Watzlawick, Bevela, & Jackson, 1967).
3. The brain is bicameral in structure (Hobson, 1994; Howard, 2000).
4. Integration of the perceptual model and the hypothetical model with the lingual-semantic model suggests cognition is triune (Bandler & Grinder, 1975a; Casey, 1976; Guenther, 1998; Murray, 1987; Ryle, 1949; Sartre, 1940; and Zimbardo & Gerrig, 1996).
5. Cognition is the interdependency amongst the three composing elements and their interplay subject to mutuality is ambidextrous manifesting as one of two types of thinking—directed and fantasy (Jung, 1956, 1959).
6. Expression as ability and complexity is relative to the developments of the physical brain and evolution of cognition—a) reptilian to kinesthetic and perception; b) mid-brain to emotive and recall; and c) cerebral cortex to symbolic and imagination (Britan, 1931; Damasio, 1994; Gleitman & Newport, 1995; Howard, 2000; and Hobson, 1994).

The central idea of this segment of the theoretical framework is that manifest socially constructed reality is an artificial representation of the contents of the psyche created through expressed symbolism. Semiotic phenomenology is a philosophy of expression as symbolism and method for examining symbolism to ascertain meaning. Neuro-linguistic programming offered a model and technique for dissecting the structure of expression and the constructive interplay of cognition.

Summary

This chapter presented the expanse of literature that referenced what came to be a theoretical framework for this present study. The literature reviewed offered an explanation about the nature of the phenomenon of leadership in cognition observable through experience and expression. These propositions suggested the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership as a strange attractor potentially existing as an archetype through a model of cognition demonstrably represented through expression. Categorical competencies were identified from the literature, as variables of a possible Lyapunov exponent, representations of an archetype, from which to compare and contrast the information that the participants of this present study provided. Occurrence in the psyche is hypothesized using the psychological interplay of cognition and communication to create archetypes originating either from inheritance or cultural imprinting. The focus in this present study was that of expression as representative manifestation of the triune structure of cognition. Symbolic communication was the key to appreciating structure and meaning. Consequently, the theoretical framework presented semiotic phenomenology with analytical enhancements using NLP Meta-model as techniques for discerning meaning from symbolic representation. The semiotic phenomenological method examines the content of the participants expression to discern meaning. The NLP Meta-model is a tool for examining the structure of expression. The framework concluded with eye-accessing cues technique is one observational tool supporting the presupposition of interdependence between expression and cognition.

Chapter 3 describes and details the design of the study to qualify the nature of leadership in cognition through the interpretation of lived experience. First, the chapter explains the relevance of semiotic phenomenology as research method to the research questions of this study. Second, the chapter details the design considerations involved in extending semiotic phenomenology with the Meta-model and eye-accessing cues of neurolinguistic programming. Finally, data collection, data analysis and verification procedures are delineated.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the design of the study and the research approach. Beginning with the research questions that initiated and structured the theoretical framework, this chapter details the planning considerations. Description of the researcher's role, participant selection, pre-collection considerations, data collection, and analysis and verification procedures follow exposition of the design of the study.

Research Questions

This research investigated the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership as a cognitive and social phenomenon in terms of a possible archetype. This conception raised questions about the phenomenon of leadership as a cognitive structure and its meaning in lived experience. Of these, three questions were primary:

1. Is social action a result of the phenomenon of leadership or is the phenomenon of leadership a derivative of social action? In other words, is there an archetype?
2. If there is a leadership archetype, what is the associated cognitive visual, auditory, or kinesthetic representation?
3. If yes, what elements of the leadership archetype are identifiable in and through social dialogue?

Research Design

The purpose and research questions of this study posed research challenges that the phenomenological approach accommodated. According to Creswell (1998), Giorgi

(1985), Moustakas (1994), and Moran (2000) phenomenology is the study of the objective in subjective experience that “presents a ‘new way’ of viewing what is genuinely discoverable and potentially there but often is not seen” (Sanders, 1982, p. 357). Unlike other quantitative and qualitative methods, the phenomenological method is conducted from a presuppositionless philosophical perspective guided by the belief that incontestable knowledge is intuitively ascertainable rather than from a perspective that proposes to hypothesize or know a priori (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994). This is Husserl’s (1931) attitude of being a perpetual beginner; the bracketing of beliefs, assumptions, biases, and prejudices to open oneself to experience, with the goal in mind that the researcher has set aside all prejudgments (Creswell).

There are variations in design and execution, arising with philosophical differences as beginning with Heidegger (1927) as cited in (Moran, 2000) and as recent as Lanigan (1988). The contributions of these two authors, and the philosopher Merleau-Ponty (1968), were the key variations in methodological design choices. Heidegger’s method is hermeneutic. Merleau-Ponty proposed that to study the thing itself is to study the structure of a thing or experience as perceived in the mind. Lanigan provided a method built on Merleau-Ponty’s ideas. Lanigan’s method examines the content of participant expression to discern meaning. Bandler and Grinder’s (1975, 1976, 1979) Meta-model and eye-accessing cues supplement Lanigan’s method. Appropriately employed during each phase of the research, the meta-model model and eye-accessing cues technique, as data collection and data analysis tools, contributed to the processes of reduction and interpretation of the nature of the phenomenon of leadership in experience.

The Meta-model served two functions. The first function served was the guiding of the interview process in its exploration by observation of the structure of the participant's communication patterns. The second function was assisting with meaning identification through pattern identification at both micro and macro levels in the deep structure when analyzing interview transcripts. The purpose of collecting and analyzing eye-accessing cue data was to distinguish shifts in cognitive processing e.g., recall to constructed and vice-versa, as well as changes in representation, and correlate consistency with identified key words and representational systems used by participants during verbal expression. It was anticipated that distinguishing changes in cognitive processing might yield insights into participant responses and perceptions both voluntary and involuntary. Observation during the interview was by video camera only. Notation and analysis of eye-accessing cue data was conducted distinct of all other efforts and was re-integrated later in the reduction effort.

This study was a qualitative design based on the concepts and principles of phenomenology originated by Husserl (1931). According to Giorgi (1997), phenomenology "wants to understand what motivates a conscious creature to say something 'is.' Thus, it has to begin at a more fundamental place, where there is 'presence' but not yet that type of presence to which one attributes existence" (p. 239). In other words, it seeks the characteristics an object or experience must possess to motivate the attribution of existence to it. The mind, according to Husserl in his description and discussion of intentionality, conveys that consciousness is toward oriented. It looks for things. Yet, in this explanation, Husserl asks the question: What characteristics motivate

the attribution of existence? As explained by Schipper (1999), Husserl's method seeks to clarify the concept already given by attempting to produce the thing anew by nourishing it from the primal, epistemologically, with some idealistic metaphysics linking knowledge perpetually to tradition (p. 477). Merleau-Ponty (1968) revised the phenomenological method along the argument that to study a phenomenon is to study the structure of the event as perceived. Merleau-Ponty is the paradigmatic case to Lanigan (1988), introducing and instructing semiotic phenomenology as derivation of communicology and phenomenology as the study of meaning through the symbolism of language (sign and signification). In other words, "philosophy is phenomenology, and, that phenomenology is a rigorous human science in the mode of communicology" (Lanigan, p. xi). Lanigan incorporated the ideas of constructionism and cognition, counting Schutz (1967) amongst its referents. Consequently, the choice of Lanigan as the model is logical as it is in conjunction with the questions and purposes of this study. Lanigan's method was supplemented with the deployment of the Meta-model technique of Bandler and Grinder's (1975) Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP).

Bandler and Grinder (1975) used Chomsky's (1957) transformational grammar model as the foundation of the Meta-model. Chomsky developed this model for the sole purpose of identifying and modeling universal patterns in human language systems. It examines communication in terms of structure rather than content. Chomsky's model is premised on message structure having two levels (surface and deep structure), and that surface communication camouflages the deep structure. This design proposed that use of this model, as analytic technique of both written and verbal communications, would

facilitate the phenomenological method to achieve a description of the meaning of the phenomenon of leadership and its represented archetype.

Bandler and Grinder (1979) discussed eye-movement patterns as manifest information signals, indicating active processing in the brain, and suggesting that it is possible for the observer to correlate eye movement data with the kind of information sought through a question or instruction. According to O'Connor and Seymour (1990/1995), neurological studies demonstrate that eye movement occurs relative to activation of different parts of the brain. Known in research circles as lateral eye movement (LEM), Bandler and Grinder (1979) labeled them eye-accessing cues. The terms are synonymous throughout this research. There are six perceptible movements in the plane of visualization. Four of these are constructed or retrieved sounds or images. The remaining two are kinesthetic and internal dialogue. Bandler and Grinder suggested a generalized pattern of constructed and retrieved sounds or images moving up or across right or left, and kinesthetic and internal dialogue as respectively down and to the left or to the right. It is to be noted that eye accessing cues as representative of subjective processing has been controversial.

Baddeley and Predebon (1991), Carbonell (1986), Dooley and Farmer (1988), Jupp (1989), Radosta, and Schleh (1987) offered distinct research endeavors, claiming to fail to support Bandler and Grinder's eye movement generalization. Hernandez (1981) and Wertheim, Habib, and Cumming (1986) reported mixed results when testing eye movement theory. Buckner, Meara, Reese, and Reese (1987) and Nate (1999) demonstrated that eye-accessing cues are a consistent, predictable, and reliable indicator

of cognitive information retrieval and processing. The controversy may be attributable to study design rather than eye movement theory. Specifically, the commonality amidst those studies failing to support Bandler and Grinder's (1975) statements as well as mixed result studies regarding eye-accessing cues may be misinterpretation of eye-accessing cue material. Bandler and Grinder hypothesized that eye-accessing cues were distinct to each individual and extended an anecdotally-based generalized pattern to the human population. With the exception of Buckner et al. and Nate, in each of these studies, the generalization is tested as universality rather than assessing individual eye movement patterns to sensory-oriented terminology to assess eye-movement theory. In contrast, the design of the studies by Buckner et al. and Nate are consistent with eye movement representation in that each searches for individual pattern and tests for consistency of pattern.

The Researcher's Role

Husserl (1931) admonished the phenomenological researchers to adapt an attitude of being a perpetual beginner or the bracketing of beliefs, assumptions, biases, and prejudices in order to open oneself to experience. Abstention from prejudgment facilitates the identification of meaning, which reveals the intentionality of experience from the participant's perspective without discoloration of the researcher's bias (Moustakas, 1994). This researcher sought to relinquish presuppositions by examination of the topical literature shown in chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation. The background of the problem and the theoretical framework identified and communicated this researcher's assumptions, beliefs, biases, and prejudices permitting the researcher a fuller awareness.

Miles and Huberman (1994) explained that the researcher or interviewer influences the quality of the data with respect to interviewing, observation, and note recording abilities and skills. Vocabulary, vocalization, and timeliness of the posing of questions facilitate disclosure of the subject's experience (Bandler & Grinder, 1982; Bodenhamer & Hall, 1999; Cialdini, 1984; Moustakas, 1994; O'Connor & Seymour, 1990; Young, 2001). With this in mind, all data collection procedures were conducted with the knowledge and understanding of this critical researcher responsibility.

Participant Selection

A phenomenological study defines the potential population as those individuals who have consciously experienced the phenomenon, can articulate it, are interested in understanding its nature and meanings, and are willing to participate in an interview (Creswell, 1998). Moustakas (1994) advised that, while general considerations include age, race, religion, ethnic and cultural factors, political and economic factors, and gender, there are no in-advance criteria for subject selection beyond the initial essential criteria previously mentioned. In Giorgi's (1985) words, "go to the everyday world where people are living through various phenomena in actual situations" (p. 8).

Given the phenomenological method requires repetitive review and lengthy consideration, Creswell (1998) advised that no more than 10 individuals be sought for participation. Moustakas (1994) avoided recommending a number, explaining that the answer to this question depends on what is under study. For example, similar to Creswell, Moustakas shares examples of studies ranging in involvement of a few individuals to Van

Kaam's (1955) analysis of 80 of 365 descriptions seeking the meaning of really feeling understood. Consequently, this study engaged a sample population of 10 individuals.

This researcher sought individuals over the age of 18 years from the metropolitan areas of La Crosse and Madison, Wisconsin, and Rochester, Minneapolis/ St. Paul, and Winona, Minnesota. Self-selection by volunteer participants who believed they had experienced the phenomenon of leadership was the only criterion. Recruitment of participants was through an invitation (see Appendix B) addressed to professional associations and social organizations with a publicly-stated interest in leadership and leadership development. The invitation briefly explained the study, requested participation, and provided contact information for responding by potential participants.

Preparation Considerations

The primary considerations in choosing locations to conduct the participant interviews were that the locations be quiet, free from distractions, reasonably convenient and comfortable for the participants, and conducive to audio- and video-taping. These locations included local universities and libraries. Participants were also offered the opportunity to be interviewed at a location of their choice. Any missed appointments were rescheduled at the participant's convenience and occurred within a 2-week period of the initially scheduled interview.

Regarding the participant selection, initial contact was an informal conversation between the researcher and the individual explaining the purpose of the study. If the individual agreed to participate in the study, the researcher hand delivered or sent the participant a detailed letter explaining the research project and the participant's obligation

and commitment through an informed consent letter (see Appendix E). The researcher anticipated an in-person or telephone conversation with each potential participant to address any questions or concerns before the signed informed consent letters were returned. Also, the researcher was accessible by telephone, e-mail, and regular mail service to address any further questions and concerns that the participants may have had related to the study. The informed consent letter provided specific details of the purpose, method, and matters of confidentiality of the study as well as what was expected of both the researcher and the participant. Participants understood that no tangible incentives were offered for their participation. The informed consent letter included a clause stating that the participant may terminate participation in the study at any time.

The informed consent letter also contained a written promise of confidentiality, attesting to protect the identity of participants both in the reporting of the study data and in any subsequent publications of the study. The researcher strictly maintained all records associated with the audio- and video-taped recordings of the one-on-one interviews, the transcriptions of the interviews, and the original informed consent letters. The informed consent letters were stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home office during the study, and following the study were placed in a safe deposit box at an external location. Further, the audio recording, video recordings, and transcripts were placed in a secure location and will remain secured for a period of 5 years following the publication of the dissertation. In the reporting of the interpretation of the participant interview, no participant was identified by name or will be listed by name in any future publication resulting from this research.

Data Collection

The process of data collection and analysis began with an informal, interactive in-depth interview consisting of open-ended comments and questions, the most commonly reported means of data collection in a phenomenological study (Creswell, 1998; Giorgi, 1985; Moustakas, 1994). Data collection involved one live audio and video-recorded interview in two parts conducted at a public location that offered relative privacy and was free from distraction (Appendix F). The first part of the interview served as base line to establish eye movement patterns to questions designed to elicit specific kinesthetic, auditory, and visual retrieval and or constructed responses, according to Bandler and Grinder (1975). The second part of interview was the actual topical interview upon which reduction occurred. The central challenges were the linguistic formulation of the questions posed during the interview and the dissection of linguistic formulation of participant responses. A second analysis of the second part of the interviews attended to eye movement patterns to distinguish response as retrieval or construction of kinesthetic, auditory, or visual elements.

Obtaining express written permission to audio- and video-record and transcribe interviews occurred before conducting audiotaped and videotaped semistructured interviews. The interview process entailed each participant responding to open interview questions focused on discerning the relational perception of individual and events.

The development of interview questions followed the wording and presentation guidelines of Moustakas (1994) and Bandler and Grinder (1975, 1976, 1979, 1982). The two objectives were broadness of inquiry and avoiding words or phrasing by the

researcher that would communicate instruction or otherwise influence the cognitive response of the participant. Broad questions facilitate the obtaining of rich, vital, substantive descriptions of the subject's experience of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). Whereas the researcher may indicate direction by word selection e.g., recall, see, hear, and feel, etcetera, avoidance of such words in instructions or questions leaves choice with the subject (Bandler & Grinder, 1979, 1982). Additionally, the researcher was careful to avoid use of the specific descriptors identified in the literature reviewed. This research modeled Van Kaam's (1959) one sentence instruction when developing the interview protocol.

According to Bandler and Grinder (1975), while there are a multitude of kinesthetic indicators of cognition able to be observed, eye-movement patterns or eye-accessing cues, indicating visual, auditory, and kinesthetic sensation offer the clearest and most verifiable revelation of which element(s) of cognition are being employed in processing. There are two types—eidetic remembered and constructed. Bandler and Grinder noted six positions or movements (left or right, and up, lateral, or down) observable.

Vc = Visually constructed images

Vr = Visually recalled (eidetic) images

Ac = Auditory constructed sounds or words

Ar = Auditory remembered sounds or words

K = Kinesthetic feelings (also taste and smell)

A = Auditory sounds or words as internal dialogue

The necessity of this research was to “pattern” each participant through a randomized series of cue questions designed to solicit a specific response. To establish pattern per participant, three to six questions designed to solicit each specific cue response were necessary and were recorded on a blank chart according to observed movement. A pattern was identified as three or more consistent movements in the same direction to the same question type. These questions were coded numerically (1-6) according to question type prior to the interview for notation on a blank chart.

Following Van Kaam’s (1959) guidelines

“The phenomenal analyst will restrict himself to one question, carefully aimed at obtaining spontaneous descriptions of subjective experience, and it will be formulated so that the subjects will be able to relate freely to a wide variety of situations. The purpose is to discover the moments common to all individual experiences of the same kind” (Van Kaam, 1959, p. 71).

Each participant was given a one sentence instruction at the onset of the interview. This instruction was, “Share a story that exemplifies leadership for you. Describe the leader, the issue, and context.” Further depth inquiry during the interview process was relative to the identification of deletion, distortion, and generalization through key words and phrases of participant responses to the initial instruction as well as sub-questions meant to elicit subject exposition.

Data Analysis

The semiotic–phenomenological method, as described and instructed by Lanigan (1988), served as model for this study. According to Lanigan, the semiotic phenomenological method is a three-step procedure of description, reduction, and

interpretation. Through this process, participant intentionality emerges as a communicative focus through the emotive, conative, referential, poetic, phatic, or metalinguistic functions of discourse. The use of the Meta-model and eye-accessing cues developed by Bandler and Grinder (1975, 1976, 1979) are in procedural steps one and two.

Procedural Step 1: Description

The description step is the data collection procedures of the participant semi-structured interviews. In this step, the researcher specified the participant's protocol for discourse by identifying the thematic context. Delineation of the course and content of the interview explored each observable pattern when offered by the participant. The Meta-model offered a paradigm for identifying and exploring the metalinguistic function of communication through the identification of the three common patterns of generalization, deletion, and distortion (Bandler & Grinder, 1975, 1976). Generalization is the representation of an entire category of experience by an element or piece from the original experience detectable in language by an absolute, i.e., the scope being unspecified, unbounded, or through self-imposed limitations (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Young, 2001). Deletion is the selective attention to certain dimensions and the exclusion of others of our experience and is observable in communication by the lack of full linguistic representation, using nonspecific words that leave out details (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Young, 2001). Distortion is the shifting of experienced sensory data linguistically inferring linkages and meanings that the listener is challenged to mentally replicate (Bandler & Grinder, 1975; Young, 2001). An example is nominalization—the

use of a process word or verb as an event word or noun. Data collection was according to the interview protocol.

Procedural Step 2: Reduction

Reduction consisted of abstracting words and revelatory phrases that functioned as existential signifiers (Lanigan, 1988). These signifiers were words or phrases that typically nominate meaning and or structure of conscious experience specifying an affective, cognitive, or a connotative boundary. The meaning, substance, or weight of words and phrases abstracted were derived by the participant's word choices, voice inflection, alliteration patterns, and accompanying kinesthetic behaviors. Moustakas (1994) dissected Van Kaam's (1959) procedure to offer guidance to a seven-step process for reviewing each interview and transcript. This seven-step process was split between two procedural steps. The first four steps occurred as part of procedural step two: reduction. The remaining three steps occurred as part of procedural step three: analysis.

1. List and preliminarily group every expression relevant to the experience.

Identification of relevant expressions incorporated the eye-accessing cues of the participants as indicative of the element of cognition enacted to express the word or phrase as recalled or constructed in response to a question, comment, or instruction by the researcher to the participant (Bandler & Grinder, 1979; and Moustakas, 1994). The video record of each interview was reviewed and coded for key words or phrases, eye movement mapped on a blank chart, voice inflection, alliteration patterns, and accompanying kinesthetic behaviors. The task here was to correlate the initial patterns initially observed and mapped in the first part of the interview with patterns observed

during the second portion (the semi-structured interview). This correlation of pattern was anticipated to reveal how often recall and constructed processing respectively and comparatively occurs when considering the concept of leadership. This correlation was anticipated to reveal the structure of balance between perception, recall, and imagination as contributing to subjective processing.

2. Reducing and eliminating expressions involved identifying invariant constituents (nonrepetitive, nonoverlapping statements). The researcher completed this step by testing each expression for two requirements: Does it contain an experiential moment necessary and sufficient constituent to understanding it? Is it possible to abstract and label the thing?

3. Identify thematic labels by clustering related invariant constituents. These clusters constituted the core themes.

4. The final identification of invariant constituents and themes was delineated by comparing and checking the invariant constituents and their accompanying theme against the complete record of each study participant. Two questions arose. First, are they expressed explicitly in the transcript? Second, if not expressed explicitly in the transcript, are they compatible? If the answer was no to either question, they were not considered relevant to the participant's experience and were to be deleted.

Procedural Step 3: Interpretation

Lanigan (1988) described hermeneutic interpretation as involving two procedures. First, critically examine the list of revelatory phrases obtained from the reduction step as the signified in the discourse. "Second, a particular signified," referring to the previous

signified, “is then used as the key part of a hermeneutic proposition—that is, a statement, written by the analyst, that gives the meaning implicit in the explicit discourse” (p. 147).

The most appropriate is the one in which both the interviewer and the respondent

“discover the sense in which the phrase is indeed revelatory of lived-meaning” (p. 147).

Interpretation involved a two-part process. In the first phase of the interpretation, the general essence or locus of the interview was identified by specification of the participant’s key revelatory phrase through the critical examination of the abstracted words and phrases identified in procedural step 2 (reduction). In the second phase of interpretation, essence was identified as the participant’s hermeneutic proposition, or, the existential meaning communicated in the form of a statement by the researcher stating the participant’s implicit meaning in the explicit expression. Moustakas (1994) final three procedural steps occur in this second phase of interpretation:

1. Construct an individual textural description and an individual structural description for each participant. The individual textural description used the relevant and validated invariant constituents and themes illustrated with verbatim examples from the transcribed interview. The individual structural description utilized the individual textual description and imaginative variation.

2. The aforementioned descriptions combined and incorporated the invariant constituents and themes to construct an individual textual-structural description of the meanings and essences of the participant’s respective experiences.

3. The final step is compiling the individual textual-structural descriptions to develop a composite description of the experience's meanings and essences for the group as a whole.

Verification

Creswell (1998) acknowledged that there is no substantial emphasis on quality and verification standards in the practice of phenomenology as a research method. Rather, the researcher's interpretation relates the quality and verification of a phenomenological study. There are two distinct verification procedures. The first is the use of an outside reviewer whose task is to look for identical patterns (Creswell). The second verification procedure is intersubjective validity—a process in which the researcher and subjects socially interact, testing and confirming the researcher's understanding from the subject's point of view (Moustakas, 1994). In this process, the researcher performs the reduction and interpretation for each description. The interpretation is shared with the subject for confirmation or revision and re-submission. If the latter, the process is repeated with each subject and description until no longer necessary. Creswell's suggestion is essentially a verification of the researcher's understanding of procedure, whereas, the procedure advanced by Moustakas focuses verification on the meaning of the experience from the subject's perspective. Moustakas' (1994) process was employed for this study.

Validity and Reliability

Qualitative studies are regarded, generally, in lower esteem than quantitative largely due to the questions of validity and reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Creswell (1998, 2003), like Merriam (2002), offered guidelines and standards for demonstrating reliability and validity in qualitative research in order to mitigate this issue.

An initial claim of reliability for this study relied on two elements. First, previously accepted works are the foundation of both the metaphysics and research method of this present study. Second, a previously accepted verification process governing the study had been put in place.

Erickson (1964) offered a profound statement resolving the validity question of qualitative research, generally and phenomenology specifically, when remarking that validation of subjective experience occurs when another participates in it. That is, to validate, one must participate. As explained in the previous paragraph, the validity of the description as interpretation of the archetype lies in the participant's verification of the researcher's validity in terms of appreciating the subject's experience. Validity extends to the reader in one of two forms. First, the reader participates (or shares) in the description to be reported. According to Erickson's logic, participation in subjective experience validates, the same may be argued relative to the reader of this study even if she/he is blocked about its outcome. If, there is the possibility of the archetype and she/he is critically cooperative about examining it. In the event that the arguments for verification and validity and reliability are presently rejected then the questions may be decided through at least two external avenues. The first of these is a three-part triangulation of the literature, the results of this study, and meta-analysis of longitudinal replication. The second is a comparison-contrast analysis of a replication study utilizing Ericksonian

hypnosis (Erickson, 1980a) as replacement to Bandler & Grinder's (1981) eye-accessing cues. Under this approach, one collects raw data from the collective unconscious as defined by Jung (1956). Under both of these approaches, one compares and contrasts for a ratio measure of overlap between the conclusions of this study with those for significant factors.

Summary

This chapter outlined and detailed the methodology of the present study, which sought the presence of a leadership as archetype. Given the exploratory nature of the study, a convenience sample was used. Data collection consisted of live audio- and video-recorded semi-structured interviews. The semiotic phenomenological method enhanced by tools of NLP served as procedural technique.

Chapter 4 presents two descriptions for each of the results of the 10 semistructured interviews conducted. The first is the structural description, which is the content, representational systems employed by participants during expression, and themes communicated. The content portion of the review examines the exploration of the first research question, Is there a leadership archetype. The second research question, what is the cognitive structure of the archetype, was explored with each participant through the representational systems. The reporting of themes is research question three, what elements of the archetype are conveyed through social interaction. The second is the textual description. The textual description of leadership as meaning in lived experience is from the participant's point of view as understood by the researcher and as verified by the participant.

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

The primary purpose of this exploratory study was to identify a potential leadership archetype through the examination of cognitive interpretation of lived experience. The premise of this study was inquiry into four commonly accepted, yet unexamined assumptions about leadership. This inquiry examined the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership as a manifestation of an archetype. The inquiry then examined the structures of cognition and expression to provide a framework from which to isolate the leadership phenomenon as archetype or artifact. Finally, the inquiry examined the potential content of cognition and social discourse when identifying and experiencing the phenomenon of leadership. This chapter presents and interprets the data gathered through 10 semistructured, face-to-face interviews of voluntary participants who identified themselves as having experienced leadership. The interview protocol consisted of three primary questions—“Leadership . . . what is the first thing that comes to mind?” and “Share a story that exemplifies leadership for you . . .” and “If you were to offer a symbol, what would it be?” Consistent with prescription and past practice, participants were not informed of the three research questions of this study until after finalization and acceptance of the final draft of the study. The results of the study are discussed after a concise introduction of the three questions, with each of the 10 participants’ respective description following each inquiry. The chapter concludes with a unified description of the participant responses and the key themes that emerged.

Data Collection

The data collection and analysis in this study was completed through semistructured interviews of a geographically and experientially dispersed sample, employing Lanigan's (1988) semiotic-phenomenology extended by Bandler and Grinder's (1975, 1976, 1979) neuro-linguistic programming (NLP). Bandler and Grinder's (1975, 1976) Meta-model offered a paradigm for identifying and exploring the metalinguistic function of communication through the identification of the three common patterns of generalization, deletion, and distortion. A semi-structured interview protocol was developed and employed as the data collection instrument. The researcher specified the participants' protocol for discourse by identifying the thematic context through three primary inquiries. The course and content of the interview explored each observable pattern when offered by the participant.

Data Recording

Two-divider partition folders were used to file a copy of the participant consent, a copy of the interview protocol and researcher's field notes, an original transcript, the researcher's annotated transcript, the participant's annotated transcript, and both drafts and final copy of the participant's description. A CD copy of the audio record and a DVD copy of the video recording were included in each file using adhesive back CD disc pockets. This filing approach allowed for consistent filing and easy retrieval and cross-referencing of information when reviewing each participant's interview record during the reduction phase. In order to maintain confidentiality, identification of files was according

to a given participant number, e.g., “Participant 1” to “Participant 10,” with no individual names in view upon opening any part of a file.

Data Analysis and Descriptions

The semiotic-phenomenological method as described and instructed by Lanigan (1988) served as model for this study. Each participant description was finalized using intersubjective validity (Moustakas, 1994).

Each participant review is in two parts. The first part is the structural description consisting of the content of the participant’s respective remarks, representational systems employed to communicate, and themes. The second part is the textual description. The content portion of the review examines the exploration of the first research question, Is there a leadership archetype. This exploration consisted of the three interview questions (Leadership, Share a Story, Symbol), with brief exposition as appropriate. The second research question, what is the cognitive structure of the archetype, was explored with each participant through the representational systems portion of each review and was intended to provide insight into the cognitive processes employed by the participant when thinking about and discussing leadership. The reporting of themes was done by labeling, with illustrating quotes and or commentary as expressed by the participant relating to research question three, what elements of the archetype are conveyed through social interaction? Each section concluded with a description of leadership as meaning in lived experience, from the participant’s point of view as understood by the researcher and as verified thereafter by the participant. The research questions were not answered at the participant level, since an underlying presupposition to attaining an archetype is that it is

evidenced through a unified description: “The core of common experiences is the same in different individuals” (Van Kaam, 1959, p. 67). In other words, identification of an archetype, its structure in cognition, and testimony thereof in social discourse is substantiated when observed in common across participants and not in any one participant’s record alone.

Participant 1

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“It comes in a variety of packages” (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Consistent with the referent variety, exposition came through sharing numerous stories and examples, relating specifics of individuals the participant esteemed as demonstrating leadership rather than one story. The framework of the participant’s comments was similar to a speech the participant had been giving for the past 20 years. (A copy of this speech was included with a personal letter with the return of the transcript.) The interview responses were consistent with the speech text and may be explanatory in understanding the lack of eye movement throughout the interview. That is, the responses were a collage of long-held beliefs and biases adapted, assimilated, and ingrained over time rather than spontaneous introspective processing associated with sharing a single story.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

Henry Ford I was the participant’s representation of competence, character, achievement, and humility. The participant explained, “He paid \$82 million in income

tax when he was building the Model-T Ford, which paid all of the government expenses. He alone sent in more money than the government cost. And he was every ounce a leader. If you read the story on Henry Ford, you'll find that he was the guy that paid the first five dollars a day to his help which created a whole new avenue of consumerism. He put people on wheels. He created—think of the industries that he created” (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007).

Representational Systems

In terms of representational systems, leadership was described in visual and auditory terms, with the latter appearing to be the distinctive qualifier. Initially, the participant expressed, “I see the person who sets by example. I can see people that teach someone to do things” (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007). This was later expanded to be “observing the actions” as being louder than words, as confirming reputation. When qualification was sought, the auditory distinction was offered by the participant as, “I hear a communicator . . . You can hear it in their voices when you hear them speak . . . I can measure that up in one sentence. When I say, ‘I think that you’re on the right track,’ as opposed to when I say, ‘I believe you are on the right track.’ The word ‘believe’ becomes a powerful word and it replaces the word think if you are sincere . . . And if you think this is the way to go, there’s some areas that you’re not sure of. On the other hand, if you believe in what you’re doing, it makes a difference” (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007).

Themes

Competence and character signified leadership thematically for Participant 1. Competence was distinguishable in terms of willingness and ability to perform a job as known by reputation. For example, when explaining why the participant selected a given individual for a managerial responsibility, he stated, "I wanted to get a job done and he could do it . . . Because he came from a successful dealership" (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007). This was in contrast to another individual described, "He had been there for years, but he was not an effective manager . . . He did all the things a managers should do, but he was not an aggressive person and he wasn't familiar with the wholesale business. And he wasn't the type that wanted to go out and call on people and solicit new business. He felt uncomfortable in that position" (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007). Beyond reputation, success in terms of achievement that outlasts the individual defined competence. Examples offered were Roy Kumm, the owner of the Hielman Brewery in La Crosse, Wisconsin, and the originator of the annual Oktoberfest celebration held in La Crosse and Henry Ford I.

Character testified to as the attributes of humility, conviction, and putting others first. Humility was attributed to an unstated number of others all described in the same way, "They worked hard and they were just plain everyday people. They'd come down in the morning, have coffee, and talk to everybody . . . never bragged, never said a word to anybody" [about personal accomplishment or wealth] (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007). Conviction was previously noted in the observation of that which is heard in the communication of leaders. The 'people first' attitude was expressed in associating

service with customers, “No matter how you slice it, if you’re going to make it, you’re going to be another way of serving that customer” (P 1, personal communication, 11/7/2007).

Description

Leadership was a necessary managerial responsibility requiring competence and character identifiable by reputation and measurable in terms of the durability of achievement. Competence was the technical skill required to perform the needed job while providing direction and development to subordinates. Character was an umbrella term for the social skills exhibited. Humility, conviction, and a ‘people or others first’ approach to human relations signified character.

Participant 2

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“The process of getting people to do things . . . it has to be tailored to the task at hand, the people you have involved, and what--so it has a flexible.” (P 2, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Participant recounted his experience with a former supervisor at the beginning of his career. Context was a group of research scientists working for a federal agency. The supervisor was employed with the agency prior to the participant joining the group. The supervisor was appointed to manage the group assembled for the particular research project.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

“A balance” (P 2, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Representational Systems

The participant’s primary representational system was consistently kinesthetic. The spontaneous response was about process/doing, and the symbol offered was a balance, implying a physical activity. Sandwiched between these elements were the illustrative points to recounting the story, and its details were about behavior. Interestingly, while verbal communication was kinesthetic in orientation, eye-accessing cues indicated visual cognitive processing (predominate visual recall and construction).

Themes

The term leadership was used synonymously with management under the rubric of expectation. That is, the participant looked to the manager for governance, direction, guidance, and assessed the manager’s performance in terms of technical and social skills. For example, “one would be the focus aspect of being able to . . . where are we going with all--with whatever it is that were doing. The other thing would be assessing what resources or people are available” (P 2, personal communication, 11/13/2007). Conviction and discretion were discernable through project and personal management behaviors. Project management was expressed by the participant as the manager having maintained group focus through utilization of consensus decision-making to facilitate the process, when appropriate, and individual direction and instruction as necessary. Social skills were described as follows:

But the way he ran our particular unit was really effective . . . He was blunt and abrupt, but you always knew where he stood, good or bad. And, I guess, part of his style was ‘If you screwed up, you were going to know about it.’ But if you did something that was good, he would let you know that with the same level of enthusiasm, I guess, for lack of a better word. So it was, I mean, good, bad, or indifferent, you knew exactly where things stood (P 2, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

While the group was described as largely “lab rat” types, with one cantankerous personality in the mix, the manager was popular within the group while not outside the group. Moreover, ambassadorship toward out-groups was expressed as,

When it came time to run things up the ladder further, you know, that was mostly his role . . . I think he even said this one time, it was to deal with the upper echelons of the administration and keep them out of our way . . . An example of that would be from time to time we would have congressmen and senators, what not, come through. And as one of the other scientists mentioned one day, when that happens . . . he is in his element. (P 2, personal communication, 11/13/2007)

Description

Leadership was the managerial balancing of technical and social skills relative to contingent demands. Three foci separated it from routine managerial performance. First was conviction to task, with the personal and shared needs of the group to attain commitment. Second was constraining with task direction, while allowing freedom of discretion toward completion. Third was poising in-group representation, with ambassadorship toward out-groups.

Participant 3

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“Someone up front” (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007). This someone was described further as a male figure telling people what to do.

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Participant recounted youth experience of participating in the Boy Scouts. Group size was approximately 50 boys of 16-17 years of age. Organizational structure was hierarchical. The Troop Master was one individual assisted by two Assistant Pack Leaders. The assistants direct a group of eight group leaders that manage the activities of a group of five scouts. The Assistant Pack Leader was described as “an ordinary man about town with a passion to help kids find their own talents,” a high school janitor by profession, and being in early 20s (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

“Rabbit.” (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007)

They have a mind of their own . . . they’re pretty independent and . . . you can only accomplish goals with their willing cooperation. But still, you can get them out from underneath the furniture and you can get them into their cage with a bit of nudging, a bit of herding. And so I was just think that, well, kids are like rabbits. They’re all over the place. No matter how hard you yell, you may not get all their attention. But you can still nudge them. You can kind of move them into the--to get to accomplish what your--what the goal or what the objectives are. (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007)

Representational Systems

There was no apparent pattern of one representational system predominating. The spontaneous response to the word leadership and the symbol offered were both visual representations, i.e., a person up front and a rabbit. However, the expositions of these visual representations were auditory, e.g., “telling you what to do” and kinesthetic, e.g., nudges and herding. Eye-accessing cues indicated internal dialogue processing visual and auditory recall and construction prior to verbalization.

Themes

Acknowledging management as leadership was in the unquestioning acceptance of the hierarchical structure of the organization, reasoning that the structure provides for leadership. Secondly in the response, “The kids would wander . . . There are so many opportunities and avenues to take that there needs to be an influence that directs them along how to consolidate the views of 40, 50 people into an activity that everyone, or most everyone, or a lot of them, can participate in” to the ‘without a leader’ sentence stem (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007). Leadership was qualified as distinctive from management through three themes. First was in its purpose of developing youth as future leaders rather than mere task completion. The organization was described as having an agenda to promote the skill development of the youth through educational opportunities and by moving up the ranks. “I think the whole goal was that he wouldn't be needed as the leader. That the organization would run itself without the influence . . . It had to be kids” (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007). Second was transparency of authority. “It was not a dictatorial or authoritarian type organization, but rather these are your opportunities” and “his approach was one of recognizing the contributions of others and not always being the--not demanding his way” (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007). Third, leadership sought willing participation through group decisions and individual freedom of choice to complete tasks. Three examples illustrate. “Providing the guidance on where to go to the future, but not forcing everyone into a set mold, into a set procedure,” “Letting others develop the agenda and letting the others take ownership in

what was going to be done,” and “Leaders let people find their kind of pathway to the goal” (P 3, personal communication, 11/15/2007).

Description

Leadership was management set apart in three respects. Its purpose was the development of youth as future leaders rather than mere task completion. While there was a hierarchical structure, authority was transparent rather than overt. Leadership sought willing participation through group decisions and individual freedom of choice to complete tasks.

Participant 4

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“Friends” (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007). “If they were here it would be a group of people just right there that are leaders” (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007). This image is associated as kinesthetically as comfort. Describing the group image as friendly in terms of encouraging, open, but definite people who have good ideas that the participant believes can be trusted. “They are just as interesting, challenging group of people to be with” (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Present supervisor, a political appointee described as decisive/action oriented, patient, social, and supportive. Prior to his appointment, the supervisor was a farmer and a state legislator professionally. Participant discussed this supervisor in both broad and detailed terms expressing, “Not on a specific incident . . . It’s more of a whole picture, a whole way of dealing with things . . . because of his way of dealing with me, with the

other people who are support staff, with the other commissioners, directors, calling the meetings . . . I guess there's so many incidents that they all fit in together" (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

"A rock or a mountain . . . it's from some insurance company . . . it's solid" (P4, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Representational Systems

Participant reports cognitive processing in visual terms, i.e., picture of friends while clarifying the images kinesthetically, i.e., feelings. Similarly, while observation is predominately visual, "I was impressed by how he handles himself and works with people that he's in the meeting with," the associative details are signified or described auditorially, e.g., "soft spoken, listening, and explaining" (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Eye-accessing cues cannot be commented on with this participant. As with all interviews, the recording of eye-accessing cues on paper was limited to the baseline portion. Notation and tracking of eye movement during Part II of the interview was done during review sessions of each video. In this case, due to an operational error by the researcher, the two-parts of the interview were not video-recorded. Discovery of this error occurred when the researcher sat down to make a duplicate of the recording and review the video. This error, while regretful, was accepted by the researcher as uncorrectable. The researcher choose not to repeat the interview as doing so would violate the letter and spirit of the phenomenological method of utilizing first-time

spontaneous responses. Initially, the researcher was concerned about a potential adverse impact relative to eye movement being indicative of cognitive processing. At the time of the discovery, four of the interviews were completed and reviewed at least once. These initial reviews offered insight into a range of variation in eye accessing cues amongst participants sufficient to conclude that adverse impact in answering the research questions of the study was unlikely. Specifically, eye movement patterns were as unique to individual participants as were the spontaneous response, stories, introspections, and symbols.

Themes

There was consistent orientation to personal values throughout Participant 4's expressions. The supervisor and others considered by the participant were observed as action oriented, bringing individuals together bound to a common vision. Described metaphorically as a net, this ideal is a consistent interaction of values in terms of traits and behaviors. Without the leader . . . "Things could be in a muddle" (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007). The researcher thought clarification of this statement with the alternate sentence fragment *a leader is necessary to* and the participant responded with

Keep everyone together, going on somewhat the same track. There will be variations, but you have to have someone who has a vision of where they want to go and then how to bring everybody along or combine them . . . something like a net that is holding basketballs or soccer balls or whatever . . . So they're all very individually and some will stick out a little further and then this one will stick out a little further, but, you know, come together. And they all get to the same place because they're carried by one person. (P 4, personal communication, 11/13/2007)

From the spontaneous response to the word leadership through description of the primary subject (immediate present supervisor) as well as the comparison to other people recognized as leaders, the terms encouraging, open, definite, trust, interesting, challenging, appreciative, listens, courteous, decisive, confident, and consistent were frequent descriptors. Participant 4 qualified these signifiers in others as being absent or deficient in the participant, stating, “I would like to be able to accumulate a lot of his mannerisms in a sense of doing things” and “I’m not good at networking” (P4, personal communication, 11/13/2007).

Description

Leadership was a catalytic role model that brought individuals together bound to a common vision. Described metaphorically as a net, this ideal was a consistent interaction of values in terms of traits and behaviors. Oriented to action, leadership maintained control by acting decisively, while modeling calm, self-assurance, attentiveness, appreciation, courtesy, and the encouragement of others.

Participant 5

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“My boss” (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Referent was a prior supervisor of the participant and the earliest professional role model encountered by this participant. The participant’s frame of reference was a change in professional circumstances due to organizational change. The prior supervisor was compared and contrasted to the participant’s current supervisor.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

“A dove . . . has a calming effect on me . . . chest puffed out like it knows what it is doing” (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007). The dove was a representation of the role model that exemplifies leadership for the participant. While explaining this symbol, the participant referenced both the dove and his prior supervisor as having this calming effect. Additionally, the reference to the dove was an association to the supervisor. “She knew what she was talking about, and even if she didn’t know what she was talking about, you thought you did because of the way that she stood tall or the way that she portrayed herself. She was just, I mean, it was just mostly like looking and watching. You just had that feeling. You just knew she did” (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007).

Representational Systems

The verbalization used by the participant was visual in orientation. Cognitive processing as determined by eye-accessing cues was a challenge. Eye movements were significantly lateral (left or right) to both visual and auditory questions on the baseline. The participant demonstrated a strong kinesthetic response during part II of the interview session, e.g., flushing of the neck and face, swelling and tearing of the eyes, halting speech at times. In the participant’s words, “I feel like I’m sitting in a doctor’s office and just letting it all out. I actually feel very calm right now, even though I look like I’m all messed up” (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007). As in the baseline, eye movement was predominately lateral with respect to both recall and constructed responses.

Themes

Initially, the participant compared and contrasted a current supervisor with the exemplifying model to qualify the distinction of management to leadership.

Leadership to me it's someone that is your boss that can teach you everything they do so you can live up to their level . . . Not just a boss that's your boss and tells you what to do . . . After seeing that, I didn't realize with my old boss how much of a leader she was, and how good at making me be good she was until I realized with my new boss that I'm not getting that anymore . . . I had someone in a leadership role teaching me all this and teaching me how to be like her, and how to be a leader, and now I don't have that anymore. And it's a big difference. (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007)

However, the key comparison was to the parental role models especially the participant's mother. It is in this that the themes of nurturing, desire to please, and replication of example were evident.

My mom is a giver, but she is not outgoing . . . she's [the prior supervisor] more outgoing than my mom is. And so I think we [participant and siblings] took the negative of, not that that's negative, but the negative of what we saw and the good of what we saw and we kind of put it together . . . it was learned from them [parents] . . . it was just something that we [participant and siblings] saw . . . I think a lot of the leadership that I feel I have or that I could have is very learned because I learned it from my old boss. She instilled all that in me, but it's because . . . I saw her and I wanted to be like her . . . She he was like a mom, but like a friend and then also a boss . . . But when I was with her, I felt like I really knew what I was talking about because I think she was like my rock. She would tell me, you know, she would be there if I did say something wrong, she could be there to fix it or she could tell me afterward . . . I felt like I was more confident about it because she was there either reassuring me or telling me, 'Yeah. That was right.' I don't feel I have that right now. Just in my work aspect in my life. My personal side of my life I have my mom telling me that. Which doesn't always make me feel confident either. (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007)

Dependency was noted in the expressions, “Without the leader I would be afraid of failure,” “I could always rely on her to tell me if I was doing the right thing,” “I feel like I am lost . . . I feel like I have this void that I’m searching for” [since becoming disconnected from the role model] (P 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007).

Description

Leadership was a surrogate nurturing relationship experienced as the desire to please by replicating the example of sharing and service with a continuing dependency for guidance and approval in achieving expectations. The chosen role model, while sharing similar attributes of the parent, was distinct in that the perceived strengths (e.g., power projection, establishing connectedness, and reinforcing confidence) of the one were the identified shortcomings of the other.

Participant 6

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“Leadership is not only positional, but is a product of the environment that the individual grows up in or lives in; is exposed to . . . It is not only being an example but it is being at the point. Being an overseer as well as an individual who has skills, knowledge, and wisdom and knows how to use them” (P 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007). When asked if there was a visual, auditory, or kinesthetic response to the word, the participant reported seeing previous examples of teachers, supervisors, and elected officials; hearing nothing; and feeling confidence. Confidence was described as relative to the perception the participant maintained of an identified leader of the latter’s knowledge and skill to address the present situation or problem.

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Participant 6 recounted an experience in which the scope, time, and consequences comprising an opportunity were overwhelming, describing it as, “I felt no matter what I did it wasn’t going to be right . . . You’re in charge, well, you’re the one we want the results from, but were not done to give you any help to do the data entry . . . So, I was feeling like I was under the microscope and under fire to get the job done without the available or proper resources (P 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007). As described by the participant, in this situation, a senior experienced coworker, occupying a disconnected supervisory role, took control and “brought order to chaos” as it related to a large project—going against the grain of supervision solving the problem as it related to getting the project done (P 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

“A hawk on a branch of a tree looking out, surveying the situation, surveying the prairie. Looking for the opportunity for its next meal. Looking for the opportunity for the circumstances that it had before it” (P 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007). The symbol was descriptive of this supervisory colleague as noted in the participant’s explanation. He was, “willing to go into the fight every day knowing that the work has gotta get done, but still being there, being visible as well as being willing to work towards the end of the project or towards the end of the large data entry project that was ahead of us” (P 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Representational Systems

While eye movement, during part II of the interview, indicated predominance to auditory recall based on the base line from part I of the interview, this was difficult to confirm because the participant frequently closed his eyes when responding to cue questions in part I of the interview. Of significance was that, while the participant labeled representations as emotions, the verbalizations and metaphors used by the participant were all kinesthetic references and were associated with control, either its loss or capture, as in taking control. Examples were against the grain, under the microscope, under fire, marine invasion, D-Day, step up, step back, step out of the fire, and heated argument.

Themes

Synonymy of management and leadership was implied during the interview through the recognition of hierarchy, supervision, and the qualification between good and bad leadership. For example,

Good leadership is a combination of knowing the circumstances, be open to others' opinions as well as being in control of the situation. Bad leadership I associate and more with positional leadership where an individual may be elected to a president position or an officer position because no one else wanted to step up. Yes, they have a position of power. They have a position within an organization, but they don't have—they're not there by design . . . They are both leadership because those individuals hold positions of power. Both individuals are looked upon by others as someone who can help solve the situation, solve a problem. (Participant 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007)

Moreover, Participant 6 distinguished good leadership from bad leadership through comparison contrast. "He self-appointed taking control of the situation and just making it easier versus supervision or supervisors at the time who had a very top down

philosophy and didn't really know the nitty-gritty on how to get it done. They just wanted the results" (Participant 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007). Confidence and reassurance were evident in the participant's reporting of how the catalytic actions of the self-appointee shaped perceptions of the individual and situation. Specifically, "He took me aside, in essence took me under his wing, and just very calmly reassured me as it relates to getting this project, the large data project, done and just brought a sense of calm to the situation . . . I was the one that was going to have to give the results, but I wasn't alone in that circumstances . . . My perception was . . . willing to step forward, get his hands dirty, to be there beside me . . . to pull his own weight and not rest on his laurels of his position" (Participant 6, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Description

Leadership was a choice to act as a catalyst, with a specific plan of action, in response to a specific opportunity. This choice reflected an affirmative self-assessment of one's experiential competence to take control of the situation. Looked to by others in need of confidence and reassurance, the power of this catalyst to unite a group was in the demonstrated willingness to solve the problem or provide guidance in completing the task by, stepping forward; assisting; getting hands dirty; getting in the trenches; or work along side others.

Participant 7

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

"Being in charge" (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Participant began with reference to high school experience involving a baseball team, coach, and team captains and compared-contrasted this initial experience with personal relationships and then chronologically up to present work context. The participant's confession of being a skeptic, "my nature as a researcher is to question" characterized the tone and substance of the interview (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

None.

Representational Systems

Auditory representation appeared to be the preferred or primary system. Eye movement was lateral (auditory recall and constructed) with a pattern of internal dialogue before verbalizing. Likewise, verbalization was consistent with auditory cues, e.g., quiet, teaching presentations on humor, sales, sharing, seminars, and listening were repeatedly referenced. Similarly, "quiet confidence" was contrasted to boastful or loud individuals. For example, "It's not the people out there that look like they've just gone to a motivational speaking seminar and come out all rah, rah, rah and all that crap. You know, I kind of like the people with a quiet confidence" (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Themes

Leadership was personal; relative to the individual's biases as illustrated in statements such as, "it all depends on what works for a particular person," "different stuff

works for different people,” “What it really comes down to is do you agree with the way things went with him or not? So, it would be a lot of differences in the perception too” and “leaders are people you like being around” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007). Individual perception was relative to credibility, which was defined as demonstrated by doing—“somebody who’s been down in the trenches and somebody who can come out of a group of people. And people know that that person shares some common experiences” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007). The participant discussed leadership from the frame of reference of self and others who exercised a choice to seek or accept responsibility, to take charge, as a means of getting something done. Similarly, the participant identified “followership” as a preference or choice, stating, “I know some people who probably would just as soon follow a little bit more and not take on the leadership” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007). In so doing, the key element was participation and consensus. Descriptive expressions of this theme were, “Keep them a part of the decision-making process,” “keep them involved in the process so they feel a part of it . . . not just real dictatorial type of leadership that is based on nothing more than authority,” and “trusting them to do it and part of it is to understand that at times you’re going to do things differently than you would do it and that’s okay. Sometimes maybe it’s better than okay. Sometimes you really find out that you’re happier by having let them do it and you like the outcome better. But even if you don’t, you realize that that’s part of it” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007).

Description

Leadership was in the eye of the beholder. It was a perception by one, relative to present attitude and prior respective experience, about another's behavior. It was a choice in terms of governing and guiding, either to act as a group vehicle or willingly with the group's means in some social action. Ideally, leadership was as an evolving representation of group consensus about desires, values, and norms.

*Participant 8**Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership*

"I think of a position of power . . . I see an image of a person up above and leading people down below" (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Participant relied heavily on recounting examples from history that are/ were considered exemplary, i.e., McArthur, Patton, Churchill, Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and Hitler. "The people I read about are men of destiny. They are put on this earth for a reason . . . When I think of leadership, I'm thinking on those terms" (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007). General McArthur was the most referenced amongst the aforementioned. The researcher assumed this is because, according to the participant's admission, a historical biography of General McArthur was the most recently read material.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

None.

Representational Systems

Eye-accessing cues as determined from review of the video recording of both the baseline (Part I) and content (Part II) of interview demonstrated that this participant's eyes did not move down during cognitive processing. During Part I, response to kinesthetic oriented questions was up and to the left. Responses to auditory (internal dialogue) cued questions was laterally to the right. Likewise, there was no downward looking movement of the eyes by the participant during Part II of the interview. During Part II of the interview eye movement was predominately lateral (left or right). This was consistent with the likely auditory aspect of reading. This may be relevant to the participant's professed prejudice toward reading, e.g., historical biographies, self-help books, and other unspecified material to satisfy curiosities about leaders and leadership. That is, the reliance on printed sources for consideration would put a heavy emphasis on the imagination. It was indicative, in this case, that cognition was association based.

Themes

There was an implicit understanding by the participant that people who want change must make it happen. "Looking back to the founding fathers, it was a little bit of both. They wanted change, and for that change to happen, Brian, they needed to get out front in the leadership. They need to get people to follow them. They needed people to buy in to the vision that they had for the country" (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007). That scale of change of magnitude originated in a rare belief in self and one's purpose and the projection of a consistent personal image. For example, "They all have one thing in common. They all thought that they had a destiny to them and they did .

. . . McArthur, he was born a leader. He knew from an early age he was born to lead men. That was his destiny. And he was told that from an early age” (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Likewise, “Let’s go back to McArthur . . . he was very big on image. He realized the power of image. Whenever you see a picture of him, he’s looking off into the distance. He’s got his shoulders back. He’s got his back straight looking out to the horizon. He has that confident look to him. George Patton was the same way. He practiced that war scowl for 20 years. Whenever you see Patton, he’s got that scowl . . . They had self confidence and they knew how to project it” (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Finally, that a personal linguistic connection at an individual level en masse stimulated belief in the leader and energized action. For example, “Being a people person is being energized by people. It’s being able to connect with them . . . When they speak to a crowd of a thousand and you’re in the audience, it feels like they’re speaking directly to you” (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007). One statement encapsulated this belief thoroughly and succinctly, “I think the real mark of a leader is that ability to connect. That’s really what it comes down to. It’s the ability to connect with vision and buy into your vision. And, Brian, leaders have self confidence and self assurance. Now, if they don’t believe in themselves and what they’re trying to sell, why would anyone else believe in them? So it all starts with their belief” (P 8, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Description

Leadership was a reciprocally energizing relationship between a hero and followers through image management. The relationship began with the leader and

extended to a population. The hero offering originated in the confidence of a destiny to change the lives of followers for the better. The power of conviction was observable in the posture and conversation of the catalyst, and the resultant shared belief in the leader and enthusiasm amongst followers for achieving the vision.

Participant 9

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“A former manager of mine . . . someone who I thought I learned a lot from . . . I felt she had very good skills” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

A prior supervisor with whom the participant shared an initial and significant professional relationship over an extended period was offered. The significance of this relationship was notable on two levels. Directly was the participant’s sharing of a sense of loss, noted as “frustration, confusion, a knot in the stomach,” as a result of experiencing disconnection with this manager’s choice to seek an alternate professional opportunity (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). The degree of assimilation of the esteemed manager’s philosophy and practice was indirectly observed in the participant’s expressions throughout the interview. “So, probably what ever that feeling is I managed to get in my employees, this woman got in me” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Three categorical examples suffice. First, the participant’s theory of staff: “a third is always going to exceed your expectations, a third is going to be about average, and a third you’re going to want to throttle” is adapted from the manager (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Second, a frequent and consistent cross-referencing of the

manager and self, i.e., the participant was recounting something about herself and switched to referencing the previous manager and vice versa. For example, “you work with them towards that, but she tried to find a way to help them” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Third, when counseling a colleague or subordinate the advice shared was a replication of advice or practice modeled by the highly esteemed manager.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

“A star” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Participant continued the description as a shooting path or something else coming out behind it in a bright gold color. The symbol was from memory and reflected a signification of the employment environment. “I think it’s because of the pins that we get for star performers. In all honesty. But that’s the first thing that popped into my head” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Representational Systems

The baseline portion of the interview indicated eye-accessing patterns of accessing the left hemisphere of the brain. Recall cues of visual and auditory were both down and to the right when facing the participant. Auditory constructed was lateral to the right. The auditory constructed cue was diagonally up to the right. Kinesthetic access was in the lower right hemisphere according to accessing cues. In contrast, there was definitive eye movement to the upper left and lateral left in response to specific questions, however, this movement was insufficient to support the identification of pattern. The verbally expressed portion of content interview did not indicate a preference

to any one representational system. The theme of connecting with people was expressed visually, auditorially, and kinesthetically. The theme of relating to subordinates from the subordinates frame of reference also lacked a demonstrated preference to a preferred representational system.

Themes

Leadership was supervisory management. When asked for leadership examples, about opportunities to exercise leadership, or explanations regarding details, the participant responded with the word management. The supervisory focus was emphasized throughout the interview, with the exposition and illustration of coaching and motivation. Two statements illustrated this focus. “She tended to coach all of us to our own strengths. She managed a group of managers. What she was able to do for each of us is see what it was we did best and build on that, but also be able to point areas that might be some causes for concern for us” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). “I was able to get staffs to perform for me. And I was able to get people wanting to succeed because they were working with me and they were having fun with me . . . I have an innate ability to motivate groups of people . . . And I still probably to this day couldn’t pinpoint what it is about me that gets people fired up and ready to go, but I think I work with them to try and figure out what it does for them” (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). In order to lead, to manage, to motivate one must demonstrate a personal interest in the subordinate and relate to each person from that individual’s frame of reference:

You know, you hold them accountable at the end of the day to what gets done and you work with them towards that, but she tried to find a way to help them work with their skills and what works with them or what do you

need to do to motivate them to do it . . . So, it just learning enough about the person to care and to ask those questions and to touch base with them . . . Different people through different things. Some were competition. Some needed to see what was everyone else was doing and know that they were on top. Some were encouragement. They just needed me to and say hey how are things going? What's working for you today? Is there something I can help you with? Others were those that like to learn. So, it was being able to do something new for them all the time. So, it was coming up with something new for them to try, a different way to do it, or have them maybe do some teaching. That helped them out too. There's always the people that are incented by money, so then it was breaking down what the sales goals were today and saying okay this is how much money you can end up making. It was finding what clicked for each of the people. (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007)

This interest and empathy included the broader social context of subordinates, as conveyed by the story of the participant's awareness of personal situations, prompting a call to employee assistance counseling to offer available resources to immigrants with special needs. The meaning of this act for the subordinates involved was reported as, "we had five or six people at our branch at that point in time and it was just, like wow, I can't believe you cared enough to do something like this. And I'm like I didn't know what else to do. I don't know how to help you guys when you send money and you don't even know if it's going to get the people or even if it gets to them; if they're going to be able to get the money home to them" (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Description

Leadership was achieving, through the power of human connection, a desired performance level by a group through management of individual motivations from each follower's viewpoint. Three connections communicated interest, caring, and stimulate a desire to perform. First was assessing and coaching contributing skills and abilities in

terms of potentials and limitations. Second was awareness of and sensitivity to ambition and interest triggers. Third was empathy to the social context and its potential influence on performance.

Participant 10

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

“Visions” (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Four referents were shared by the participant—cooking as metaphor, advice offered by graduate schoolteacher, a childhood memory involving a foreman, and the participant’s personal practices. The commonality among these was the use of the word leadership by the participant when referring to management and managerial competence in terms of delegating, decision-making, and supervisory skills.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

North Star. “Well, through history, through the last 2200 years, human beings have been, at least the human race, has been using the stars as the guidance in sailing true and finding new world. And to me a leader should be the one enable to the path” (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Representational Systems

The baseline portion of the interview indicated eye-accessing patterns of accessing the right hemisphere of the brain. Both recall and constructed visual and auditory cues were lateral and to the right when facing the participant. Kinesthetic access was of notable interest in that physically associated references were diagonally down to

the left (facing participant), while emotionally referenced cues were diagonally up to the left (facing participant). The expressed portion of content interview showed a consistent pattern of lateral left (facing participant) or the right hemisphere of the brain. The content interview was particularly interesting, in that while visual was the primary verbal orientation to leadership, e.g., visions were the spontaneous response choice relative to visual appeal, navigation as the theme of explanation of the symbol of the North Star, the kinesthetic representation of taste was the explanatory vehicle elucidating the participant's perceptions.

Themes

People respond to that which they find attractive (dynamic) and choose that which they find familiar (static). Testimony of the dynamic was in analogous terms of meal as metaphor and charisma. Meals were spoken of by the participant as “old Chinese saying about cuisine, that there is three main ingredients of our cuisine or any dish . . . color, smell, and taste . . . you have got to have that three combination” (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007). More specifically, to be attractive, meals were to be fresh, new, different, color (jump, contrast, vivid); a wow smell, and stimulating, or “savory” to use the participant's adjective to taste. “It is one who can combine multiple and classic cuisine and come up with a new cuisine or a new fusion, a new product. And that tastes wonderful. That tastes fresh. That tastes different . . . a fusion cuisine leader the one that in a way can create something brand new, create a buzz ” (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007). Similarly, charisma was described as image, adventurous, risk taking, bold,

confidence, passion, direction/ vision, energy, appeal. The cross connection from meal as metaphor to charisma was Richard Branson.

I think culinary experience . . . a lot of time leadership is kind of like that . . . Richard Branson . . . Well, he's one guy that can create a buzz in industry, in the world extremely well and he's able to create a successful business. There are other leaders in the world that, well, I say—I should say leader, but more of a successful businessman in the world. Bill Gates. Now, he is a businessman. Now he is—he is a successful leader? Tough to say. I don't really look at Bill Gates as a leader. I really look at him as maybe a genius. Branson? He's a pretty unique leader. And every leader seems to be able to, I mean, when we talk about charismatic leader. Okay. Richard's able to create his own personal charisma. Bill Gates, I think he will die trying. (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007)

In contrast, Participant 10 testified to the static (stable, reliable, familiar) element through the story of the three skills and a childhood memory. These two short references highlighted the social and technical skills of managing.

When I was in my grad school, one my professors said to me that what he learned from his previous employer, the CEO of the company of ADC Communications and the he back then told me that three things you need to remember in life. First is competency. The second is communication and the third is courtesy. Say you may spend the first five, ten years acquiring competency to do you job. You may be another ten to twenty years to perfect your communications. But you will spend a lot of time even until the end of your life to perfect courtesy because a lot of people when they move up this corporate ladder or achieve what they have, they forgot to be—they forgot to be a courteous person. They become a jerk. They will choose to boss people around. So to him courtesy is something you will spend probably all the rest of your life seeking for. It's not a story. But it explains how I feel. It was told to me probably seven years ago and I chose now to remember that one short conversation I had with this person.

You know, I believe the ability not the skill—people keep saying a good leader should have good people skill. And it's funny you mention it. We talk about leadership today because a couple of days ago I was thinking, you know, leader does not have to exist in a high level in a corporation. He exists among us. And while I was looking—actually I walked by this

construction site. I heard this foreman talking to his people. It kind of reminded me back to my childhood because I grew up in the environment that the foreman may have to speak like five different languages in order to get people to work. And a lot of time foreman will be the person that people have chosen as someone they can trust, someone that they will listen to. At least the worker will listen to the laborer. The worker listen to that stuff. And in a way that foreman is the leader in that group. You could be the senior engineer in the construction site. You're nothing if the foreman would not agree what your approach is going to be. (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007)

Participant 10 leaned to the idea of leadership being requisite, expressing the idea that a loss of identified leader or leadership handicaps a group's action but does not stop it. Rather, according to Participant 10, while leader was a symbol or representation of group and its intentions, the leader follower relationship was reciprocal in that social action empowered leadership while leadership (the act of managing) empowered action.

Without a leader . . . it's like a dragon without a head . . . In all, the most of the story books that I've read, dragon is portrayed as a strong, sometimes fearful animal. Can be harmful; can be friendly. A dragon without a head is pretty dangerous. Imagine you have a big dragon without a head running around. You never know whether this dragon will be friendly or harmful. And hopefully with that head, at least he'll surface intent and "the decision making process for me is the way to empower the people that work with me. In return, it will empower the leadership. (P 10, personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Description

Leadership was a static-dynamic symbol by which people navigate the course of social action. As static, leadership was amongst us as a familiar representation selected for its demonstrated managerial competence. As dynamic, leadership was separate from us and desired for its embodiment of savory character traits.

Participants' Unified Description of Leadership

To discern a single unified description, the researcher reviewed each participant record and the agreed upon descriptions for commonalities. This portion of the data set is reported in the same fashion as that of each participant. Responses to each of the three primary questions, representational systems, and themes are reported from a macro perspective.

Protocol Inquiry 1: Leadership

Seven of the ten participants reported that the first thing that came to mind upon hearing the word “leadership” was a person or people. Six of the seven identified a supervisory authority figure either present, past, or symbolically. One participant’s initial response was an image of a group of people. The three remaining identifications were descriptive attributions—process, position, and vision—serving a group function.

Protocol Inquiry 2: Share a Story

Eight of the ten participants identified a personal past role model as exemplifying leadership. These role models were immediately “lived experiences” that were initial and demarked a defining ideal and established an ongoing developmental influence for participants. Participant 4 was alone in identifying a present manager/supervisor as the role model of choice. Participant 8 was unique in that while defining the standard that exemplified leadership the role models were identified through study as historical and having uncommon legends associated with them. All ten participants considered the exemplification replicable. However, Participant 8 was alone in viewing the role models as being beyond facsimile by the participant or the common person. That is, the

demonstration of leadership was by a rare character of person nurtured by and to a specific environmental context.

Protocol Inquiry 3: Symbol

When asked for a symbol of leadership, only one participant identified a human being, i.e., Henry Ford. Four identified an inanimate object—a balance, a rock, a shooting star, and the North Star. Three identified an animal—a rabbit, a dove, and a hawk. Two participants had no symbolic reference. Six of the symbols represented the role model discussed by the participant; two were representative of experience; and two were conceptual representations.

Representational Systems

All three primary representational systems, i.e., visual, auditory, and kinesthetic were in evidence. Noteworthy within these significations was the primary representation system elucidating it. The meaning of four of these representations elucidated through one system, although initially signified through another system. Specifically, Participant 1 identified behavior as a broad category of representation and then isolated an auditory distinction. Participant 2 kinesthetically signified with the label of process, but then unified that descriptor with a visual image of a military commander (a General), citing fluidity of approach despite uniformity of desired outcome. Participant 4 identified a collective image of “friends” as categorical, isolating the commonality of a physical feeling of calmness when focusing on any one of the individuals. Participant 10 was distinct in associating a visual label of “Visions” through the kinesthetic representation of taste. The remaining six participants consistently signified in terms of a visual

representation—an image of a person occupying a relative occupational role. That is, a supervisory authority in relation to the participant. A summary of the study interview responses is shown in Table 1.

There are three summary observations made from the eye-accessing cue data collected. First, as suggested by Bandler and Grinder (1976) eye-accessing cue patterns are individually unique. The challenge observed during collection of baseline data was that cue questions must be immediately relevant to the participant or presented as stimulating to cognition. In those instances when a participant did not relate to the stimulus question e.g., the sound of a chainsaw in a corrugated tin shed, the researcher observed no eye movement. Second, the predominant eye-accessing cues were consistent with the representational system(s) referenced verbally e.g., visual recall and visual construction when using visual oriented language, auditory recall and auditory constructed when describing sound, and kinesthetic when behavioral. Predominately amongst these systems was visual recall and visual construction. This raises the question, is the predominance of visual a result of nature or nurture? Third, eye-accessing cues are indicative of cognitive processing. Two observations were consistent across participants. First, eye movement preceded verbalization. Second, association of participant's verbal expression was consistent to specific eye-movement. For example, prior to describing a visual image participants eye movements were indicative of visual recall. The observations made during the interviews and analysis of the video recordings raises the question, given the uniqueness of patterns amongst participants is eye-movement

indicative of specific areas or regions of the brain being activated when stimulated with a comment or question.

Table 1.

Summary of Participant Responses to Interview Questions

P	Q1: 1st Response	Elucidation	Q2: Referent	Q3: Symbol
1	Role Model	Auditory	Authority figure, prior & Self	Person (Henry Ford)
2	Process	Kinesthetic	Supervisor, Prior	Balance
3	Person (Front), Male	Visual	Authority Figure, Prior	Rabbit
4	Friends	Kinesthetic	Supervisor, Present	Rock
5	Supervisor, Prior	Visual	Supervisor, Prior	Dove
6	Role Model	Visual	Colleague	Hawk
7	Person, Authority	Visual	Authority Figure, Prior	
8	Position of power	Visual	Role Model, Historical, Macro	Pinnacle of Pyramid
9	Supervisor, Prior	Visual	Supervisor, Prior	Shooting Star
10	Vision	Kinesthetic (Taste)	Teacher, Role Models, Self	North Star

Themes

There are seven themes across the ten descriptions—(a) management, (b) choice, (c) depiction, (d) context, (e) competence, (f) character, and (g) imprinting. In the initial conception of this study, the initial research question was: Is leadership a societal requisite or collective social fantasy? Seeking some insight into this question, one of two sentence stems, i.e., “Without a leader . . .” and “A leader was necessary because . . .” were presented to participants for completion. At the surface level, there was confession, either anecdotally or metaphorically, of a presupposition of necessity for management in the form of governance for nine of the ten participants. This necessity can be reported as

direction, vision, control, e.g., “you’re like a boat without a rudder” (P 1), and “someone ultimately needs to be able to stand up and say, okay, well, here is how it needs to end or here is when we know we’re going to be done” (P 9) and “it’s like a ship on an ocean without a wind. It really doesn’t have any direction, any purpose” (P 8). The necessity of governance was discussed as follows: without leadership there is anarchy, the necessity to keep everyone together going on somewhat the same track, about solving problems and being in control, and the lack of coordination resulting in a lack of effectiveness or intention. Management was also thematic in terms of guidance, as testified to by seven of ten participants through the discussion of vision and direction. Three participants spoke to the necessity of vision. According to Participant 10, “A leader should be a person that can envision what’s coming up and conduct and convey that message or convey that visions to his or her followers or subordinates” (personal communication, 10/29/2007). “You have to have someone who has a vision of where they want to go and then how to bring everybody along or combine them” (P 4, personal communication, 10/13/2007). Finally, Participant 9 stated, “As far as leading—the person who is able to stand there and say, hey, this is the point we need to get to. This is how we’re going to know when we’re done” (personal communication, 10/29/2007).

Choice was the selection amongst four alternatives and acting accordingly in a given situation. There was leadership, or, to act as a catalyst; followership, or, to accept another individual’s decision to act as a catalyst; abstention, or, to do nothing; or resist as a catalyst; or follower, who one will exercise in response to change. In a situation, there was likely to be an appointed leader, who became part of the assessment. The question

each person asked: Is it desirable and achievable to self-appoint as the leader in the situation? Second and subsequent questions were of the identified leader: What is that person's competence? and What is that person's character to address the situation? If one deems one's competence and character to be both adequate and appropriate, then one chooses to pursue the opportunity to exercise leadership (e.g., P1, P3, P7, and P10). If one deems one's competence and or character to be inadequate (e.g., P5, P6, P8, and P9) or inappropriate (e.g., P2 and P4), then one exercises the option to accept, abstain, or resist another's choice to act as the catalyst and focal point of the group.

Competence was the demonstration of technical skills. Relating to Participant 10's frame of reference, it was that which people found familiar. Alluded to as managerial or job related responsibilities, the challenge with this theme was that there were no dominating skill or skills identified in conjunction with participants' referent of competence. Across participants alluding references ranged from reputation or "proof and performance," solving problems, being effective, assessing situations, staff, and other resources to having good skills or knowledge; and in terms of achievement or ability to develop others (P 9, personal communication, 10/29/2007). To quote participant 1, "I hired a lot boy when I was at . . . who is now the—in charge of the parts and service department down there and has been for quite a few years. But he went to school; he went into the used car department. He became a line mechanic; he became a writer. And some years after I left, Terry made him the parts and service manager. So, you know, he in his own way was a leader" (personal communication, 10/7/2007). Table 2 shows participant responses on competence.

Table 2.

Participants' Responses Regarding Competency (Technical Skills)

Count	Competence	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10
7	Manage	X	X	X			X	X		X	X
6	Achievement/ Results	X	X	X	X		X		X		
	Credibility (Reliability) /										
6	Reputation	X			X		X	X	X	X	
5	Choice/ Decision Making		X	X	X	X		X			
4	Communication	X	X						X		X
4	Skill		X					X	X		X
3	Problem Solution	X				X	X				
3	Responsibility	X	X				X				

Character was the demonstration of social skills. Significance varies in detail amongst participants, from the succinct testimony of making connections (e.g., P 5 and P 9) to the extensive, in which the theme was predominately the character of the exemplifier (e.g., P 4). Similar to competence, there was no dominating signifier. Rather, as read, the list was of traits or attributes observed about the personality being discussed by the participants that were appealing or desired in people, as evidenced by terms like charisma, magnetism, energy, and appeal.

Depiction was the leader being similar, but somehow relatively superior, in competence and character to the individual exercising the choice (e.g., P1, P2, P3, P4, P5,

P6, P8, P9, and P 10). Participant 2 described the exemplifier as coming from within group . . . popular with group who reported to him, but not with people in the larger group. Participant 3 discussed the leader as relative to the group, as having shared a common interest with the group. “Someone who’s been down in the trenches and somebody who can come out of a group of people. And people know that that person shares some common experiences and that persons is going to have more credibility and greater leadership qualities within that group of people than somebody else who’s coming from outside and is just seen as an outsider” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007). This principle offers insight into the qualifier that distinguishes management from leadership. Incumbents assigned the expectation of leadership by authority rather than chosen by the group constituency were labeled managers or poor leaders rather than leaders or accepted as good leaders (e.g., P1, P2, P3, P4, P6, P7, and P 10). In the words of one participant, “I think we’ve all known people who’ve got authority but they got their heads up their butts too or they’re dinks and nobody cares for them. People follow them out of fear and make fun of them as soon as they’re out of site” (P 7, personal communication, 10/15/2007). The qualifier here was one of acceptance by the individual. That is, for leadership to exist, the participant must accept the hierarchical superior or self-appointed catalyst. The three factors of context, competence, and character appear to determine this outcome of acceptance or rejection. Table 3 summarizes the pattern of participant responses when discussing attributes of character.

Table 3.

Participant Responses Indicating Character (Social Skills)

Count	Character	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10
	Respectful/ Recognizing										
8	Others	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
6	Confidence	X			X	X	X	X	X		
5	Listening	X			X		X		X		X
4	Calm/ Control				X	X	X	X			
4	Conviction	X	X				X		X		
3	Appeal			X	X						X
3	Energy/Energize/ Excited				X	X		X			
3	Image					X			X		X
2	Charisma							X			X
2	Guidance			X						X	
1	Aggressiveness	X									
1	Dominance							X			
1	Fortitude								X		
1	Humility	X									
1	Intelligence								X		

Context is a relationship consisting of Scope-Time-Consequence (S-T-C) as individual factors is an implicitly discussed theme that influences the decision-making

process in which choice is exercised. The change is seen as incremental or discontinuous, occurring over a period of time, and either having a specific immediacy or cumulative threat (e.g., P 6). Situations low in urgency (scope) given the routinized nature of the context; time being stretched out (slow relative movement); and consequence is minimal (little or no immediacy of threat) afforded considerable latitude to be critical of technical and especially social skills (e.g., P 7).

Imprinting, as in assimilating, duplicating, or a desire to replicate the attributes and or behaviors of exemplifier, was expressed by six of the participants. During a discussion of the participant's description, Participant 1 shared that attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors was the result of people who he worked for, worked with, and who taught him things (personal communication, 12/7/2007). Participant 3 adopted the style observed as his ideal, expecting it of himself and looking for it in others. Participant 4 expressed, "I would like to be able to accumulate a lot of his mannerisms in a sense of doing things" (personal communication, 10/13/2007). "I think a lot of the leadership that I feel I have or that I could have is very learned because I learned it from my old boss. She instilled all that in me, but it's because I wanted—I saw her and I wanted to be like her" (Participant 5, personal communication, 10/28/2007). Participant 9 demonstrated assimilation and replication by interchangeably referring to the exemplifier and self when recounting details about the leadership experience. Moreover, Participant 9 confessed to getting her managerial philosophy and practices from this designate. Finally, Participant 10 reported this through the personal significance of story of the graduate schoolteacher who advised

of the three skills—competency, communication, and courtesy—and how that has guided his managerial practice.

Description

I experience leadership when I relate to it, accept it, and agree to participate.

Summary

Attaining a unified description was difficult. This study examined 10 in-depth interviews, yielding ten disparate meanings of leadership as lived experience. Moreover, introspection by participants about this lived experience through representational systems as manifest in verbal expression and eye movement patterns indicated a similar lack of uniformity. Lived experience was reported as imprinted—a role model relationship in which the defining standard is established in an initial or early relationship with an occupant in a managerial role. Seven themes were identified through categorization of explicit and implicit data points. Most significant amongst participants was the exercise of choice.

Chapter 5 examines the unified data and description to answer the three research questions of this study, their respective implications, and offers recommendations to further research. The chapter offers four summary conclusions relative to the theoretical framework advanced in chapter 2. These summary conclusions serve as segue to an alternate paradigm examining the role and relationship of leadership in social dynamics. This role and relationship is examined as a socially negotiated and constructed schema derived from individual constituent schemata. The chapter concludes with exposition of

the potential social significance of the findings along with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5:

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 interprets the unified themes and description to answer the three research questions of the study and presents an analysis of the research design. The unified themes and description clarify understanding of the four assumptive components of existence, necessity, origin, and function. The phenomenon of leadership is examined as a socially constructed schema derived from individual constituent schemata emergent through attribution—in a word, myth. The chapter concludes with exposition of the potential social significance of the findings explaining (a) the diversity and complexity of the literature, (b) the lack of an accepted definition of leadership, (c) why leadership training and development fails to achieve the desired result, and (d) the question of the relationship between events and the phenomenon of leadership. The study concludes with five proposals and questions for future research.

Conclusions

Research Question 1

The first question of this research opened inquiry into the components of necessity, origin, and function and their intertwined relationship. “Is social action a result of the phenomenon of leadership or is the phenomenon of leadership a derivative of social action” questions the components of necessity and function. Asking the root question: Is there an archetype?—questions the related component of origin. The three questions were asked as one because three assumptions, as the argument for the existence

of the phenomenon of leadership, are interdependent. Consequently, it is by asking the that latter question, insight into the former may be revealed.

For the purposes of this research, an archetype was defined as an unconscious representation in the psyche common among the collective by which individuals define, identify with, and respond involuntarily or unconsciously to an external embodiment or manifestation, of that representation as stimulus. We navigate life by these representations as perceived and experienced. This identification with and response to an archetype should be consistently reported through one or more of the representational systems that comprise cognitive processing. Given the physical evolution of the brain, this unconscious response was anticipated to be reported as either, first, a physical, or second, an emotive, response to an experienced phenomenon.

Data collection through semi-structured interviews involved three primary questions to ascertain any involuntary or unconscious response(s) as well as potential consistency across participants. The first question asked for a spontaneous response by the participants to the word leadership. This spontaneous response was explored for any representational systems associated with the response. The second question invited the sharing of a story that exemplified leadership to the participant. This second question comprised the core of the interview protocol through careful and deliberate exploration of the shared story. The third question asked for a symbol of leadership. The premise of the third question was that association to an archetype might be more readily available to the research participant after the lengthy introspection of the interview process.

When prompted with the word leadership, six of the responses indicated accessing memories of lived experience, while four were metaphorical. Effort was made to discern the form (i.e., visual, auditory, or kinesthetic) trigger or anchor associated with these responses. Visual associations were experience-based memories. No auditory association was reported. Similarly, no kinesthetic or emotive association was reported. Moreover, of significance is that while participants were asked for the first thing that comes to mind, the delay in response along with eye-movement observed, while studying the video recordings, amongst the majority of participants indicates cognitive processing rather than an unconscious response. Therefore, responses to the verbal cue are inconsistent with the definition of a primordial instinct and consequently, fail to support the idea of an archetype. This result is interpreted to mean that using a verbal cue does not trigger the archetype as a motive force or into cognitive recognition. It indicates that experience is necessary to cue a potential archetype. This however, is an impractical ambition in the face of not knowing the existence of an archetype or that which may trigger it.

The invitation to share a story that exemplified leadership for the participant yielded ten distinct responses. Using the interview protocol, and as cued by participant's responses, each response was explored. Eight of the ten participants identified a personal past role model(s) as exemplifying leadership. These role models were initial and demarked a defining ideal and established an ongoing developmental influence for participants. Participant 4 was alone in identifying a present manager/supervisor as the role model of choice. Participant 8 was unique in that the role models identified were learned about through reading and study of historical biographies beginning in the

participant's youth. While all ten participants considered the exemplification replicable, Participant 8 was alone in believing the role models as being beyond duplication by the common person. That is, Participant 8 believed the demonstration of leadership is by a rare type of person nurtured by and to a specific environmental context. Consequently, any potential replication would require an equally rare individual.

The significant commonality amongst participant stories was a consistent absence of involuntary response when first observing or interacting with the identified leader or in any subsequent experience with that individual. Rather there was consistent demonstration of response to a leader or leadership experience as deliberate choice after a discretionary period of observation and assessment of the individual identified as a managerial authority and the situation in which the participant was in relationship with that individual. The testimony of deliberation and choice is direct contradiction to Jungian archetypal theory as delineated in Chapter 1. If there were a leadership archetype, choice, as factor, would be less prominent in participant conversation.

When asked for a symbol of leadership, six participants symbolized the leader discussed, one participant symbolized leadership as a concept, one participant symbolized experience, and two participants offered no symbol. Exposition of meaning by the participants indicates representation of a range of individual respective schemata rather than a archetype. Succinctly, it appears that asking for a symbol following introspection does not yield accessing a possible unconscious archetype. Rather, introspection focuses cognition on the context and content details of the experience processed.


In summation, while this exploratory study utilized a limited sample, the consistency amongst the spontaneous responses, stories, and symbols was rationalization relating to past or current experiences in conscious memory. In other words, choice is relative to a pattern of contingent assessment of the context, self, and an assigned role or a catalyst. Consequently, it is sufficient to conclude the subjective interpretation of experience does not reveal an archetype. However, the subjective interpretation of experience appears to support the four assumptive components in the following terms.

1. Management, rather than the phenomenon of leadership, is the role and responsibility necessary for social structure and function.
2. The origin of the phenomenon of leadership is emergent reality socially constructed through schemata and the exercise of choice.
3. The role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership indicated both manifest and latent functions.
4. The existence of the phenomenon of leadership is as an artifact of attribution, a belief, a myth, a choice.

The first three conclusions are consistent with an existing recognized body of literature. Examples of this include Hogg (2001), Lord and Emrich (2001), Hunt (2004), Berson, Dan, and Yammarino (2006), Uhl-Bien (2006), and Van Vugt (2006). Hogg (2001), Lord and Emrich (2001), Berson et al. (2006), and Van Vugt (2006) supported the idea of the various types of interacting leadership schemata. Hunt (2004) offered a continuum of six positions, ranging from scientific realism to social constructionist philosophy of science. This research and its conclusions lean to the latter persuasion.

Uhl-Bien (2006) advanced an overarching framework through a continuum of two extreme positions of entity and relational. This study relied on an examination from the entity perspective and derived conclusions from a relational one. It is in the clarification of the assumptive components of necessity, origin, and function that the conclusion regarding the assumptive component of existence is drawn.

The model in Figure 3 details the components and relations contributing to the emergence of the leadership phenomenon as role and relationship in social groups. As emergent, the phenomenon of leadership in social dynamics is the interplay of individual schemata, relative to experience, through social discourse. The model examines four primary schemata and six relationships. The four schemata are change, leader-representational, leader-required, and leader-collective. The six relationships comprise the interplay of experience and subjective reality. Rather than definitive, this model is intended to be a starting point for defining and exploring the phenomenon of leadership as lived experience. This model does not account for all possible schemata that may contribute and or be modified in cognition.



Legend:

Change: a perceived alteration in experience.

V_R : Law of requisite variety

V_L : Law of limited variety

S-S: structural schema of change as perceived.

Choice: individual and collective decision-making.

V: valence

I: Instrumentality

E: Expectancy

◊: the expansion of Choice detailing cognitive processing and social exchange.

A-V-N: Ambition, Values, & Norms; the structural dimensions of schemata.

L_R : Leadership-Representational schema.

L_q : Leadership-Required schema.

L_C : Leadership-Collective schema.

C_a : Choice to act as a catalyst (Leader, appt either by self or hierarchy)

f: Choice to act as follower.

A: Choice to abstain.

R: Choice to resist. This choice has subsequent catalyst and follower choices.

$\Sigma(F)$: Sum of motivational force of group size n.

1: Change necessitates choice; triggers the creation of Leadership-Required schema.

2: Leadership-Required and Leadership-Representation exchange and modify/ reinforce scher

3: Choice 1 (L_q) exercised. If choice 1 exercised by Catalyst is accepted by group, choice 2 (L_C) Leadership-Collective is formulated through social exchange. If choice 1 (self-appointed) is rejected, 2.

4: Social exchange of Leadership-Required, Leadership-Representation, Leadership-Collective modification of schemata.

5: Leadership-Required contributes to Leadership-Collective.

6: Manifestation of social action.

Figure 3. The elements and process of the emergent attribution of leadership in social dynamics.

Assumptive Component of Necessity: Of Management; Not Leadership

Camouflaged within the discussions of choice by participants is a potential explanation to the origination, acceptance, and perpetuation of the belief of necessity. Consistent among participant stories were interchangeable use of the labels of management and leadership in conversation with hierarchy being associated with the role. It is in this synonymous use of the words that the assumption of necessity is professed. That is, hierarchical managerial authority is required for the successful existence and maintenance of a group. Its existence in human social structure is, according to Van Vugt (2006), a coordination strategy of groups to accomplish group goals. Coordination is a recognized function of management taught in business programs and is a performance expectation of job performance. Participant testimony of experience supports these ideas in that when the role is assigned through routinization, it is labeled management with the anticipation of the demonstration of the phenomenon of leadership. In effect, the assessment of competence and character are of managerial skill and ability to coordinate social action at the macro (group) level, while being appropriately sensitive to the micro (individual) level needs for guidance toward achievement. When the role is self-appointed, hierarchy is established and coordination control forfeited to the leader who then takes on a managerial role, if not actual at least in perception. Hierarchy is a derived necessity resulting from the process described as progressive segregation, by Von Bertalanffy (1968).

Assumptive Component of Origin: Schemata, Change, and Choice

Defining and Characterizing Schemata

Cognitive psychologists use the label schema to identify representations or maps of objective phenomenon in cognition (Taylor, 1999). A schema is initiated and anchored through perception and is modified through the interplay of schemata through memory, perception, and imagination with subsequent experience (Berson et al., 2006; Hogg, 2001; Lord & Emrich, 2001). Schemata initiate and morph to varying degrees over time relative to a range of variables (Taylor), e.g., strength of anchoring of initial experience, degree of significance of events in terms of association, dissociation, congruence, and dissonance. Given that social realities are cognitive replications of natural phenomenon or imaginative projections of possible phenomenon, it logically follows that the structure of social reality is reflective of cognitive processing. Consequently, Bridgeforth's (2005b) identification of the core of dimensions of Ambition, Values, and Fulfillment/Norms (A-V-N) as the common core dimensions to the strata of social systems is appropriate in this work as the framework of schemata. The fourth dimension is time. Participants testified to creation of schemata, their descriptive characteristics, and employment for assessment of observed events and the revision of schema. For example, discussion of ambition was in terms of change and the determination of a satisfactory outcome in response. The discussion of values, both individual and cultural, was in terms of participant assumptions about necessity and the themes of competence and character. Additionally, the social values of structure and hierarchy were presented in terms of governance and authority. The discussion of Fulfillment/Norms (Norms) by participants

was in terms of guidance, participation, and as a desire or expectation to exercise some decision-making or action taking latitude in contributing to an outcome. The dimension of time was implied through the recognition of change in time, e.g., past and future, the progression or lapse of time, and the gap between events.

The origination of schemata was testified to amongst the participants in this present study, with 9 of the 10 having referenced an initial managerial experience as exemplifying the phenomenon of leadership. This early experience served to define a schema to serve both as an individual standard and as a template in social discourse when discussing leadership. Four specific schemata were deduced through this present study. Although testimony about individual perceptual assessment involved the synonymous use of the terms management and leadership, schemata appear to serve as the qualifier for discerning a criticizing distinction between the terms according to expectation. Choice of depiction (i.e., leader), in terms of acceptance of an assigned or self-appointed leader, is reflective of the idea of the leader being similar, but somehow relatively superior, in competence and character to the individual exercising the choice. Incumbents assigned the expectation of leadership by authority rather than chosen by the group constituency were labeled 'managers' or 'poor leaders,' rather than leaders or accepted as 'good leaders.' That is, when the observer's expectation is met, the incumbent's behavior is viewed favorably as leadership. When the observer's expectation is not met, the incumbent's behavior is viewed in lesser terms, either neutrally, possibly negatively, as managerial.

Schemata can and may form from that which is assumed to be known about a change (both actual and desired), the appointed leader (either self or by hierarchical appointment), and the group in which the individual is a member and evolves relative to both social discourse and social action. For example, the L_C schema morphs and evolves relative to ongoing events through individual awareness and assessment and collectively through social exchange. For example, Burns (1978) and Weber (1947/1964) both recognized this phenomenon when discussing the rise and fall of leaders within groups. This raises the question: What factors comprise the social cognition that negotiates the finalization of acceptance of a manifest leader? This research did not endeavor to ask or explore this question. Reviewers of this work are encouraged to explore small group research, such as Lewin (1935, 1936), Lewin (1948), Cartwright (1951), Gemmill (1986), Fielding and Hogg (1997), Gemmill and Oakley (1992), Hogg (2001), Sosik (2001), and Van Vugt (2006) for insights.

Chapter 2 presented the idea of the Mandelbrot Set as metaphor, in which the phenomenon of leadership could and should be considered from the perspective of a replicated pattern. The proposition of Mandelbrot's fractals as metaphorical is in evidence both in the patterning of schemata and in participant testimony of replication. Patterning of schemata follows the modeling of leadership schemata according to imprinted experience and sharing a common composition. Participants offered testimony of the fractal nature of schemata in the form of the theme of imprinting. This theme is the actual or desired assimilation and replication of perceived behaviors, attributes, and practices of the identified exemplar by the observer. For example, both Nelson Mandela

and Martin Luther King replicated the example of Mahatma Gandhi's civil disobedience and nonviolent resistance. The descriptions in chapter 4 support the idea that, while schemata vary from person to person, the participants offered testimony supporting this proposition in the form of the theme of imprinting. Referring to referents as role models, participants expressed desire to replicate these examples as well as confessed to having adopted philosophies, policies, and practices. One participant's comments were ripe with cross reference in the form referring to the exemplar when discussing self and vice versa. Three participants discussed teaching and coaching aspiring subordinates the philosophies, policies, and practices observed through demonstrations and taught to them by their respective role models.

The Schemata of Leadership

Leadership is esoteric in that it has been indirectly described by many a student and client with which I have worked as, I may not be able to define it, but I know it when I experience it phenomenon. Similarly, the unified description derived from participant descriptions in this study was, I experience leadership when I relate to it, accept it, and participate in it. These notions convey that the phenomenon of leadership is existential and serves some function. However, these notions do not reveal that to which intentionality attaches when seeking the phenomenon of leadership in a situation, in themselves, and others. Moreover, these notions fail to explicate that which motivates people to accept the phenomenon of leadership. Finally, these notions fail to expound that which stimulates agreement to participate in social action. Camouflaged in participant

discussions, the answers to these questions explain both the content of leadership schemata and the role and relationship of the phenomenon of leadership in social action.

This research identified three leadership schemata—leader-representational, leader-required, and leader-collective—through deductive analysis. Each of these schemata is socially imprinted. The leader-representational schema (L_R) is a representation associated with a person's earliest identified perception of the phenomenon of leadership. This L_R schema is the achievement standard to replicate before a person is willing to consider him or herself a leader. Moreover, the L_R schema is used in subsequent experience as a template for creating a leader-required and contributing to a leader-collective schema. Finally, this L_R schema was compared, contrasted, and incorporated into the participant's perceptions observation and experience of leader-required and leader-collective schemata relative to the change schema initiated in experience. The leader-required (L_q) schema is a representation of an imagined requirement relative to perceived change. The creation of an L_q schema occurs when experiencing change. The leader-collective (L_C) schema serves as representation of the group personality and a component of attribution when symbolizing the group's collective achievement. Distinctive to the L_C schema is as a socially negotiated schema, it is created from the L_R and L_q schemata of group constituents and may be influenced by the schemata of out-group members.

As a myth, the phenomenon of leadership is a mix of the necessitated familiar with a set of desired or appealing relationship factors. This mix presents the dimensions of values and norms that comprise schemata. On the surface, the essential composition to

leadership schemata appears to be a simple formula of $(a + b = c)$ or Competence (technical skill) + Character (social skill) equals Leadership. Competence is the demonstrated knowledge, skills, and abilities to address situational requirements. Competence is assessed over time through performance or assumed based on the reputation of the individual. Social skill is a categorical descriptor of the preferred relationship a group member shares with the identified authority figure (a.k.a., leader). Elements of this relationship include, but are not limited to, the degree of openness—closeness/comfort of relationship between individuals, willingness to listen and adopt proposed ideas, and degree of trust in the form of latitude (decision discretion) afforded one by the other. This formula is reminiscent of Blake and Mouton's (1964) managerial grid (discussed in Yukl, 2002), is acknowledged in a letter exchange between Bedian and Hunt (2006), explicitly identified by Barker (2006), and alluded to by Dubrin (2007).

Unlike Blake and Mouton's (1964) continuum of task versus relation orientations, participants perceived and expected a combination of these behaviors. Moreover, the descriptors used represented traits, behaviors, and styles. Consequently, there is no single dominating leadership theory identifiable. Rather, the challenge in this simple formula is that each individual assigns the variables and weights according to her/his own schema of ambition, values, and norms. This was anticipated in the earlier chapters of this work, but was not sought or examined through the interview process, as it would have been beyond the scope of the present endeavor and required a far greater period than was already requested of participants. Perhaps a future study will search out the range of factors associated with each dimension and how they align to determine the categorical formula.

Change & Choice

Change is the accepted label for the ongoing social construction of reality. The definitions and variables of change are recognized in the literature as a social construction or as that arising from social exchange. Van de Ven and Poole (1995) offered a dialectical interpretation in which organizational existence comprises a pluralistic world of contradictory and colliding events, forces, and values competing for domination and control in which stability and change are a balancing of power. Appelbaum, St. Pierre, and Glavas (1998) widened the lens angle describing change as the interplay of history, economics, politics, and business sector characteristics. Hendry and Siedl (2003) described Luhmann's (1995) evolutionary theory explaining change on the logic of the communication system. Under Luhmann's proposal, social systems are systems of communications in which the communications themselves exercise choice to determine the substance and extent subsequent communications occur. According to Luhmann, communication systems possess and utilize autopoietic processes to select whether and for what reasons communications come about that lead to changes in the communication system. It is from these processes that the communication system generates random mutations and then selects changes from these. Amongst participants, change was described in terms of a responsibility, e.g., problems needing solution, addressing everyday challenges, demands by superiors, and reacting to external conditions, amongst others, occurring within explicit and or anticipated to occur within projected time frames. These explicit definitions and discussions lack explanation of how change as schema is represented in cognition through the interplay of perception,

memory, and imagination. For this, one must blend the theoretical with the implicit discussion points of participants to offer a conjecture of how a schema of change may be constructed and contribute to leader selection and acceptance.

The use of Gersick (1991), and Pullen (1993), Burnes (1996), and Beeson and Davis (2000) to interpret the conversations of participants, one distills a 2 x 2 matrix of three interdependent variables (see Figure 4). The three variables of change are locale, scale, and time. The complexity to the interdependency to these variables is that each is a distinct form. As descriptive of choice control, the variable of locale is dichotomous. That is, being exercised by a system (i.e., an individual) or occurring in the environment (i.e., being beyond the immediate knowledge or control). As descriptive of impact or consequence as anticipated or experienced, the variable of scale is a continuum of explicit to imagined. This continuum is the range of having specific immediacy or cumulative threat ranging from of little consequence to qualified in the form of unknown. The variable of scale is determined by the relationship between the variables of time and locale. As descriptive of the relationship between two schemata, the variable of time is a comparative measure of allowance for response relative to the duration of change as occurrence. Both response allowance and occurrence duration independently range in perception from instantaneous to infinite.




Figure 4. The three relative interdependent variables and their relations comprising and influencing individual and collective perceptions of change.

As objective reality, change is the manifestation of cumulative choice. As subjective reality, change is a schema of choice in which any affect is possible and the question to decipher which effect is probable. Einstein's theory of relativity (Hawking, 1988) applies here. The observer's relative position to events and the perceived impact or consequence influence how one interprets the relationship amongst the three variables. Participants testified to cognizing reality in these terms. Four examples illustrate. Participant 6 described an incremental change that was perceived to be discontinuous, given the perceived demand of immediacy of response. Participants 5 and 9 both described an incremental environmental change that was discontinuous in its affect on them personally. This change occurred in a brief moment relative to the length of duration afforded to respond to the change. Participant 8 described how the incremental

actions of individuals over relative durations contributed to discontinuous change in the environment.

Decisions are relative to schemata of social identity (Hogg, 2001). Choice, as processes of cognitive assessment and decision, occur an unknown number of times. Two are primary in that these manifest in a behavioral response of expression. As reported amongst participants, in any situation, one of four choices is selected after assessing change (Figure 5). These choices are to: (a) act catalytically by self-appointment to a position of responsibility and accountability for the direction, action, and outcome of the group (C_a); (b) participate in a contributory supporting capacity (f); (c) to abstain entirely (A); or (d) resist the one who chooses to self-appoint (R). In the event R is chosen, there is the subsequent iteration of choices to self-appoint or to follow the one who does. Of interest is that the subsequent three choices are secondary subsequent decisions in response to the choices of others.




Figure 5. The process of choice relative to the accessing, creation, and negotiation of leadership schemata.

The change schema provokes an assessment of the situation and creation of an L_q schema. The L_q schema is then used to assess self in relation to others. The L_q schema selects the outcome of choice one and subsequently, social dialogue about the L_C , which results in the selection of choice two. Choice two, acceptance or rejection of the appointed leader derives from matching the perceptions of both need and the appointed's perceived ability to perform satisfactorily the coordination role relative to the individual perceiver's earliest indelibly anchored experience with the phenomenon of leadership.

Amongst participants, catalysts were perceived to be decisive, action oriented, calm, confident, aggressive, and dominant. If the catalyst (leader aspirant) did not fit the schema, (s)he was criticized and or rejected for being dissimilar to the standard. Given eventual acceptance of a leader in terms of cooperation and participation by group members, it is projected that the leader-required and leader-collective schemata undergo cognitive re-configuration and to some degree of social negotiation. When accepted, the demonstration of catalysis energized action by triggering belief in the potential for or in the desired outcome, translating it into a positive and high expectancy.

Social dynamics is a loop of change and choice (Figure 6) in which the two laws of requisite variety (Vancouver, 1996; von Bertalanffy, 1968) and limited variety (Scott, 1992) govern and guide. The law of requisite variety describes flexible adaptability while seeking to maintain a certain equilibrium among variables as necessary to survival. This certain equilibrium is a system-preferred state. Essentially, the law of requisite variety states that being must choose when experiencing change. The choices and behaviors of systems derive from the collective range of options comprising the system through

inheritance or experientially learning. This is Pondy and Mitroff's law of limited variety (Scott, 1992). The law of limited variety states, "A system will exhibit no more variety than the variety to which it has been exposed in its environment" (Scott, 1992, p. 85). The oscillation-is-choice derives change and change necessitates choice. Each decision leads to a specific action that stimulates or invokes change on some relative level in the contextual environment. This change, in turn, mandates individuals' exercise of choice. Together these laws determine both change and choice. Each successive experience from individual to generational contributes to the complexity and alters the mix of options. The composition, capability, and behavior of social interaction at micro, macro, and meta scales are the evidence of the collective of decisions. While the latter invokes the former, it is the former, which decides the appropriateness of the latter. The bond of irony is free will coupled with limited temporal information on which to decide. Change and choice shifts the appropriateness of the presuppositions by which we govern and guide. Put another way, the terms are synonymous and simultaneous, despite their being experienced and represented as distinct and dissimilar. In this present study, both terms are used and distinguished when appropriate to the element being expounded.




Figure 6. Socially constructed reality as the oscillating experience of change and choice.

Assumptive Component of Function: Manifest and Latent

Both manifest and latent functions are present. The manifest function is the recognition and response to environmental change. The latent function at the motivational level is evidenced in the leader as symbol.

In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the literature conveys the idea that the purpose of leadership is to anticipate, recognize, and invoke change, with emphasis on invocation. The participants interviewed for this study did not share this assumption. The expected norms expressed by participants were that leadership was action contributing to understanding the change, formulating a plan to meet the demands, and assisting in responding to change. In other words, in terms of ambition, rather than invoking change, the phenomenon of leadership was expected to contribute to coping and responding to change. Just as there was variation in the composite of participants, so there was range in the degree of expectation. The range observable in participant testimony was from ‘just tell me what you want’ to ‘guide and assure me each step of the way.’ The commonality

to this range was the label vision. This label conveyed a demonstrated competence of understanding the context, degree of challenge, needed and available resources, and the ability to formulate a plan and guide its execution. This hidden consistency, amongst participants, suggests that people may not fear change, but view it as developmental—a chance to grow personally and professionally, provided the perceived needed guidance. It was these expectations that selected choice in terms of answering a seeming ‘unconscious’ question. Who possesses the required combination of skills that fits both my representation of leadership (i.e., the leader-representational schema) and that demanded by the present change (i.e., leader-required)?

The consistency of the argument for the necessity of management—to control, coordinate, accomplish, etc.—is a statement of a disconnect between expectation and reality. That is, arguing the necessity of management, generally through allegory and metaphor (e.g., herding rabbits, herding cats, facilitating, and coordinating, etc.), that without leadership people would go their own ways, is acknowledgement of variation of motivational forces in social dynamics between individuals. Attribution through rationalization may serve a latent function, as defined by Merton (1968), of group dynamics. This is not to deny the reality of the individual or any actions thereof. Rather, leadership is the identification and acceptance of a focal point that binds and bounds the group constituents toward a singular outcome. Leadership is the socially accepted label describing the attribution of group motivation (achievement of a singular outcome, coalescence of values, and acceptance of diversity of achievement) to a uniform representation. Succinctly, Leadership is the group. The group is leadership. The question

that remains is an adequate theory to offer insight into both phenomena. It is proposed that Vroom's (1964/1995) expectancy theory is the most appropriate conception.

Using Vroom's (1964/1995) expectancy theory of motivation as a framework, insight into choice and subsequently into change as a lived experience is gained. While originated as a theory of individual motivation (Steel & König, 2006), its systemic orientation and use of group-based research makes it extendable. Motivational force (F) is equal to Valence (V_I) multiplied by Expectancy (E) or $V * E = F$. Valence is "affective orientations toward particular outcomes" and "its instrumentality toward other outcomes" (Vroom, 1964/1995, p. 18, 20). (I) [subscripted here not in the original] is the variable of Instrumentality—the belief the probable attainment of a subsequent relative to the first outcome—which contributes to determining valence. "Expectancy is an action-outcome association" or an assessment of probability of achievement (Vroom, 1964/1995, p. 21). Force is used in the Lewinian sense of a field of forces of direction and magnitude. Applying Vroom to groups of n , F is the manifestation of social action relative to individual motive forces. This manifestation will expand and contract as schemata morph in relation to social dynamics—assessment and conversation of the change experienced relative to force of the group's actions and those of others in the broader social context. In other words, social action changes relative to the current context of achieved results and correlate re-configuration of leadership schemata and assessments of valence, instrumentalities, and expectancy.

Assumptive Component of Existence: An Artifact of Attribution

Participant testimony describing leader action and group performance was cause and effect explanation. Catalysis and the process of choice appear to be the root source of attributing to the leader the collective result of the group. As events manifest, a state of autocatalysis, of attributing action and results, is credited to the leader, and leadership is created and perpetuated. This is consistent with Pfeffer's (1977) definition of attribution theory, "the study of attribution is a study of naïve psychology—an examination of how persons make sense out of the events taking place around them" (p. 109). Weber (1947/1964) described this phenomenon when discussing the rise and fall of the charismatic according to the fate of the group. As success perpetuates, the legend grows. In contrast, when failure manifests and compounds, attribution of leadership ability declines. Participant testimony was consistent with Weber's observations. All ten participants reported an increase in the regard for the leader referent relative to outcome either collective or individual.

To encapsulate the conclusions to the first research question a look in the virtual mirror is beneficial. The leadership literature has been described in terms similar to the concept of leadership itself. For example, the literature has been described as complex, contradicting, and confusing (Barker, 2000; Rost, 2001) and the concept has been labeled an enigma (Wood, 2005) and defined as "mystique" by the French Foreign Legion (B. S., personal communication, 6/28/2006). One might question and debate the origins of this challenge. Is it in the traditional standard that one must first define the thing to be researched? Or does the challenge originate in unexamined assumptions? For example,

Hunt (2004) offered a modified historical-contextual superstructure model a researcher might use to advance a definition of leadership for a researcher's purposes. The model acknowledges that researchers have ontological, epistemological, and methodological beliefs, which comprise the underlying assumptions that frame the definition. There are three limitations with this and similar approaches. First, this approach is about formulating and framing an individual's perceptions and reflections about the phenomenon of leadership without distinguishing between the contributions of imagination, perception, and recall comprising cognition. Second, this approach leads to research and conclusions that support or deny the researcher's perspective or definition of the phenomenon of leadership in terms of a given sample's general agreement rather than revealing something of the phenomenon itself. Third, and consequently, this approach perpetuates the unintended consequence of complexity, confusion, and contradiction. While these limitations are significant, the origin of the problem must be at a deeper level. The origin of the problem must be in that which is in common. The root of this self-perpetuating prophecy of confusion is the reliance on the four unexamined assumptive components of existence, necessity, origin, and function. This research effort, in answer to Barker's (2001) call for a metaphysical and phenomenological approach, acknowledged those components, accepting existence as given and opening the remaining three to inquiry through the exploration of lived experience. The consequence is discovery that the assumptive components of theory and research are inconsistent with lived experience in the present in two material respects. These material differences are discernible when comparing the literature with lived experience.

The first inconsistency regards the origin of the phenomenon of leadership. Bass (1990) is representative of the traditional view of leadership. Based on examination of the literature to date of reporting, Bass stated that findings suggested the nature of leadership appeared to be an acquired status through active relations among members of a group, in which the leader demonstrates capacity to carry cooperative tasks to completion, rather than the mere possession of some combination of traits. In contrast, from the perspective of lived experience, leadership is an emergent attribution of the demonstrated capacity of the active relations amongst group members to carry cooperative tasks to completion, to either escape from or conquest the threat perception of the unknown, to the one individual most representative of the group's assessment of need and ability of technical and social skills. This subtle, but important difference—rather than suggesting that the phenomenon of leadership originates in the leader, the phenomenon of leadership originates through social discourse and social action. In other words, the phenomenon of leadership is a cognitive and socially constructed artifact—a representation of the group as a composite personality and a symbol of its collective action. Leadership is choice.

The second regards the necessity and function of the leadership phenomenon. Accepted leadership theory and research argues the necessity of leadership upon the premise that managerial control is a problem of motivation, i.e., leaders must motivate (influence) followers to attain achievement of goals or objectives. This ideology of necessity and function originated and matured with the industrial age (Bendix, 1954). Accordingly, research has looked at the phenomenon of leadership from the perspective of the leader as being the critical independent variable. From the perspective of lived

experience, managerial control of social action is the challenge. From the perspective of lived experience, the necessity and function of leadership is to positively unify expectancy by coalescing values while allowing for equifinality in individual action to achieve goals or objectives. In other words, participants consistently expressed the idea that the 'must motivate' ideology is a myth. Human beings motivate themselves. Participants recognized that a group of people exercises individual choice according to their respective values, priorities, expectancies. In summation, the necessity and function of the phenomenon of leadership is coordination of motivational forces amongst group members so that activities contributing toward an accomplishment are in accordance with some socially contracted (professed) expectation or desire. In short, leadership is a label used to communicate the expectation of managing group motivation.

These two disparities suggest that the word *leadership* is the unification of two distinct ideas. *Leader*, the group's agreed upon representation; and *ship*, the function of binding expectation and bounding action. This small shift from dependence on an individual to attribution of social action toward an individual is critical. This shift suggests that we need to examine the phenomenon of leadership as cognitive schemata and how socially shared schemata contribute to social action and the emergence of attribution.

Research Question 2

Research question two assumed if a archetype was found to exist, some indication concerning cognitive structure, i.e., composition of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic representation, of the archetype might also be evident. Given that this research

failed to identify an archetype, there can be no discussion of its cognitive structure. What can be stated about cognitive structure is that while all three primary representational systems (i.e., visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) were in evidence amongst participants, there was no commonality or consistency amongst participants with respect to access or employment in cognitive processing.

Research Question 3

Research question three assumed that if a archetype was found to exist, social discourse might prove indicative to discerning specific elements of the archetype. Consistent with the definition of archetype, these indications would be those elements believed and discussed in common amongst an unrelated group of participants. While seven themes—management, choice, depiction, context, competence, character, and imprinting—were identified across the ten participant descriptions, this research failed to identify a archetype. This conclusion is derived from the recognition that the themes identified are categorical representation of the phenomenon of leadership amongst participants. Consequently, there can be no discussion of discerning its elements in social interaction. However, these themes contribute to understanding the four assumptive components of the myth of leadership.

The Research Method

The method designed and employed to conduct this exploratory study integrated the meta-model and eye-accessing cues from NLP with semiotic phenomenology. The purpose of integrating the meta-model was to guide each participant interview by identifying the three most common errors when mistaking the representation of

experience with experience itself (Battino & South, 2005). These errors are generalization, deletion, and distortion. That is, during the interview process identification of these errors were trigger points for subsequent inquiry. This integration assured collection of meaningful thematic data and contributed to individual and collective reduction. The integration of eye-accessing cues as a data collection technique was for the purpose of indication and verification of cognitive processing. As explained in Chapter 3, it was anticipated that eye-accessing cues would precede verbalization and be consistent with expression. As indication and verification, the structure of cognition would contribute to the reduction process by observing the origin (i.e., memory, constructed, kinesthetic, or internal dialogue) and processing of subjective interpretation. Three conclusions are offered with respect to these integrations. First, the use of the meta-model during the interview facilitated both the data collection and reduction processes. Second, as indicated by the structural descriptions of participants, support for Bandler and Grinder's (1975) hypothesis that eye-accessing cues are distinct to each individual is supported. Third, as reported in Chapter 4, eye-accessing cues preceded and were consistent with expression. This indicates that eye-accessing cues are unconscious and support the proposition in Chapter 2 of expression being triune. However, the time required to record and analyze the individuality of movement and varying degree of movement amongst participants outweighs the marginal contribution to the outcomes of this study. In summation, do not use the eye-accessing cue technique when replicating this research.

Social Change Implications

Understanding the phenomenon of leadership from the perspective of schema offers insight into (a) the diversity and complexity of the literature, (b) the lack of an accepted definition of leadership, (c) why leadership training and development fails to achieve the desired result, and (d) the question of the relationship between events and the phenomenon of leadership.

The recognized contradiction and confusion that is the literature is the result of two errors. The first of these errors was the acceptance of the four assumptive components without open acknowledgement or empirical examination. Science is the pursuit of truth. The pursuit of truth requires acknowledgement and validation of the assumptions guiding and governing that pursuit. To date research based on unacknowledged and untested assumptions, regardless of how common and accepted, has resulted in a pattern of perpetuating the imprinting process through proselytizing to one idea or another. The second error has been and continues to be the pursuit of defining and explaining the phenomenon in terms of a manifest function. Pursuit of a manifest function structures research design to examine the phenomenon symptomatically rather than systemically. For the phenomenon of leadership to be appreciated, its meaning, a.k.a. function, must be more thoroughly examined as a social construct through the lens of individual experience. The meaning of experience is the window to viewing the latent function that triggers the emergence of leadership. Moreover, the viability and longevity of the phenomenon of leadership in a social setting appears to be explicitly linked to a latent function. In the final analysis, if researchers are to make progress in the study of

the phenomenon of leadership, emergence, a.k.a. group motivation and process of attribution, must be examined. In short, this is the work that Gemmill (1986) started and is waiting for a champion to take up.

When considering leadership as fractal schemata of cognitive and social phenomenon, the diversity, complexity, and confusion of the literature are readily understood. Allegorically, research and discussion has been a view through a prism with focus on a small band of the breadth of possibility. Is it possible that clarity will be afforded if the existing literature were examined again and catalogued according to schemata in terms of content, creation, interdependency, and inter-relation, etcetera? Would this clarity aid in understanding the evolution of our collective perception of leadership as an experience and as a cognitive construct? This effort would require acceptance that management and leadership are distinct phenomena according to function. Acceptance of distinction would mean the implication, use, and teaching of management and leadership as synonymous and interchangeable terms must cease. Consequently, acceptance means that alleged leadership studies examining managerial issues and management as subject of study or sample are studies in management not leadership. The effect will be a considerable reduction in the recognized literature and accepted knowledge regarding the phenomenon of leadership.

Bass' (1990) observation that "there are as many definitions of leadership as there are people who have attempted to define it" (p. 7) is reported by Prince (2005) as expressed earlier by Cartwright and Zander (1953) and echoed as recently by Grint (2000). A thousand years from now, the statement may be as accurately reflective then as

it is now. The reason: There are as many definitions of leadership as there are human beings. As a socially constructed and cognitively evolving construct, leadership will likely be one of those vague esoteric terms that have a base of unconscious stability with a dynamic interpretation offering a perpetual range of variation through lived experience. Researchers, practitioners, students, whomever, may use tools such as Hunt's (2004) historical-contextual superstructure model to advance a definition of leadership for her/his purposes. Beyond the immediate expediency, however, leadership will remain a I know it when I experience it phenomenon. Moreover, as this research revealed, the phenomenon of leadership is the exercise of choice of relation, of acceptance, and of participation. In short, this researcher is comfortable offering two predictions. First, the lack of universal definition will fuel question, confusion, and contradiction well into the future. As time goes on, the problem will compound rather than diminish. Second, and consequently, attainment of a single, universally-accepted, working definition of leadership is unlikely because the concept evolves as it is discussed, studied, and experienced.

Leadership training and development will fail to achieve appreciable results when the content and or experience of these programs are foreign or incongruent with the prior experience comprising the present schemata of the participant. What can be done about it? At a meta-level, individuals and organizations can change their expectations respective to the purposes and outcomes of training and development initiatives. For example, considering training and development opportunities as expanding the scope the law of limited variety by providing additional information from which individuals may

exercise choice, rather than holding the expectation of an immediate alteration in performance, converts failure to success. For example, redefining leadership by its function refocuses the objectives and content of training. Specifically, the objective shifts from rearing proselytes of one theory or another to a competence model focused on unification of group motivation. This competency model requires organizations identify the technical skills and social behaviors, e.g., personalities, value systems, and other factors, that comprise the presentation of leadership practice the organization desires to standardize. It would require the design and development of assessment mechanisms for identifying those individuals who model the desired. Likewise, the design and development of accepted means and methods for reinforcing consistent adherence and demonstration of the competencies required. Finally, create an assessment process by which malleability of the potential candidate is determinable and assign the candidate upon hire to a mentor whom that person is most likely to identify with, accept, and replicate.

Approaching research and analysis from the four assumptive components can and may yield schemata that serve to explain human and social development patterns. Additionally, such research efforts can and may contribute to understanding how culturally specific schemata have evolved over time. Identification of the catalogue of schemata offers the potential of understanding why people in given contexts chose the leaders they did. Finally, this paradigm offers the potential for manipulating a group of n size by training/coaching an actor to fit its identified representation.

Recommendations

The following five proposals and questions are offered as both general considerations and recommendations for further research. Two of these items are suggestions to further consideration of the original questions of this present study. The remaining four are suggestions to further consideration of the alternate paradigm advanced in this chapter.

This research is a first step in identifying that which people relate to when they experience leadership. A potential bias of this research is the sample. In this study, the participants involved were recruited through professional organizations with an explicit interest in leadership. The unintended consequence of this effort was to recruit a sample predominately from business organizations. This raises the question: If a sample was recruited from the public, would replication of this study reveal similar or disparate themes and conclusions?

Participant testimony offered support to the component of fractal composition both in schemata and in professional practice. Studies isolating schemata in terms of the potential number, composition, and similarity and variations of structure across scale may yield a more definitive description of the phenomenon of leadership as a social imprint. Similarly, of interest would be a phenomenological study using a connected series of subjects to discern the degree of pattern (e.g., acceptance, assimilation, and replication) amongst a chronological chain of influence beginning with the junior participant to the most senior. The challenge is discerning a method to identify these patterns in terms of both distinctiveness and variation. Examination of a relational chain of at least three

people is a suggested approach. To discern such patterns, one must seek out an individual's criteria set by which leadership is experienced from the three perspectives.

Of social dynamics, pattern analysis of social events over time will prove enlightening in terms of cultural and contextual influences and structures. Of schemata, there is a multiplicity of questions. A few examples follow. How do schemata evolve? Is there a pattern in cognitive development? What factors serve to anchor composing elements in schemata?

Through this present study, the applicability of Vroom's (1964/1995) expectancy theory as a possible path to description was proposed. To observe divergence and convergence of motivational force amongst group participants, dissection of expectancy theory at the individual level is required. The requirement here is to discern a method of measuring the degree of congruence or incongruence of schemata (e.g., change, L_q) both in individual cognition and between group members.

While the subjective interpretation of experience does not yield a archetype in the human psyche, it does not conclude that an archetype does not exist. Rather, it suggests that an alternative approach is required. This research supported the idea that eye-accessing cues are reflective of both conscious and unconscious cognition. (Conscious being used in the presently accepted form and not as defined previously in this work.) Conscious cognition is observable when the eyes reflect constructed processing. Unconscious cognition is conveyed through recall movement. Unconscious cognition may be further split into individual and collective unconscious offering and exchange by the relative degree of context-content offered during expression. The more monotone the

expression, the closer one gets to the collective unconscious. The more monotone the expression, generalized as noted by the absence of specific context, the closer one gets to the collective unconscious (Erickson, 1980a; Jung, 1956). Jung (1959) alluded to this with his statement about searching for the archetype through altered states of consciousness, mentioning that it is “through the dissolutions of paranoiacs, the fantasies observed in trance states, and the dreams of early childhood” (p. 50). Jung’s suggestion about trance states is a suggestion to use hypnosis. Bandler and Grinder (1981) explained that hypnosis as simply an altered state of consciousness. The deepest form of hypnosis and most direct communication with the unconscious is the somnambulistic (Erickson, 1980a). Hypnosis is recognized as a research method for examining the structure and content of the psyche and as a viable means for altering subjective experience and consequent behaviors of hypnotically trained subjects (Erickson, 1980b; Levitt & Chapman, 1979; Zimbardo, Maslach, & Marshall, 2007). This raises two questions. How might the conclusions from a replication of this present research, using hypnosis, compare in terms of supporting or denying the initial conclusions? Is it possible to use hypnosis as a developmental tool or technique in leadership training, focusing on aspects of the themes identified here?

If a leadership archetype were to be found its description and characteristics would be meaningful and relevant at all structural levels. This was the premise of the argument in Chapter 2—that for leadership to be existential it had to exist in the base of the psyche as something the leader in context manifested and a follower identified with. That is, the leadership archetype would govern and guide the leader’s decisions,

behaviors, and expressions. Conversely, followers would unconsciously (instinctually) respond to that manifestation or embodiment. However, in the interim, I stipulate that this research used a small sample (10) and that hypnosis as a research method may yet reveal a leadership archetype, I am persuaded there is no archetype for two reasons. First is the commonality of choice amongst participants. Each discussed the exercise of choice to relate, accept, and participate. Choice and unconscious response are mutually exclusive. Second, and more importantly, the findings persuade that leadership is a social construction that does not exist beyond attribution (individual cognition being projected onto objective reality). Conversely, if leadership is limited to the impulse/instinct to follow when another steps out from a group, as defined by Van Vugt (2006), the last 100+ years studying the idea of leadership has been mere intellectual play with no practical value. Rather, the research has been empirical investigation into management and social control rather than leadership.

Summary

This dissertation examined the phenomenon of leadership from a meta-level. From this perspective, the challenges of contradiction and confusion of theory and research results arise from four heretofore unacknowledged and unexamined assumptive components. The challenges were attributed to originating in an absence of knowing what leadership is—as an individual cognition and as a social phenomenon. To address this problem, an inquiry into the possible existence of a leadership archetype and identification of its characteristics was undertaken. The collective body of literature was then re-cast according to two metatheories. This effort served as foundational to a

theoretical framework concerning the existence and nature of leadership as an individual and social construct. Relative to that theoretical framework, a research design was crafted and deployed. Analysis of ten participant interviews yielded the phenomenon of leadership to be relative to an individual's initial experience. The conclusion of this unified description, *I experience it when I relate to it, accept it, and participate in it*, was that the subjective interpretation of lived experience does not reveal an archetype. Rather, the phenomenon of leadership presents as a socially negotiated schema used to contribute to, rationalize, and navigate participation in social experience. The support for social imprinting was interpreted to indicate that an alternate paradigm, one describing the phenomenon of leadership in terms of function was appropriate. The social change implications of these conclusions are the suggestions for re-examining the literature in terms of schemata and their relation to social action and the alteration of expectations regarding training and development. The final sections presented a suggested research agenda offering replication of the study, and employing an alternate method. It was proposed that the use of pattern identification and analysis of schemata can and may isolate the universal variables of leadership that people identify and result in a unification of leadership theory and research. The resulting unification can and may contribute to analysis of social behavior yielding greater accuracy in leadership development. That is, facilitate the manufacture of leaders relative to the representations of a given group and consequently, influence those groups and social exchange toward whatever agenda one may choose. Is such an ambition probable and practical? For the phenomenon of leadership to be appreciated, its meaning, a.k.a. function, must be more thoroughly

examined as a social construct through the lens of individual experience. The meaning of experience is the window to viewing the latent function that triggers the emergence of leadership. Moreover, the viability and longevity of the phenomenon of leadership in a social setting appears to be explicitly linked to a latent function. In the final analysis, if researchers are to make progress in the study of the phenomenon of leadership, emergence through group motivation and the process of attribution similar to what Gemmill (1986) advocated must be continued. This approach would advance the understanding of schemata and the latent social function of groups. More importantly, this approach should gestate Burns (1978) thoughts on leadership and leadership identification and lead to improved leadership training and development, and assessment outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. J. (2006). The arts & leadership: Now that we can do anything, what will we do? *Learning and Education, Academy of Management*, 5, 486-499.
- Anderson, P. (1999). Complexity theory and organization science. *Organization Science*, 10(3), 216-232.
- Antonakis, J, Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Appelbaum, S. H., St. Pierre, N., & Glavas, W. (1998). Strategic organizational change: The role of leadership, learning, motivation and productivity. *Management Decision*, 36, 289-302.
- Baddeley, M., & Predebon, J. (1991). 'Do the eyes have it?': A test of neurolinguistic programming's eye-movement hypothesis. *Australian Journal of Clinical Hypnotherapy and Hypnosis*, 12(1), 1-23.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1975). *The structure of magic I*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1976). *The structure of magic II*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1979). *Frogs into princes neuro-linguistic programming*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1981). *Trance-formations neuro-linguistic programming and the structure of hypnosis*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1982). *Reframing: Neuro-linguistic programming and the transformation of meaning*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.
- Banutu-Gomez, M. B. (2004). Great leaders teach exemplary followership and serve as servant leaders. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 4(1/2), 143-151.
- Barker, R. A. (1997). How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is? *Human Relations*, 50, 343-362.
- Barker, R. A. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*, 54, 469-494.
- Barker, R. A. (2002). *On the nature of leadership*. Lanham, New York: Oxford

University Press of America.

- Barker, R. A. (2006). Pointing the finger at leadership. *Journal of the North American Management Society*, 1(1), 3-9.
- Bass B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications 3rd ed.* New York, NY: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Battino, R. & South, T. L. (2005). *Ericksonian approaches a comprehensive manual 2nd edition*. Bethel, CT: Crown House Publishing.
- Bedian, A. G & Day, D. V. (2004). Can chameleons lead? *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 687-718.
- Bedian A. G. & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 190-205.
- Beeson, I. & Davis, C. (2000). Emergence and accomplishment in organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13, 178-190.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bennis, W. (1999). The end of leadership: Exemplary leadership is impossible without full inclusion, initiatives, and cooperation of followers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28, 71-80.
- Bennis, W., Rummier, G., Gery, G. Burke, W. W., Juechter, W. M., & Tichy, N. (2003). What lies ahead/ dead end or open road. *T+D*, 57(1), 32-41.
- Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Bennis, W. (2004). Leadership Paradox. *CIO Insight*, Oct(44), 35-36.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

- Berson, Y., Dan, O., & Yammarino, F. J. (2006). Attachment style and individual differences in leadership perceptions and emergence. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*, 165-182.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Bodenhamer, B. G. & Hall, L. M. (2001). *The user's manual for the brain*. Trowbridge, Wilshire UK: The Cromwell Press.
- Bonstetter, B. J. (2000). The dna of global leadership competencies. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 42*, 131-144.
- Bridgeforth, B. W. (2005a). Advancing the practice of leadership: A curriculum. *The Journal of Leadership Education, 4*(1), 4-30.
- Bridgeforth, B. W. (2005b). Toward a general theory of social systems. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 25*(10/11), 54-83.
- Briggs, J. & Peat, F. D. (1989). *Turbulent mirror*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Britan, H. H. (1931). *The affective consciousness*. New York, NY: The MacMillan Company.
- Buckner, M., Meara, N. M., Reese, E. J., & Reese, M. (1987). Eye movement as an indicator of sensory components in thought. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 283-287.
- Burnes, B. (1996). No such thing as...a `one best way' to manage organizational change. *Management Decision, 34*, 11-19.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Burns, J. S. (2002). Chaos theory and leadership studies: Exploring uncharted seas. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(2), 42-56.
- Campbell, J. (1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. New York, NY: MJF Books.
- Campbell, J. (1959). *The masks of god: Primitive mythology*. New York, NY: Arkana.
- Carbonell, D. A. (1985). *Representational systems: an empirical approach to neuro-linguistic programming (eye movements)*. Ph.D. Dissertation, DePaul University, United States -- Illinois. Retrieved January 19, 2007, from ProQuest Digital

Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 8523962).

- Cartwright, D. (Ed.), (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1953). Leadership: Introduction, in D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.) *Group dynamics: research and theory*. London: Tavistock.
- Casey, E. S. (1976). *Imagining a phenomenological study 2nd ed.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Cherry, D. & Spiegel, J. (2006). *Leadership, myth, & metaphor. Finding common ground to guide effective school change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press/ Sage Publications.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1984). *Influence the psychology of persuasion*. New York, NY: Quill William Morrow.
- Conforti, M. (2003). *Field, form, and fate patterns in min, nature, & psyche revised edition*. New Orleans, LA: Spring Journal Books.
- Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 747-767.
- Cooksey, R. W. (2001). What is complexity science? A contextually grounded tapestry of systemic dynamism, paradigm diversity, theoretical eclecticism. *Emergence*, 3(1), 77-106.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crothers, A. L. (1992) *Presidents as archetypes: The American construction of leadership*. Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, United States -- Tennessee. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.
- Dalton, C. M. (2004). Of heroes and leaders. *Business Horizons*, 47(6), 1-2.

- Damasio, A. R. (1994). *Descartes' error emotion, reason, and the human brain*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Daneke, G. A. (1999). *Systemic Choices: Nonlinear Dynamics and Practical Management*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Deming, W. E. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Advanced Educational Services.
- Denton, D. K. (1998). Viewpoint: Blueprint for the adaptive organisation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 7(2), 83-91.
- Dolan, S. L., Garcia, S., & Auerbach, A. (2003). Understanding and managing chaos in organizations. *International Journal of Management*, 20(1), 23-35.
- Dooley, K. J., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1999). Explaining complex organizational dynamics. *Organization Science*, 10(3), 358-373.
- Dooley, K. O., & Farmer, A. (1988). Comparison for aphasic and control subjects of eye movements hypothesized in neurolinguistic programming. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 67, 233-234.
- Draper, T. (1996). *A Struggle For Power The American Revolution*. New York, NY: TimesBooks Random House.
- DuBrin, A. J. (2007). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior 4e*. Australia, Canada, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, United Kingdom, United States: Thomson South-Western.
- Eddie, J. M. (1970). Can grammar be thought? In J. M. Eddie et al (eds). *Patterns of the life world*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Edwards, S. (2002). *Mythic leadership*. Ph.D. dissertation, Pacifica Graduate Institute, United States -- California. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968). *Max weber on charisma and institution building*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, M. H. (1964). The "surprise" and "my friend-john" techniques of hypnosis: Minimal Cues and Natural field experimentation in *The nature of hypnosis and suggestion the collected papers of milton h. Erickson on hypnosis volume I* (E. I. Rossi Ed.). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers, INC.
- Erickson, M. H. (1980a). *The nature of hypnosis and suggestion the collected papers of*

milton h. Erickson on hypnosis volume I (E. I. Rossi Ed.). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers, INC.

- Erickson, M. H. (1980b). Hypnosis: a general review in *The nature of hypnosis and suggestion the collected papers of milton h. Erickson on hypnosis volume III* (E. I. Rossi Ed.). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers, INC.
- Fairholm, M. R. (2004). A new sciences outline for leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(3/4), 369-383.
- Fiedler, F. (1973). The trouble with leadership training is that it doesn't train leaders in W. R. Lassey & R. R. Fernandez (pp. 238-246). *Leadership and social change*, La Jolla, CA: University Associates Publishers and Consultants.
- Fielding, K. S. & Hogg, M. A. (1997). Social identity, self-categorization, and leadership: A field study of small interactive groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1, 39-51.
- Fleishman, E.A., Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Levin, K.Y., Korotkin, A.L. & Hein, M.B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leadership behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2, 245-87.
- Galbraith, P. (2004). Organisational leadership and chaos theory: Let's be careful. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(1), 9-28.
- Gemmill G. (1986). The mythology of the leader role in small groups. *Small Group Behavior*, 17, 41-50.
- Gemmill G. and Oakley J. (1992). Leadership: an alienating social myth? *Human Relations*, 45, 113-129.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gersick, C. J. G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multi-level exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 10-36.
- Gerth, H. H. & Mills, C. W. (Eds.). (1946). *From max weber: Essays in sociology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbs, JR., R. W. (1995). Idiomaticity and human cognition. In D. J. Levitin (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive psychology: core readings* (pp. 733-750). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, A Bradford Book.

- Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a qualitative research procedure. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 28, 235-261.
- Giorgi, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Phenomenological and psychological research*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Gleick, J., (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Gleitman, L. R. & Newport, E. L. (1995). The invention of language by children: environmental and biological influences on the acquisition of language. In D. J. Levitin (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive psychology: core readings* (pp. 685-784). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, A Bradford Book.
- Goeppinger, A. (2002). The fallacies of our reality: a deconstructive look at community and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5(1), 77-83.
- Goldman, R. (1997). *Circumcision the hidden trauma how an American cultural practice affects infants and ultimately us all*. Boston, MA: Vanguard Publications.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzes, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greene, R. (1998). *The 48 laws of power*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Grint, K. (2000). *The arts of leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guenther, R. K. (1998). Memory. In D. J. Levitin (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive psychology: core readings* (pp. 311-360). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, A Bradford Book.
- Hall, L. M. & Belnap, B. P. (2004). *The sourcebook of magic a comprehensive guide to nlp change patterns second edition*. Norwalk, CT: Crownhouse Publishing LLC.
- Hammer, M. & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the corporation*. New York, NY: HaperCollins Publishing.
- Harter, N. (2003). Between great men and leadership: William James on the importance of individuals. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1), 3-12.
- Hawking, S. (1988). *A brief history of time from the big bang to black holes*. Toronto, New York, London, Sydney, Auckland: Bantam Books.

- Hench, T. J. (1997) *An "evolutionary history" of the office systems furniture industry and the nature of strategic change. Evolution, entrepreneurship, and strategy as complex adaptive processes: A study in self-organizing systems*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, United States -- South Carolina.
- Hendry, J. & Seidl, D. (2003). The structure and significance of strategic episodes: Social systems theory and the routine practices of strategic change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 175-196.
- Hernandez, V. (1981). *A study of eye movement patterns in the neuro-linguistic programming model*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ball State University, United States -- Indiana. Retrieved January 19, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 8120505).
- Hersey, P. (1984). *The situational leader*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Hobson, J. A. (1994). *The chemistry of conscious states how the brain changes its mind*. New York, NY: Little Brown & Company.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- House, R. J. & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Howard, P. J. (2000). *The owner's manual for the brain everyday applications from mind-brain research 2nd edition*. Marietta, GA: Bard Press.
- Hunt, J. G. (n.d.) in Antonakis, J, Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hunter, J. (2004). *The world's most powerful leadership principle: How to become a servant leader*. New York: NY: Crown Business.
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Jenner, R. A. (1994). Changing patterns of power, chaotic dynamics and the emergence of a post-modern organizational paradigm. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 7(3), 8-21.
- Johnson, J. L., & Burton, B. K. (1994). Chaos and complexity theory for management. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3, 320-329.
- Jung, C. G. (1956). *Symbols of transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1960). *On the nature of the psyche* (R.E.C. Hull, Trans.). New York, NY: Bollingen Foundation.
- Jupp, J. (1989). A further empirical evaluation of neurolinguistic primary representational systems (PRS). *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 2, 441-450.
- Keene, A. (2000). Complexity theory: the changing role of leadership. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32(1), 15-18.
- Kets De Vries, M. F. R.. (2007). Decoding the Team Conundrum: The Eight Roles Executives Play. *Organizational Dynamics*, 36, 28-44.
- Kenny, D. A. & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 678-685.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge 3rd edition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions 3rd edition*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago.
- Lanigan, R. L. (1988). *Phenomenology of communication merleau-ponty's thematic in communicology and semiology*. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levitt, E. E. & Chapman, R. H. (n.d.) Hypnosis as a research method in E. Fromm & R. E. Shor (Eds.). *Hypnosis: developments in research and new perspectives new and revised 2nd edition* (pp. 185-216). New York, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Levy, D. (1994). Chaos theory and strategy: theory, application, and managerial implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 167-179.
- Lewin, K. (1935). *A dynamic theory of personality selected papers* (D. K. Adams & K. E. Zener, Trans.). New York & London: McGraw-Hill Book Company. (Original work published in 1935)
- Lewin, K., (1936). *Principles of topological psychology* (F. Heider & G. Heider, G. Trans.) New York & London: McGraw-Hill Book Company. (Original work published in 1936)
- Lewin, G. W. (Ed), (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York, NY: Harper &

Brothers Publishers.

- Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A. Orton, D. J., & Schrieber, C. (2006). Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems. *E:CO*, 8(4), 2-12.
- Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. M., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402-410.
- Lord, R. G. & Emrich, C. G. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 551-579.
- Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mandelbrot, B. B. (1977). *The fractal geometry of nature*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Marion, R., (1999). *The edge of organization: Chaos and complexity theories for formal social systems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mathews, K. M., White, M. C., & Long, R. G. (1999). Why study the complexity sciences in the social sciences? *Human Relations*, 52(4), 439-462.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and invisible*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Merlevede, P. E., Bridoux, D., & Vandamme, R. (1997). *7 steps to emotional intelligence*. Bancyfelin, Carmathen, UK: Crown House Publishing Limited.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam-Webster Inc. (1989). *The new merriam-webster dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis a sourcebook of new*

- methods 2nd edition*. Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J. G. (1978). *Living systems*. Niwot, CO: University of Colorado Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as political arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22, 133-154.
- Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Murray, E. L. (1987). Imagination theory and phenomenological thought. In E. L. Murray (Ed.). *Imagination and phenomenological psychology* (pp. 175-220). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Nate, S. R. (1999) *Eye accessing cues: A study of eye movements while retrieving internal information*. Ph.D. dissertation, Walden University, United States -- Minnesota. Retrieved January 19, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9958731).
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice 3rd edition*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- O'Connor, J. & Seymour, J. (1995). *Introducing nlp psychological skills for understanding and influencing people*. San Francisco, CA: Thorsons, Inc.
- Parsons, T. & Shils, E. A., Editors (1951). *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 104-112.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Prince, L. (2005). Eating the menu rather than the dinner: Tao and leadership. *Leadership*, 1, 105-126.
- Pullen, W. (1993). Strategic Shocks: Managing Discontinuous Change. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 6, 30-39.
- Radosta, R. (1982). *An investigation of eye accessing cues*. Ed.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, United States -- Texas. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 8219481).

- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the 21st century*. New York, Westport, London: Praeger.
- Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sashkin, M. & Sashkin, M. G. (2003). *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizations' success*. New York, NY: Berrett-Koehler.
- Sanders, P. (1982). Phenomenology: a new way of viewing organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 353-360.
- Sartre, J-P. (1940). *The imaginary*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Schipper, F. (1999). Phenomenology and the reflective practitioner. *Management Learning*, 30, 473-485.
- Schleh, M. (1987). *An examination of the neurolinguistic programming hypothesis of eye movements in children*. Ph.D. dissertation, Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University, United States -- California. Retrieved January 19, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 8709616).
- Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Northwestern University Press.
- Schutz, A. (1970). *On phenomenology and social relations edited by wagner, h. r.* University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, W. R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems 3rd edition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sendjaya, S. & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant Leadership: Its origins, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*; 9(2), 57-64.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Currency DoubleDay.
- Sheldon, W. R. (1998) *Exploring relationships between Jungian archetypal psychological perspectives and charismatic/transformational leadership*. Ed.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, United States -- New York. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.
- Sholtes, P. R. (1998). *The leader's handbook*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Sholtes, P. R. (1999). The new competencies of leadership. *Total Quality Management*, 10, S704-S710.
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*; 10(4), 80-91.
- Solow, D. & Szmerekovsky, J. (2006). The role of leadership: What management science can give back to the study of complex systems. *Emergence: Complexity & Organization*, 8(4), 52-60.
- Sosik, J. J. (2001). Self-other agreement on charismatic leadership: Relationships with work attitudes and managerial performance. *Group & Organization Management*; 26, 484-512.
- Stacy, R. (1992). *Managing the unknowable*. New York, NY: Josey-Bass.
- Steel, P. & König, C. J. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 889-913.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sullivan, T. J. (2004). The viability of using various system theories to describe organisational change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(1), 43-54.
- Taylor, J. G. (1999). *The race for consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: A Bradford Book/ MIT Press.
- Thietart, R. A. & Forgues, B. (1995). Chaos theory and organizations. *Organization science*, 6, 19-32.
- Tracy, L. (1989). *The living organization systems of behavior*. New York, NY, Westport, CT, London England: Praeger.
- Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Leader political skill and employee reactions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 493-513.
- Tway, D. C., Jr. (1994). *A construct of trust*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, United States--Texas.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 654-676.

- Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Living systems theory as a paradigm for organizational behavior: Understanding humans, organizations, and social processes. *Behavioral science, 41*, 165-205.
- Van de Ven, A. H. & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 510-540.
- Van Eenwyk, J. R. (1997). *Archetypes & strange attractors the chaotic world of symbols*. Toronto, Canada: Inner City Books.
- Van Kaam, A. (1959). Phenomenal analysis: exemplified by a study of the experience of "really feeling understood." *Journal of Individual Psychology, 15*, 66-72.
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 354-371.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: Foundations, development, applications*. London: Allen Lane.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964/1995). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Wahlstrom, T. L. (1997). *Psychological applications in management: The hero's journey*. D.M. dissertation, Colorado Technical University, United States -- Florida. Retrieved December 19, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9914320).
- Walters, J. S. (2006). Inspired leadership: the powerful attractors for a new era of mastery. *Strategic Direction, 22*(4), 3-4.
- Watt, W. M. (2003). Effective leadership education: Developing a core curriculum for leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education; 2*(1), 1-14. Retrieved September 24, 2004 from <http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/02-01/WattFinal.pdf>
- Watts, S. (2005). *The people's tycoon henry ford and the American century*. New York, NY: Alfred Knoff.
- Weathersby, G. B. (1998). The crisis of leadership. *Management Review, 87*, 5.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons Trans). New York, NY: The Free Press. (Original work published 1947)
- Wertheim, E., Habib, C., & Cumming, G. (1986). Test of the neurolinguistic programming hypothesis that eye-movements relate to processing imagery.

Perceptual and Motor Skills, 62(2), 523-529.

- Wheatley, M. (1992). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Wilden, A. (1980). *System and structure: Essays in communication and exchange*. New York, NY: Tavistock Publications and Methuen.
- Williams, G. P. (1997). *Chaos theory tamed*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.
- Wood, M. (2005). The fallacy of misplaced leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42; 1101-1121.
- Young, P. (2001). *Understanding nlp metaphors and patterns of change*. Carmathen, UK: Crown House Publishing Limited.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations 5th edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Z (n.d.). *The black book of executive politics*. New York, NY: National Institute of Business Management.
- Zimbardo, P. G. & Gerrig, R. J. (1996). Perception. In D. J. Levitin (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive psychology: core readings* (pp. 133-188). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, A Bradford Book.
- Zimbardo, P., Maslach, C. & Marshall, G. (n.d.). Hypnosis and the psychology of cognitive and behavioral control. In E. Fromm & R. E. Shor (Eds.). *Hypnosis: developments in research and new perspectives* (pp. 649-683). New Brunswick, London: AldineTransaction.

APPENDIX A:

CONTACT LIST

Professional Associations And Social Organizations

The following list was compiled as a result of Internet and Public Library searches conducted between April 18, 2007 and May 13, 2007. The variation amongst the information contained is a reflection and result of the information made publicly available by the various organizations publishing this information between the aforementioned dates. The listings are segmented by population center i.e., La Crosse, WI area, Madison, WI area, Minneapolis/St Paul, MN area, and Rochester, MN area.

La Crosse, WI Area.

American Business Women's Association
Karen Hansen
2845 Brook Court
La Crosse, WI 54601
608-788-3709

Business & Professional Women, La Crosse Noon Chapter
Cari Burmaster
821 Valley Court
Onalaska, WI 54650
608-783-5540

Junior Achievement of the Coulee Region
W7787 Robin St.
Onalaska, WI 54650
608-789-4777

La Crescent Chamber of Commerce
PO Box 132
La Crescent, MN 55947
507-895-2800 Office, Fax 570-895-2619

La Crosse Area Business Club, Inc.

Mike Stuhr, Pres.
P.O. Box 2241
La Crosse, WI 54602-2241
608-788-9800; 608-783-7512

La Crosse Area Society for Human Resource Management
Melissa Borsheim
401 Main St
La Crosse, WI 54601
608-791-4245

Onalaska Area Business Association
1101 Main St.
Onalaska, WI 54650
608-781-9570 Office

SCORE
712 Main St
La Crosse, WI 54601
608-784-4880

Greater La Crosse Area Chamber of Commerce
712 Main St.
La Crosse, WI 54601
608-784-4880

La Crosse Area Toastmasters - Club 411
Matthew Christen
308 14th Ave. South
Onalaska, WI 54650
608- 781-0935

Onalaska Rotary Club
Bob Dinicola
P.O. Box 134
Onalaska, WI 54650
608-783-1406 -

Rotary Club of La Crosse
P. O. Box 1914
La Crosse, WI 54602-1914
608-526-4491

Rotary Club of La Crosse - East
Sonia Phillips
P.O. Box 393
La Crosse, WI 54602-0393
608-788-4776

Valley View Rotary Club
Bonnie Jeranek
P.O. Box 545
La Crosse, WI 54602-0545
608-784-2996

Business Professional Women
Wisconsin State Federation
Gert Bloedorn, President
4750 Vista Rd
Manitowoc, WI 54220
Phone: (B) 920.686.4050; (H) 920.684.9654
E-mail: gertb@lakefield.net
Retrieved: <http://www.bpwusa.org/files/public/2006-2007stateleadership-all.pdf>,
05/13/2007

American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), Northwest Wisconsin Chapter
Bob Pecor: Chapter President
Email: bob@coachingforward.com

Madison, WI Area
ASTD-SCWC
Jami Hartwick
1 E. Main Street, Suite 305
Madison, WI 53703
Email: astdscwc@astdscwc.org
Phone: 608.212.ASTD
Fax: 262.569.1540

East Side Business Men's Association
3735 Monona Dr.
Madison, WI 53714
(608)222-9131
fax (608)222-9132
office@esbma.com

Blackhawk Toastmasters Club

c/o Rick Reiner
One Gifford Pinchot Drive
Madison, WI 53726
(608)231-9442 or 231-9419

International Coaching Federation
Mary Kay Aide, Chapter Host/President
marykay@lifecoachmkay.com
www.lifecoachmkay.com
608-239-1066

National Association of Women Business Owners
4230 East Towne Blvd. #317
Madison, WI 53704
(608) 442-1924

The Business Forum
2810 Crossroads Drive, Suite 3800
Madison, WI 53718
Phone: (608) 443-2486

The Madison Club #1
Roe M. Parker, Vice-president of Public Relations
O: (608) 266-0025
H: (608) 835-3580.
roe.parker@wctsystem.edu .

Uptowner Toastmasters
President: Nancy McCulley
608.239-0890

Minneapolis/St Paul, MN Area
Rotary Club of Minneapolis
Tami Hagen, Executive Director
650 Third Avenue South, Suite 100
Minneapolis, MN 55402
E-mail: tami@mplsrotary.org

Minneapolis City of Lakes Rotary Club
Amber Bullock, Administrator
205 Heritage Circle North
Burnsville, MN 55337
Tel: 952-426-1569

Fax: 952-736-2627
E-Mail: bytmn@yahoo.com

Rotary International District 5960 Offices
Lee Finholm, District Governor
2233 Hamline Ave N, Suite 511
Roseville, MN 55113
Phone: (651) 636-9054
Fax: (651) 636-8799
E-mail: jingle@rotary5960.org

Society for Human Resource Management (#917)
Samantha Chamberlin, President
CSOM 1-105
321 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612)625-2490
Email: shrm@csom.umn.edu; chamb140@umn.edu
Website: <http://www.csom.umn.edu/shrm>

American Society for Training & Development (ASTD), Twin Cities Chapter
Rita Maehling: Chapter President
Phone: 651.290.6262
Fax: 651.290.2266
Email: info@astd-tcc.org; ritam@archievetconsulting.boz

Business Professional Women
Minnesota State Federation
Linda Hauge, President
522 E Alcott
Fergus Falls, MN 56537
Phone: (B) 218.998.7122; (H) 218.739.4217
E-mail: lhaugebpw@hotmail.com
Retrieved: <http://www.bpwusa.org/files/public/2006-2007stateleadership-all.pdf>,
05/13/2007

Accentuators - Club #: 8783
Accenture Tower
333 South 7th St., Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.277.6596
E-mail: george.heim@accenture.com

Ah-Ambient - Club #: 841690
Ambient Consulting
5500 Wayzata Blvd #1250
Minneapolis, MN 55416
Phone: 952.393.9486
E-mail: paul.burke@ambientconsulting.com

Antlers Toastmasters Club - Club #: 725
Dain Plaza / Suite 707
60 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 952.933 5094
E-mail: lmbell8@comcast.net
Website: antlers.freetoasthost.net

Bullseye Toastmasters Club - Club #: 1007533
Target Corporation
33 S 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.304 5661
E-mail: kelly.taschler@target.com

Burlington Northern Club - Club #: 2342
180 E 5th St, Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.298.6579
E-mail: robert.wagner@bnsf.com
Website: club2342.freetoasthost.com

Butler Expressors Club - Club #: 4217
100 North 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone: 612.330.0247
E-mail: aapersyn@aecengineering.com

Capitol Club - Club #: 4179
Transportation Building
395 John Ireland Blvd
Saint Paul, MN 55155
Phone: 651.296.3127

Capitol Square Club - Club #: 6042
Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West

Saint Paul, MN 55113
Phone: 651.582.8611
E-mail: JulAnn.Meech@State.mn.us

Carlson Toastmasters - Club #: 863176
U of MN Carlson School of Management
321 19th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55455
E-mail: kpike@csom.umn.edu
Website: <http://www.csom.umn.edu/Page4969.aspx>

Centennial Nooners Club - Club #: 3580
US Bank Trust Center
180 East 5th Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.645.6675
E-mail: roycewiens@qwest.net

Comedy Club - Club #: 2665
Shingle Creek Commons
4600 Humboldt Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55412
Phone: 763.576.9743
E-mail: orrx0012@umm.edu

Converse All Stars Club - Club #: 3107
ING North America Insurance Group
20 Washington Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 612.342.7914
E-mail: paul.nelson@us.ing.com

Creative Memories Club - Club #: 6025
3001 Clearwater Rd
Saint Cloud, MN 56301
Phone: 320.380.2475
E-mail: hgrothe@antioch.com
Website: creativememories.freetoasthost.org

Cultivated Club - Club #: 4972
MN Department of Agriculture
Orville Freeman Office Bldg.
625 Robert Street North

Saint Paul, MN 55155-2538
Phone: 651.215.3946

Daylighters Club - Club #: 4807
Rasmussen College
226 Park Ave S
Saint Cloud, MN 56301
Phone: 763.262.4210
E-mail: daylighters@freetoasthost.org
Website: daylighters.freetoasthost.org

Dialoggers Toastmasters Club - Club #: 2401
USDA Forest Service
1992 Folwell Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108
Phone: 612.624.6765
E-mail: alewand@umn.edu

Early Words Club - Club #: 5006
Hewlett-Packard #500
3433 Broadway Street
Minneapolis, MN 55414
Phone: 612.229.2938
E-mail: alscoff035@aol.com

Eclectics Club - Club #: 9393
Steve Tyykila
Knox Presbyterian Church
1536 Minnehaha Ave West
Saint Paul, MN 55104-1208
Phone: 612.721.6327
E-mail: styykila@netzero.net

Expressly Speaking Club - Club #: 687051
U. S. Postal Service
100 S 1st St., Rm 421A
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 763.427.2428
E-mail: michelle.m.mattsen-kraljic@usps.gov

Extrovert Engineers - Club #: 1007560
KFI Engineering
670 W County Rd B

Saint Paul, MN 55105
Five Star Speakers Club - Club #: 591398
US Bank
200 South 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.973.0955
E-mail: Ericajhanson@usbank.com
Website: www.tm5starspeakers.org
FRB \$peakea\$y Club - Club #: 5348
Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis
90 Hennepin Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 651.726.3511
E-mail: kent.hawks@mpls.frb.org

Freethought Toastmasters Club - Club #: 6913
Larpenteur Estates Party Room
1276 Larpenteur Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55113
Phone: 651.488.8225
E-mail: bperry8268@aol.com
Website: www.crest-o-the-hill.org/6913/Freethought.htm

Gold Medal Toastmasters - Club #: 262
General Mills Riverside Tech Center
330 University Avenue SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414
Phone: 763.764.3786

Gopher Toastmasters Club - Club #: 183
Hennepin Center For The Arts
528 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone: 612.728.8057
E-mail: info@tmclub183.org
Website: www.tmclub183.org

Heritage Toastmasters Club - Club #: 3676
Sinley Square
190 East Fifth Street 5th Floor
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.290.5625

HGA's Tech Talkers Club #: 981465
HGA
701 Washington Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55401-1180

Honeywell Astros Club - Club #: 1227
Honeywell International, Inc.
2600 Ridgway Pkwy
Minneapolis, MN 55413
Phone: 612.951.5824
E-mail: randy.hochstein@honeywell.com

Humor Mill Toastmasters Club - Club #: 330
934th Airlift Wing Officers Club
Hwy 5 & Post Road
Minneapolis, MN 55111
Phone: 651.455.7003
E-mail: robert.wagner@bnsf.com
Website: humormill.freetoasthost.org

King Boreas Club - Club #: 208
Associated Bank
176 Snelling Ave N
Saint Paul, MN 55104
Phone: 651.222.1757
E-mail: dr_suzy@juno.com
Website: kingboreas.freetoasthost.us

Lawson Thrill Speakers Club - Club #: 7507
Lawson Commons
380 St Peter St,
Saint Paul, MN 55102
Phone: 651.767.4557
E-mail: joan.watson@lawson.com
Website: www.lawsonthrillspeakers.org

Los Lagos Club - Club #: 4226
Rice Street Library
1011 Rice Street
Saint Paul, MN 55117
Phone: 651.464.4703
E-mail: merce741@aol.com
Website: loslagos.freetoasthost.us

Lunch Bunch Toastmasters Club - Club #: 8136
VA Medical Center Rm 2g-102
1 Veterans Dr,
Minneapolis, MN 55417
Phone: 612.725.2012

MACMasters Toastmasters Club - Club #: 902590
Metropolitan Airports Commission
6040 28th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55450
Phone: 612.725.6433
E-mail: rhunter@mspmac.org

Mears Park - Club #: 5133
Mears Park Center
390 N. Robert St.
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1626
Phone: 651.602.1065
E-mail: mike.nevala@metc.state.mn.us
Website: mearspark.freetoasthost.info/

Metro Speak Easy Club - Club #: 1392
ING Building
100 Washington Ave South
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 763.522.6365
E-mail: minnesota@speakeasytoastmasters.org
Website: www.speakeasytoastmasters.org

Metropolitan Club - Club #: 1696
St. Paul Rice Street Library
1011 Rice St
Saint Paul, MN 55121
Phone: 612.758.9148
E-mail: craigostrem@vanclemens.com
Website: www.freewebs.com/metropolitan-1696

Midway Club - Club #: 383
George's on Plato
199 East Plato Blvd
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Mills Early Risers Club - Club #: 2312

General Mills World Headquarters
1 General Mills Boulevard
Minneapolis, MN 55440
Phone: 763.764.3169
E-mail: Barb.Grachek@genmills.com

Minneapolis Club - Club #: 75
Davani
1138 Hennepin Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.822.0235
E-mail: djansen86@hotmail.com
Website: www.pqcoin.com/club75

Minnesota Mutual Life Club - Club #: 560
Minnesota Mutual Life
400 Robert Street North
Saint Paul, MN 55101-2098
Phone: 651.665.7705
E-mail: kristin.ferguson@securian.com

Mutual Voices Club - Club #: 3852
400 Building
400 Robert Street N 6th Fl
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.665.3674
E-mail: mutualvoices@yahoo.com
Website: www.mutualvoices.blogspot.com/

Northern Orators Toastmasters - Club #: 5584
BAE Systems
4800 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55421
Phone: 763.572.7639
E-mail: dave.t.oliver@baesystems.com

One Voice Club - Club #: 4437
American Express Financial Center
104 AXP Financial Center Conference Center H4
Minneapolis, MN 55474
Phone: 612.678.1770

Ordway Orators Club - Club #: 4709

St. Paul Travelers
385 Washington Street,
Saint Paul, MN 55102
Phone: 651.310.5998
E-mail: dmoerke@spt.com

Pillsbury Club - Club #: 1891
General Mills Inc
1 General Mills Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 763.764.6732

Pleasure Speakers - Club #: 5126
Hayden Hts Library
1456 White Bear Ave N
Saint Paul, MN 55106
Phone: 651.407.4047
E-mail: cheinsch@sprintmail.com

Power Speakers Toastmasters Club - Club #: 8293
Larpenteur Estates
1280 Larpenteur Avenue W
Saint Paul, MN 55113
Phone: 651.488.8225
E-mail: nup@minn.net
Website: d6tm.org/Clublinks/powerspeakers.html

Power Up Toastmasters Club - Club #: 3939
Dunwoody College of Technology
818 Dunwoody Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55404
Phone: 612.802.6996

PROS Club - Club #: 4650
The Backyard Bar & Grill
1500 E 78th St
Minneapolis, MN 55435
Phone: 612.798.0002
E-mail: smuraski@onvoymail.com

Public Employees Club - Club #: 7527
City of St Paul
City Hall Annex 11th floor

25 W 4th Street Rm 1106
Saint Paul, MN 55102
Phone: 651.266.6683

Republican Voices Of The Lakes Club - Club #: 435
Polly's Coffee Cove
1382 Payne Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 763.767.1452
E-mail: linda996@earthlink.net
Website: www.d6tm.org/RepublicanVoices.html

River Park Toastmasters Club - Club #: 9033
Minnesota Department of Revenue Building
600 North Robert Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.556.4702
E-mail: Mike.Bublitz@state.mn.us
Website: www.riverparktoast.netfirms.com

Roller Toasters Club - Club #: 4216
Minneapolis City Hall Rm 333
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612.230.6525

Russell H Conwell Club - Club #: 82
Minneapolis City Hall
350 South 4th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612.242 1068
E-mail: len.langkau@softbrands.com

Ryan Club - Club #: 6465
Ryan Companies US Inc Suite 300
50 South Tenth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone: 612.492.4402
Website: club6465.livejournal.com/

Sales And Marketing Executives Club - Club #: 2019
Minneapolis Club

729 2nd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.342.0657
E-mail: brian.larson@wachoviasec.com

Shock, Rhythm And Talk Toastmasters Club - Club #: 4805
Guidant / Conference Room E210
4100 Hamline Avenue North
Saint Paul, MN 55112
Phone: 651.582.6299
E-mail: Sujeet.Deshpande@guidant.com

Soaring Eagles Toastmasters Club - Club #: 6292
Jim Lupient Auto
7100 Wayzata Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55426
Phone: 952.937.5516
E-mail: jane@guertinfamilyrealty.com

Sound Speakers Club - Club #: 4020
CentraCare Health Plaza
1900 CentraCare Circle - Kraemers Room
Saint Cloud, MN 56303
Phone: 320.229.3316
E-mail: christensen@clearwire.net

Speak Up And Out Club - Club #: 2509
Vera's Cafe
2903 Lyndale Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408
Phone: 612.822.0127 Ext:532
E-mail: contact@speakupandout.org
Website: speakupandout.org

Speaking In Bytes Toastmasters Club - Club #: 633024
Fairview Health Services IMS
323 Stinson Blvd NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-2611
Phone: 612.672.5873
E-mail: bklingsb1@fairview.org

St Cloud VA Club - Club #: 588511
St Cloud VAMC

4801 Veteran's Dr
Saint Cloud, MN 56303
Phone: 320.255.6316
E-mail: cheryl.thieschafer@va.gov

St. Paul Speakers Toastmasters Club - Club #: 5886
Minnesota Mutual Co.
400 N Robert St
Saint Paul, MN 55101-2015
Phone: 651.767.4557
E-mail: joan.watson@lawson.com
Website: d6tm.org/sps.html

Stagecoach Speakers - Club #: 6594
Wells Fargo Bank
6th and Marquette
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone: 612.343.6354
E-mail: christopher.o.solberg@wellsfargo.com

Stagecoach Speakers-HMMC - Club #: 931300
Wells Fargo Home Mortgage
2701 Wells Fargo Way
Minneapolis, MN 55468
Phone: 612.312.6906
E-mail: stagecoachttopics-hmmc@wellsfargo.com

Stellar Speakers Toastmasters Club - Club #: 719114
Capella University
222 S. 9th S
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.977.5349
E-mail: nate.otto@capella.edu

StockTockers Club - Club #: 8067
Allianz Life Insurance Company
5701 Golden Hills Drive
Minneapolis, MN 55440
Phone: 763.765.7821
E-mail: kristine_campbell@allianzlife.com

Tale Weavers - Club #: 693
Minnehaha United Methodist Church

3701 E 50th St
Minneapolis, MN 55417
Phone: 651.726.3511
E-mail: kenthawks@gmail.com

Tartan Club - Club #: 162
3M Company
3M Center
Saint Paul, MN 55144
Phone: 651.737.3138
E-mail: qionгдаiley@yahoo.com

Techie Talkers - Club #: 983435
SoftBrands
Two Meridian Crossing, Suite 800
Minneapolis, MN 55423
Phone: 651.851.1831
E-mail: len.langkau@softbrands.com

The Ralph Smedley Club - Club #: 5770
William Mitchell Law College
875 Summit Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105
Phone: 651.455.7003
E-mail: robert.wagner@bnsf.com
Website: ralphsmedley.freetoasthost.net/index.html

Thriftbuilders Toastmasters Club - Club #: 1414
TCF Bank
801 Marquette Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.667.6283
Website: thriftbuilders.freetoasthost.info

Thrivent Toastmasters Club - Club #: 1767
Thrivent Financial
625 4th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612.340.5472
E-mail: marna.gisvold@thrivent.com

TLG Whizzes Toastmasters Club - Club #: 9313ay
The Lacey Group

900 Second Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.359.3738
E-mail: andrea.sundberg@lacek.com

Toast O' The Town Toastmasters Club - Club #: 3932
AgriBank Bldg
375 Jackson St
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.266.6077
E-mail: waynetheplain3000@yahoo.com
Website: toasttothetownfreetoasthost.com

Toast of BI - Club #: 8754
BI
7630 Bush Lake Road
Minneapolis, MN 55439
E-mail: toastmasters@biworldwide.com

Trane Hot Air Vents Club - Club #: 6477
The Trane Co
4833 White Bear Pkwy
Saint Paul, MN 55110
Phone: 651.236.5388
E-mail: karen.gruetzmacher@hbfuller.com

V.A.M.C. Club - Club #: 3334
VAMC
One Veterans Drive
Minneapolis, MN 55420
Phone: 952.890.2754

Victory Toastmasters Club - Club #: 221
Bethesda Rehabilitation Hospital
559 Capitol Boulevard
Saint Paul, MN 55103
Phone: 651.777.7622
E-mail: gfelland1@comcast.net
Website: victory.freetoasthost.org/

Vikings Club - Club #: 591
Arlington High School
1495 Rice St #1651

Saint Paul, MN 55107
Phone: 651.266.2390
E-mail: anderslc@usfamily.net
Website: us.geocities.com/d6conf/viking/viking.html

Voices Of Ameriprise Financial - Club #: 5338
Ameriprise Client Service Center
910 Third Ave South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612.671.5902
E-mail: terri.kasel@ampf.com

Westside Chats Club - Club #: 758930
US Bank
60 Livingston Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55107

Westwinds Club - Club #: 1409
3M Bldg 42-1 W
900 Bush Ave
PO Box 33331
Saint Paul, MN 55133
Phone: 651.778.4056
Website: www.d6tm.org/clublinks/westwinds.html

Wind Chimes Club - Club #: 5751
3M Center
230 Cafeteria Rm C-1
Saint Paul, MN 55144
Phone: 651.733.6253

Winona Chamber Toastmasters Club - Club #: 762916
Winona HRA Building
1756 Kraemer Drive
Winona, MN 55987
507.452.2272
E-mail: info@winonachamber.com

Word Merchants Club - Club #: 6553
Target Corp
1000 Nicollet Mal
Minneapolis, MN 55403

Phone: 612.761.5554
 E-mail: Carla.Tappainer@target.com

Wordsmiths - Club #: 374
 Hamline University
 1536 Hewitt Ave
 Saint Paul, MN 55101
 651.641.1990
 E-mail: leo@creativitygarden.com
 Website: www.wordsmithstm.org

XNSPeakers Club - Club #: 5582
 414 Nicollet Mall - 1B
 Minneapolis, MN 55401
 Phone: 612.337.2243
 E-mail: judy.l.ring@xcelenergy.com

Zaj Lus Dragonspeakers - Club #: 999440
 First Choice
 753 Milton St N
 Saint Paul, MN 55104
 Phone: 651.340.2928

Rochester, MN Area
 Rotary Club of Rochester, The
 Rick Lien, Rick, President
<http://www.rochesterrotaryclubs.org/>

Greater Rochester Rotary
 President: Dale Rohlfin
<http://www.rochesterrotaryclubs.org/>

Rochester Rotary Risers
 President: Tim Connelly
<http://www.rochesterrotaryclubs.org/>

Chamber Toastmasters - Club #: 5917
 Rochester Area Chamber Of Commerce
 220 South Broadway Ste 100
 Rochester, MN 55904
 507.288.4331
 E-mail: ross.messick@charter.net
 Website: www.rochestermn.com/community/chambertoastmasters

Chamber Toastmasters Too! Club - Club #: 9026
RACOC / Holiday Inn Express
220 S Broadway Ste 100
Rochester, MN 55902
507.288.6892
E-mail: rpadz@attglobal.net
Website: www.chamber2.freetoasthost.us

Humor-US Club - Club #: 821458
St Mary's Hospital
1216 2nd St SW Rm G-21
Rochester, MN 55905
Phone: 507.287.8948
E-mail: hinton@us.ibm.com
Website: humor-us.freetoasthost.com

IBM Toastmasters Club - Club #: 6747
IBM Corp - Bldg 006-2 F202
3605 Hwy 52 N
Rochester, MN 55901
Phone: 507.253.5829
E-mail: xiaoming@us.ibm.com
Website: w3.rchland.ibm.com/projects/Toastmasters

Mayo Daybreakers Club - Club #: 5536
Mayo Clinic
200 1st Street SW / GO_02_160
Rochester, MN 55905
Phone: 507.284.5890
E-mail: jackson.angela@mayo.edu
Website: mayodaybreakers.freetoasthost.net

Mayo Hi-Nooners Club - Club #: 4677
Phone: 507.284.2425
E-mail: rochmayotoast@yahoo.com
Website: www.hinooners.com

Rochester Break Of Day Toastmasters Club - Club #: 8693
Christ United Methodist Church
400 5th Ave. SW, Room 146
Rochester, MN 55902
Phone: 507.421.8667

E-mail: tragan@bonestroo.com

Rochester Suburban Club - Club #: 1883

St Mary's Hospital

1216 2nd St SW

Rochester, MN 55905

Phone: 507.273 1466

E-mail: dpearson@venturecs.net

Website: rochester.freetoasthost.org

APPENDIX B:

CALL FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Dear :

I am a Ph.D. student with Walden University completing a degree in Applied Management Decision Sciences specializing in leadership and organizational change. Having completed all my coursework, I am doing a dissertation research project into leadership. My purpose in writing to you is to request your cooperation and assistance in making contact with potential subjects through your organization. Specifically, I am asking you to forward this information to your membership for consideration or for the opportunity to address your organization to present and discuss the intended research at your next meeting.

The purpose of the study is to assess the meaning of leadership as an individual and social construct in everyday experience. I am seeking people who have experienced leadership, can articulate it, are interested in understanding its nature and meanings, and willing to participate in an interview.

Individuals agreeing to participate in this study means committing to one two-part audio- and video-taped interview. The first part of the interview will take no more than 15 minutes and will involve a series of questions with the instruction to think of the answer without responding verbally. The only information recorded will be eye-movement. The second part of the interview involves a set of instructions and a series of open interview questions about the individual's response to that instruction.

Consent Statement

I have read the preceding information describing this study. I am 18 years of age or older and agree to take part of the study by cooperating with and or participating in recruitment of participants via one or more of the following means (please check all that apply).

Granting entrance and consent to talk with members of the organizations
Providing a list of member names and contact information
Arranging the opportunity for the researcher to speak publicly to the group
Making contact with organizational members myself and referring those who may be interested to the researcher

I understand that participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time. I can keep a copy of this consent form for my records. I voluntarily consent to participate in the recruitment effort of the study and agree to allow responses and comments to be used for academic purposes by the investigator including the preparation of a pilot study and

doctoral dissertation, as well as for publications for scholastic conferences and in journal articles. I understand that participant anonymity will be safeguarded at all times during the process of the study and in the preparation of all related materials and presentations. Interested parties will be provided with a participation consent form before becoming an active subject.

Contacts and Questions:

Please contact Brian W. Bridgeforth, the principle investigator of the study through the contact information posted here if you are willing and interested in participating.

Brian W. Bridgeforth
Principal Investigator
E-mail: bbridgef@waldenu.edu
Phone: (608) 526-4084

If you have any questions concerning your participation, please call me at (608) 526-4084 (CST) or my faculty advisor Dr. William D. Steeves Jr. (703) 321-2826 (EST), or the Research Participant Advocate at Walden University Leilani Endicott at (800) 925 3368, extension 1210. Please feel free to keep a copy of this advertisement for your records and I will be glad to provide you with a summary copy of the findings of the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

In your service,

Brian W. Bridgeforth, PhD (ABD), MBA, MA
Student, Walden University

APPENDIX C:

FACILITY CONTACT LIST

The following list was compiled from an Internet search conducted on May 13, 2007. The variation amongst the information contained is a reflection and result of the information made publicly available by the various organizations publishing this information between the aforementioned dates. The listings are segmented by population center i.e., La Crosse, WI area, Madison, WI area, Minneapolis/St Paul, MN area, and Rochester, MN area.

La Crosse, WI Area
La Crosse Public Library
800 Main Street
La Crosse, WI 54601
Phone: 608.789.7100

Murphy Library
UW - La Crosse
1631 Pine Street
La Crosse, WI 54601-3748
Phone: 608.785.8505

Viterbo University
900 Viterbo Dr.
La Crosse, WI 54601
Phone: 608.796.3269

Madison, WI Area
University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries
728 State Street
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: 608.262.3193

Madison Public Library
201 W. Mifflin St.
Madison 53703
Phone: 608.266.6300

South Central Library System (Network of 52 Public Libraries)
5250 E Terrace Drive
Madison, WI 53718
Phone: 608.246.7970

Minneapolis/St Paul, MN Area
Minneapolis Public Library
Phone: 612.630.6000

Walden University
155 Fifth Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Phone: 866.492.5336

Saint Paul Public Library
Melanie Huggins, Library Director
90 West Fourth Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102
Phone: 651.266.7000

University of Minnesota Libraries
Wilson Library
West Bank, Minneapolis Campus
309 19th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0438
Phone: 612.626.2227;

Rochester, MN Area
Rochester Public Library
101 2nd Street SE
Rochester, MN 55902
Phone: 507.285.8000

Southeastern Libraries Cooperating/Southeast Library System
2600 19th Street NW
Rochester MN 55901
Phone: 507.288.5513

APPENDIX D:

FACILITY COOPERATION REQUEST

Dear _____:

I am a Ph.D. student with Walden University completing a degree in Applied Management Decision Sciences. Having completed all my coursework, I am doing a research project into leadership. My purpose in writing you is to request your cooperation in providing a conference room with a table and two chairs in which I may interview subjects. The desired facilities would need to provide minimal distraction and reasonable privacy for the comfort of participating research subjects. All other required equipment will be provided by me, the researcher.

The purpose of the study is to assess the meaning of leadership as an individual and social construct in everyday experience. Achievement of this project entails an audio- and video-taped interview of consenting subjects. Interviews are anticipated to be 60-90 minutes in duration occurring within a two-hour time block.

Upon your consent and as the study progresses I will be in contact with you via your provided e-mail to arrange and schedule use of the requested facilities.

Consent Statement

I have read the preceding information describing this study. I am 18 years of age or older and have sufficient authority upon which to agree to provide the requested facilities for the stated purpose of audio- and video-recorded interviews. I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time. I can keep a copy of this consent form for my records.

Contacts and Questions:

Please contact Brian W. Bridgeforth, the principle investigator of the study through the contact information posted here if you are willing and interested in participating.

Brian W. Bridgeforth
Principal Investigator
E-mail: bbridgef@waldenu.edu
Phone: (608) 526-4084

If you have any questions concerning your participation, please call me at (608) 526-4084 (CST) or my faculty advisor Dr. William D. Steeves Jr. (703) 321-2826 (EST), or the Research Participant Advocate at Walden University Leilani Endicott at (800) 925 3368,

extension 1210. Please feel free to keep a copy of this advertisement for your records and I will be glad to provide you with a summary copy of the findings of the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

In Your Service,

Brian W. Bridgeforth, Ph.D. (ABD), M.B.A., M.A.

APPENDIX E:

CONSENT FORM

Characteristics of The Leadership Archetype: An Exploratory Study

You are invited to participate in a research study of leadership. If you have experienced leadership, interested in understanding its nature and meanings, can articulate it, and are willing to participate in an interview. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before acting on this invitation to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Brian W. Bridgeforth a doctoral candidate at Walden University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to identify the meaning of leadership in everyday experience.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you are asked to commit to one two-part audio- and video-taped interview of approximately one to one and a half hour in duration. The first part will take no more than 15 minutes in which you will be asked a series of questions with the instruction to think of the answer without responding verbally. The only information recorded will be the direction your eyes move. In the second part, lasting approximately one hour, you will be given a set of instructions and asked to respond to open interview questions regarding your response to that instruction.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with any institution or agency. If you initially decide to participate, you are still free to withdraw at any time later without affecting those relationships.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

There are no risks associated with participating in this study and there are no short or long-term benefits to participating in this study.

In the event you experience stress or anxiety during your participation in the study, you may terminate your participation at any time. You may refuse to answer any questions you consider invasive or stressful.

Compensation:

There will be no compensation provided for your participation in this study.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any report of this study that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records (audio- and video-tapes, and transcripts) will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home office when in use and in safe deposit box at an external location when not in use. Only the researcher will have access to the records. All records will be kept for a period of five (5) years following publication of the dissertation. Upon the five-year anniversary, the records will be promptly destroyed.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Brian W. Bridgeforth, PhD (ABD). The researcher's faculty advisor is Dr. William D. Steeves Jr., Schools of Management and Public Policy and Administration, Walden University 8918 Kenilworth Drive Burke, VA 22015-2174; Phone 703 321-2826, wsteeves@waldenu.edu. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact them via Brian W. Bridgeforth, PhD (ABD), MBA, MA N7433 CTY RD V, Holmen, WI 54636; Phone: 608.526.4084. The Research Participant Advocate at Walden University is Leilani Endicott; you may contact her at 1-800-925-3368, extension 1210, if you have questions about your participation in this study.

You will receive a copy of this form from the researcher.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Printed Name of
Participant

Participant Signature

Signature of Investigator

APPENDIX F:
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Objectives:

1. Confirm or deny the existence of a leadership archetype.
2. Identify the individual as well as common structure i.e., composing elements or characteristics, of that archetype.
3. Understand the imprinting process that sustains and perpetuates the archetype in the human psyche.
4. Identify the pattern occurrences of visual recall, visual construction, and internal dialogue processing during verbal intercourse.
5. Identify the pattern occurrences of theoretical references (e.g., trait, servant, charismatic) in terms of unsolicited and voluntary subject expression during verbal intercourse.
6. Identify the pattern occurrences of thematic references (e.g., change, influence, credibility, systems, politics, and power) in terms of unsolicited and voluntary subject expression during verbal intercourse.

Script:

Good (morning / afternoon / evening). Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I would like to offer some background on myself and cover a few things before we start. Is that acceptable?

I am a Ph.D. student with Walden University completing a degree in Applied Management Decision Sciences specializing in leadership and organizational change.

After completing an MA and MBA in business and management, I found my industrial practice as a manager and leader of change was generating deeper and more urgent questions that I, and many colleagues, did not have answers to, so I decided to pursue my doctorate. Professionally, I have been teaching and consulting for about 11 years. I chose Walden University (www.waldenu.edu) because it is satisfied two requirements for me. First and foremost, it was and is recognized as a premier International Internet-based University with a long record of excellence. Second, it was/is one of the few institutions to provide a program specifically catering to what I was interested in that offered faculty that were academic and industry experts to guide and assess my development. One of those questions is the research I am doing now. For as long as I can recall I have been interested in leadership as concept and practice. This research offers the opportunity to look at in a way that has not been done before—from everyday experience.

What might this research do for you? Initially, you might find the interview and reflective process, to influence your perceptions about leaders; enhance your understanding of leadership; and positively change how you practice it yourself. Moreover, you can and may collaborate with me on discussing my research and its theoretical underpinnings. If you are interested, a copy of the final published dissertation will be provided for your review and use. Alternately, you may seek my council regarding practice, whichever suits.

What might I get out this? The short answer is the information gathered from my study will be used to complete a research project that is in partial fulfillment of the requirements of my doctoral program at Walden University. The long-term answer is that

I hope to understand something fundamental about the human psyche about why we do what we do with this thing called leadership that I may share with and teach others.

Confidentiality is always a concern. To that end, I would like to offer the following assurances.

Your participation is voluntary and you do not have to respond to every item or question. The process you will encounter is iterative. After this interview, I will mail you a copy of the transcript from the interview for your review and any additional comments you would like to add as supplement or clarification. After you have returned either the transcript with notation or a short note expressing that it is acceptable as is I will reduce it to its essence—a short description of the meaning of the overall content. This will then be shared with you for your suggested revision or approval. We will repeat this process until you approve of the description. After all descriptions are approved by subjects I will reduce the totality of them further into a summary description or essence and share that with all subjects.

You and your responses will remain anonymous and confidentiality of your identity and your responses will be maintained at all times.

Audio- and video-tapes will be stored in locked safe deposit box at a secure facility when not being used.


Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.

Interview Part I: Eye Accessing Cues

Date: _____

Participant's Name: _____

Handedness (Right/Left): _____



V^c = 1, V^r = 2, A^c = 3, A^r = 4, K = 5, A = 6

V^c : Visually constructed images.
 V^r : Visually recalled (eidetic) images.
 A^c : Auditory constructed sounds or words.

A^r : Auditory remembered sounds or words.
 K : Kinesthetic feelings (also taste and smell
 A : Auditory sounds or words as internal
 dialogue.

Ask each subject to simply think of the answer and not verbally respond.

Eye-Accessing Cue Questions

(1) Vc = Visually constructed images.

1. What would your bedroom look like with pink spotted wallpaper?
2. If a map is upside down, which direction is southeast?
3. Imagine a purple triangle inside a red square.
4. How do you spell your Christian name backwards?
5. Imagine your car as green with yellow dots on it.
6. Imagine yourself with red hair.
7. Picture a traffic light with the green light at the top and the red light at the bottom.

(2) Vr = Visually recalled (eidetic) images.

8. What color is your front door?
9. What do you see on your journey to the nearest shop?
10. How do the stripes go round a tiger's body?
11. How tall is the building you live in?
12. Which of your friends has the longest hair?
13. See yourself yesterday. What did you wear?
14. See the color you most favored as a child.
15. See the color that graced your bedroom walls at that time.

(3) Ac = Auditory constructed sounds or words.

16. How loud would it be if ten people shouted at once?
17. What would your voice sound like underwater?
18. Think of your favorite tune played at double speed.

19. What sound would a piano make if it fell off the top of a ten-storey building?
 20. What would the scream of a mandrake sound like?
 21. What would a chainsaw sound like in a corrugated iron shed?
 22. Name the seventh word in "T'was the Night Before Christmas"
 23. Hear the sound of a large rock hitting water.
 24. Hear me sounding like I had Donald Duck's voice.
- (4) Ar = Auditory remembered sounds or words.
25. Can you hear your favorite piece of music in your mind?
 26. Which door slams loudest in your house?
 27. What is the sound of the engaged tone on the telephone?
 28. Is the third note in the national anthem higher or lower than the second note?
 29. Can you hear the dawn chorus in your mind?
 30. Listen to your favorite song. What does it sound like?
 31. Listen again to the very last statement I made.
 32. Listen to the sound of ocean waves lapping on the shore.
- (5) K = Kinesthetic feelings (also taste and smell).
33. What does it feel like to put on wet socks?
 34. What is it like to put your foot into a cold swimming pool?
 35. What is it like to feel wool next to the skin?
 36. Which is warmer now, your left hand or your right hand?
 37. What is it like to settle down in a nice hot bath?
 38. How do you feel after a good meal?

39. Think of the smell of ammonia.
 40. What is it like to taste a spoonful of very salty soup?
 41. Feel yourself rubbing your hand over a very fine fur coat.
 42. Imagine diving into a very cold stream or pool.
 43. Feel your love for the one person you love the most.
- (6) A = Auditory sounds or words as internal dialogue.
44. What tone of voice do you use when you talk to yourself?
 45. Recite a nursery rhyme silently.
 46. When you talk to yourself, where does the sound come from?
 47. What do you say to yourself when things go wrong?
 48. Go inside and repeat to yourself the choices you had concerning the last major decision you made.
 49. Recite the words of your favorite verse to yourself.
 50. Talk to yourself about what you really want out of life.

Interview Part II: Content Interview

Following the prescriptive formats of Kvale (1996), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Moustakas (1994) there are three primary questions to this interview. Subsequent bridging and detail questions or subquestions are identified as anticipated presently. Further depth inquiry during the interview process will be relative to the identification of deletion, distortion, and generalization through key words and phrases of subject responses.

1. Think about leadership.
 - a. What do you see?
 - i. Is the image still or in motion?
 - ii. Is it large or small?
 - iii. Black and white or color?
 - b. What do you hear?
 - i. Describe it (allegory/ metaphor)?
 - ii. Is the sound loud or soft?
 - c. What does it feel like?
2. Share a story that exemplifies leadership for you. Describe the leader, the issue, and context.
 - a. Which came first, the leader or the necessity for change?
 - b. Please complete the following sentence stem: A leader was necessary because . . . or Without the leader . . .

- c. Why did you choose to exercise leadership; or why did you choose to refrain from exercising leadership?
 - d. How was the leader identified or selected?
 - e. Was there anything significant (that stands out) about the leader's social interaction that was different from other members of the group?
 - f. Was there anything specifically significant about the leader that separated that person from the rest of the group?
 - g. What about that leader stimulated or inhibited action on your part?
 - h. How would you describe the nature and proximity of your relationship with the leader?
 - i. Did the initiative fail to achieve its objective? How did this outcome affect your perception of the leader?
 - j. What was the leader's position amongst the group after realizing the result?
3. If you were to offer a symbol that described or illustrated this person as a leader, what would it be (Visual, auditory, or kinesthetic)?

Developed from information in:

- Bodenhamer, B. G. & Hall, L. M. (2001). *The user's manual for the brain*. Trowbridge, Wilshire UK: The Cromwell Press.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews an introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Connor, J. & Seymour, J. (1995). *Introducing nlp psychological skills for understanding and influencing people*. San Francisco, CA: Thorsons, Inc.
- Tway, D. C., Jr. (1994). *A construct of trust*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, United States -- Texas.

CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATION

Ph.D.: AMDS – Leadership & Organizational Change, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN	08
M.B.A.: E-Business, University of Phoenix, Phoenix, AZ	02
M.S. (coursework: 23/30 cr. hrs): Org. Dev. & Training, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI	00
M.A.: Organizational Management, University of Phoenix, Phoenix, AZ	98
B.S. (dbl mjr): Accounting & Business Administration, Viterbo College, La Crosse, WI	94
A.A.S.: Business Administration & Personnel, Mid-State Technical College, Wisconsin Rapids, WI	90

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Social Dynamics, Change, Leadership, Systems Theory, NLP, and Communication.

EXPERIENCE

Academic Dean, Columbia Southern University, Orange Beach, AL 08-Pres
Chief Academic Officer leading staff and managing operations serving 17,000+ students.

- Lead 200+ management, administrative, services, and support staff working in 3 colleges.
- Oversee the planning of new programs, accreditation, program review, and assessment plans.
- Manage 11 programs offering 20 degrees with multiple concentrations, and 15 discipline specific certificate options.
- Manage course development and deployment of a catalogue of 380 courses simultaneously deployed across 3 concurrent enrollment systems on a monthly basis.

President, Development by Design, Holmen, WI 01-08
Organizational development and management/ leadership development training.

- Designed, authored, conducted, and evaluated training, curriculums, and courses covering a variety of management and leadership topics as well as train-the-trainer and faculty mentoring.
- Developed leadership competency model based training program.
- Advised schools regarding distance education offerings, practices, and instructor training.
- Originated organizational change process model.
- Organizations: UW-La Crosse / Centenary College / Ho-Chunk Nation / US Army / Tomah VA / Silver Lake College / Herzing College / Fastenal / Western Wisconsin Technical College / St. Mary's University / Cambridge National University / Omniversity.

Chief Technology Officer, Allergy Associates of La Crosse, La Crosse, WI 99-01
Systems and Process Reengineering Project

- Engineered and lead \$500K systems project from design and budget through contract negotiation to implementation that included overseeing training.

- Envisioned and planned two websites, an e-com initiative, and patient education center. Total investment > \$250K the first year.
- Achieved > 40% increase in average monthly collections reducing A/R Days by 27 days after revamping financial policy and collection management process.

Short-term service opportunities, Manpower, Olsten, La Crosse, WI 97-99

Human Resources Director, IRIS USA, Pleasant Prairie, WI 96-97

Established and managed the human resources function during start up phase.

- Raised staffing level from 14 to 128 in 6 months.
- Trained factory supervisory staff.

Consultant, Sterling Business Partners, La Crosse, WI 94-96

Facilitate client performance

- Designed “Erudite” an academic enterprise information application for client.
- Originated a model and method for organizational design, diagnosis, and development.
- Designed job analysis form for developing ADA compliant position descriptions analyzing and authoring numerous position descriptions.

Systems Administrator/Instructor, Viterbo College, La Crosse, WI 90-94

- Researched and structured the Management Computer Information Systems curriculum.
- Built the organization and managed staff of 22 work-study students providing technical, end-user, clerical, and library services to over 300 internal and external clients.
- Taught computer literacy courses for PC, MAC, & NeXT computer platforms.

PRESENTATIONS

Organizational Behavior (2006). Small Business Development Center, UW - La Crosse.

Prospecting (2006). Small Business Development Center, UW - La Crosse.

Leadership Is As Leadership Does (2006). Conference on Applied Management and Decision Sciences.

PUBLICATIONS

Book Review: Managing People and Organizations in Changing Contexts. (2007). *Emergence: Complexity and Organization* (E:CO), 9(4).

Leadership Is As Leadership Does (2006). *Applied Management and Decision Sciences Conference, Dallas TX. Proceedings: <http://www.amdsconference.org/>*

Advancing the Practice of Leadership: A Curriculum (2005). *The Journal of Leadership Education*, 4(1), 4-30. Available: <http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/>.

Toward A General Theory of Social Systems (2005). *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 25(10/11), 54-83.

TRAINING

OMT/ODC/MOC Doctoral Consortium, Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA 07

Online Teaching Certification, University of Wisconsin, MBA Consortium	05
Online Faculty Training, Centenary College, Hackettstown, NJ	05
Teaching At A Distance: From Concept to Practice w/ Dr. Joe Levine, Learner Associates	05
Online Distance Education Faculty Development, Franklin University, Columbus, OH	02
Accelerated Learning (Faculty Training), Western WI Technical College, La Crosse, WI	02

AFFILIATIONS

Member, Academy of Management	06-Pres
Member, Systems Dynamics Society	04-06
Member, American Society for Training & Development (ASTD)	00-01, 04
Member, WWTC Supervisory Management Advisory Committee	02-03
Executive Member, e-Business Communication Association (EBCA)	02-06
Board of Directors, AllergyChoices	00-01
Member, American Management Association (AMA)	99-Pres

VETERAN

A1C, USAF, 81st Services Squadron, RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, Honorable Discharge.83-87

COURSES TAUGHT

Graduate: Leadership & Team Building / The Learning Organization / Organizational Behavior / Organizational Theory / Business Strategy & Policy / Management / Marketing for Managers / Business & Professional Ethics / Train the Trainer / Creative Thinking & Innovation / Financial Markets & Monetary Institutions/ Marketing Management.

Baccalaureate: Leadership Development / Leadership & Team Development / Strategic Management / Capstone / Senior Project / Project Management / Human Resources Management / Industrial & Organizational Psychology / Organizational Behavior / Organizational Development / International Marketing / Sales / Advertising / Quantitative Decision Sciences / Finance / Management / Supervision / Business Principles & Management / Macroeconomics / Microeconomics / Principles of Economics / Accelerated Learning / PC Literacy / Macintosh Literacy / NeXT® Literacy.