

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

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 bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI 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.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9419170

Language, metaphors, and phenomenology of leadership

Watson, John Lynn, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1993

Copyright ©1993 by Watson, John Lynn. All rights reserved.

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

LANGUAGE, METAPHORS, AND PHENOMENOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP

by


John Lynn Watson

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1993

Approved by


Dissertation Co-Advisor


Dissertation Co-Advisor

WATSON, JOHN LYNN, Ed.D. Language, Metaphors, and Phenomenology of Leadership. (1993)
Directed by Dr. Fritz Mengert. 174 pp.

In current scholarship, the subject of leaders and leadership has been identified and measured through traditional sampling and research techniques. The assumptions of these techniques is that leaders and leadership operate as a positional, top down phenomenon. Articulated by a cultural voice, these techniques are limited to traditionally accepted modes of inquiry and research.

The purpose of this study was to explore a philosophical conceptual frame, one that is based in language phenomenologically with an epistemological orientation. By studying the language of leadership, interpretations and descriptions may be rendered which focuses a metaphorically constructed lens of reality. Secondly by allowing the researcher to express the self phenomenologically the humane elements of research and leadership spring forth.

The writer found that life itself is the expression, through language and metaphor, of leadership, and that every person is capable of this expression. Through prophetic and spiritual language, the expression of "ducere vitam" is brought to the realm of relationships, sharedness, and vision.

Chapter I strives to make meaning from the derivation of such words as lead, leader, and leadership. A comparison of

the language of leadership and management begins the metaphorical interpretation imbedded in the construct of the terms. Chapter II utilizes current literature to develop the metaphorical concepts about language important to making meaning in our everyday experience. Chapter III moves toward understanding the metaphors of leadership in a cultural setting. Questions about leadership as relationship form the basis for assertions in Chapter IV. Chapter IV makes assertions about leadership being a relationship that has significant overtone based in the concepts of spirituality. The concept of leadership as a spiritual metaphor is developed in Chapter IV.

If the language of leadership is to be uniquely capable of determining the meaning of leadership, the language must reflect a sharedness of understanding that language itself is what will bring into focus the spiritual vision we share.

© 1993 John Lynn Watson

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Co-Advisor Blake L. Ruppel
Dissertation Co-Advisor Jeff Hunsford
Committee Members Richard Johnson
C.M. Schultz

November 15, 1993
Date of Acceptance by Committee

November 10, 1993
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alan, Anita, Bruce, Charles, Chuck, Crawford, Dale,
David, Eddie, Eloise, Felicia, Fritz, Jeanette, Jenny, Jim,
John, Karen, Marge, Mike, Nance, Nancy, Ray, Richard, Ross,
Skip, Steve, Tony.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| APPROVAL PAGE | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN LANGUAGE | 1 |
| Introductory Statement | 1 |
| The Meaning of Leadership | 3 |
| Leader-ship | 5 |
| To Lead | 6 |
| The Leader | 8 |
| Leader[Ship] | 11 |
| Leader[ness] | 13 |
| Leadership and Essentialist Thought | 16 |
| The Definitions of Leadership | 19 |
| The Language of Management | 22 |
| Manage | 23 |
| Management | 25 |
| Manager | 26 |
| Leadership: Meaning and Metaphors | 27 |
| The Management/Leadership Dichotomy | 31 |
| Differentiating Leadership and Management | 32 |
| Management and Essentialist Thought | 37 |
| Leadership: More Meaning and Metaphor | 39 |
| II. LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN LITERATURE | 47 |
| Ways of Knowing | 47 |
| Metaphor and Culture: | |
| Conflict vs. Cooperation | 55 |
| Spirituality and Leadership | 60 |
| Issues of the Human Condition | 62 |
| Methodology | 66 |
| A Methodology for the Study of Leadership | 68 |
| Spirituality Lost | 73 |
| The Democracy of Leadership | 77 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

| CHAPTER | Page |
|--|------|
| III. LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN CULTURE | 82 |
| The Hermeneutics and Phenomenology of Leadership | 82 |
| Hermeneutics | 84 |
| Autobiography of a Researcher: Hermeneutical and Phenomenological | 86 |
| Hermeneutic Methodology | 88 |
| Autobiographical Methodology | 92 |
| Phenomenological Methodology of Autobiography | 97 |
| Autobiography: An Example of the Method | 102 |
| Leadership, Relationship, and Family | 114 |
| "Ducere," "Educere," Educator | 118 |
| Disintegration of Family, Spirituality, and Leadership | 122 |
| The Other Communities | 127 |
| Leadership and the Struggle for Static Truth and Dynamic Truth | 132 |
| Leadership as Static and Dynamic | 139 |
| IV. LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN SPIRITUALITY | 141 |
| Leadership: The Reality of Language and of Knowing | 144 |
| Leadership: The Act of Guiding and Directing | 146 |
| Leadership: An Autobiographical Phenomena | 150 |
| Leadership: An Experience in Community | 152 |
| Leadership: A Spiritual Journey | 154 |
| Leadership is Sharing Vision | 157 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 166 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|--|------|
| 1 Rost (1991) Dichotomous Management Leadership Descriptors | 34 |
| 2 Shapiro Dichotomous Cultural Descriptors | 36 |

CHAPTER I
LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN LANGUAGE

Introductory Statement

This dissertation does not begin on the title page and end on page 174. Instead, it began in 1991 as I made notes in the margins of class notes from Epistemology and Foundations of Interpretive Inquiry. Those margin notes were the first steps of a long, arduous journey toward the completion of the dissertation.

Committee members Fritz Mengert, chair, Dale Brubaker, Chuck Achilles, and Skip Moore commented during the oral presentation that I, as a writer and scholar, had completed an especially significant journey. They asked me to finish this dissertation by writing this introductory statement detailing just how far I have come on the journey.

I have had the good fortune of health and strength, enough to run the Marine Corps Marathon in 1988, 1989, and 1990. This 26.2 mile foot race is a gruelling event, even for the fittest and swiftest. It is a race intended to create extremes. The length is extreme. It seems the body is built well for running 17-21 miles, but after 21 miles, extreme fortitude and stamina are required to complete the remaining miles. The marathon runner typically experiences

extreme euphoria, extreme health, extreme pain, extreme anxiety, extreme doubt, and extreme self-examination. I have experienced all of these sensations. This "long run" and its extremes are metaphors about the journey of writing a dissertation.

During the extreme self-examination while writing this paper, partners were very important and helpful. Advisors, fellow runners/writers, spouses, and families were a few of the partners needed along the journey. Running and writing, skills that can only be accomplished by learning the correct methods, require efficiency. I was a clumsy runner/writer the first few miles, but as the race wore on, I became at ease, and I got into a rhythm. Close to the end, after mile 22, a race within a race began. This race was to survive and finish. Now that the race is over, it seemed easy. Not that I would want to do it again, but if I had to, I know I could.

The committee also suggested I define a certain terminology used in this dissertation: Epistemology is the study of knowing and how things are known; Axiology is the study of reality and how we agree upon what is real; Ontology is the study of truth. Hermeneutic phenomenology is interpretive description. Hermeneutics acknowledges the person conducting the research as part of the research and phenomenology struggles with the contradictions of life.

The Meaning of Leadership

In classrooms, workshops, curriculum designs, experiential learning situations, and in the exercise of authority, I have come face-to-face with the phenomenon of leadership. What are the traits, skills, values, and "right stuff" necessary to be a leader? I have struggled to understand the concepts of leadership, but no one source gives concise empirical data or evidence as to its meaning or definition. Typically, the examples and definitions are hegemonic and are based on models of predominantly white men in positions of authority. Is this the only meaning of leadership?

To come to know and understand leadership several questions are appropriate. How do leaders know that they are leading? Alternately, how do followers know when they are being led? As simple as it may sound, the question remains, how is leadership knowable? Is it knowable not only as an empirical occurrence or phenomenon, but also as an experience in context? These epistemological questions are followed by axiological and ontological questions about leadership as well.

The term followership implies that people are led. Followership has a strong metaphorical context similar to leadership. Napoleon supposedly looked out his window every morning to see which way the people were going so he could

get in front of them. President John F. Kennedy suggested that steering from behind was actually a better way to navigate the course. Voltaire is attributed with saying, "I lead, therefore, I must follow." Voters during the 1992 presidential election said, if the people lead, the politicians will follow. These statements suggest an epistemology of followership. Is following the crucial element that establishes the phenomenon of leadership, or is followership simply the byproduct of a type of recognizable leadership? As with leadership, no one source has given concise empirical data to the meaning of followership.

Some researchers have attempted to define and describe leadership, and a few of them, followership. Some have defined leadership as a model possessing a set of behaviors, traits, and skills closely linked with individual traits. Others have defined leadership as a product, a process, an outcome, or an entity. Still others define leadership as a relationship, a synergism, a state of being, or collaboration. Some definitions consider only technical rationality and appear to borrow the language of management. This has created the less-than-concise empirical epistemology of leadership phenomenology and renders discussion regarding the development of a leadership education curriculum design confusing and debatable. What is it about the epistemology

of leadership that makes it so undefinable or multidefinitional?

Since twentieth century researchers struggle with the definition(s) of leadership: What did the originators mean when the terminology was derived? Has the terminology become confusing? What is the root or derivation of the terminology and what are some of its other uses? How did so many definitions emerge? To answer these and other questions I turned to the Oxford English Dictionary (O.E.D.) to provide an historical perspective of the derivations of the terms leadership and management. The following is an interpretation of my findings.

Leader-ship

The term leadership is derived from the term leader plus the suffix "ship." The leader, meaning one who leads, joined with the term ship form the meaning: the dignity or position of a leader. This is especially intended to mean the person with the responsibility of a political party or military group, particularly as it relates to persons in positional authority and their ability to lead. This definition is not limited to the ability of an individual and can mean a group's ability or the group itself as collective leadership. Action, influence, or motivation are necessary for direction and organization of efforts if leadership is to occur in a group undertaking. Education became incorporated into the

meaning as it applied to school skill. The word education is derived from the root ducere which means to lead. How does the leadership act become engaged?

To Lead

To lead or leading is the action of lead. As early as 1340 the O.E.D. quotes; "through ledying of the fende He shale ven to Jerusalem went" (p. 750). Translation: He went leading the defense to Jerusalem. The obvious reference to military (fende) reinforces the derivation based on political, governmental, and military positional leadership. Is the position of leading and the action of leading limited to the military and politics, and, if so, what may be known about the leader?

Lead. The word has always served as the usual rendering of the Latin "ducere" and "educere" and it has in some degree influenced the development of the meaning. "Ducere," to cause or to lead, is the root of the word "education" ("educere"), which means to lead out. "Educere" means to bring up, tend, and support the growth of offspring, both human and animal. "Eductio" means the leading out (of troops). "Educator," from the Latin, means one who brings up children. Leading from "educere" and "ducere" relates to leading, supporting, and nurturing children to adulthood. Education as a form of educating is the process of leading

someone out of ignorance. Leadership as a form of inducing is to cause, and, in either case, leadership recognizably is the process of education that induces, deduces, and educes, thereby causing and bringing out.

The Latin "dux" means one who leads or shows the way, one who acts as a leader of a group, party, or a leader in a war. The O.E.D. goes on to define lead this way; to conduct, to cause to go along with oneself, to bring, or cause (another person) to go. The directional action of these meanings poses an ethical consideration relative to intentional and causal effects that may be either positive or negative; therefore, a person can lead down or up either rightly or wrongly. Lead again has the connotation of conveying by a vehicle or cart usually coal or grain as in "to lead in the grain." The wind, a non man-made natural agent, has been referred to as a lead, by way of its ability to carry. To guide, direct by going on in advance, to cause to follow in one's path are ways to lead. Motives, conditions, or circumstances can be leads. A clue or marker, particularly to guide a boat into port, is a lead. By aiming in advance of the pigeon, one leads the bird. An unfortunate boxer (pugalist) may lead with the chin. Historically many a groom has had occasion to lead a bride to the altar, to church, or to marry. The lead lamb leads the unsuspecting flock to slaughter. The lamb leads by taking advantage of

the flock's submissiveness as the shepherd cajoles the lead lamb.

Further, reference to water comes from the Latin, "aquam ducere." Literally translated, it means water lead, and is otherwise known as a channel. The French "conduire" means to guide or steer a boat. The Latin "conducere" means to bring together, collect, or assemble (persons, animals, and also water). To "conduire," or lead the boat, provides the conduit for the vessel to travel. To lead is to conduct (as in affairs), to manage, govern, or conduct oneself, behave, or act.

"Ducere vitam," the Latin for passing through time, or to lead one's life, is the personal act of going or passing through life. A rare reference meant to support life by (bread) which could construe leading a life as survival. To direct by one's example or official initiative is to lead as a role model, example, or picture, and renders a visual image of seeing what it is to lead or visualizing leadership.

The Leader

The O.E.D. defines the one who leads as the leader. In the very literal sense the leader is the one who precedes, by guiding, by taking others by the hand, a cicerone. The leader as well may conduct, and this act of guiding becomes an act of controlling. In this way the guide may precede, as

well as bring along, through conducting the guidance. The leader as herdsman or shephard referred to one who leads the animals or puts a lead on an animal. The leader as the driver of a vehicle defines the driver engaged in the occupation of water-carrier. The water-carrier as leader was followed by a large number of people who carried water by hand, in barrows, or by cart. Men or women who used carts, the carters, were known as the leaders. The meaning noted in the term, coal leader, was also derived this way, too.

A second version of the term leader refers directly to the action of leading, the one who leads a body of armed men. This worthy occupation required valor on the part of the leader. Bravery could just as easily be mistaken for stupidity, gullibility, or foolhardiness. Are these also the traits of a leader? The political and military references cast the early uses of the terms leadership and lead, but do not serve as the only definitions.

A leader is also defined as one who guides others in action or opinion. This is the first reference to the guidance of opinion, rather than physical movement, from point A to B which means to direct or conduct activity to enable or change opinion of an individual or group. This type of leader was known to take the lead in business, enterprise, or movement. This acknowledges a formal indication of the follower's relationship to the leader

because it is now the leader who is "followed" that gives the leader the quality of leading. The Q.E.D. defines one who is following to be a disciple or adherent.

The terms "disciple" and "adherent" imply that there exists a discipline to followership that must be adhered to. This reference creates curiosity about the leader-follower relationships in both positive and negative directions, particularly to antecedents relating to the constructive and destructive nature of cults, sects, and religion. Crusades were just the type of militaristic and religious acts the definitions of the terms suggest. The Q.E.D. does identify other nonpolitical and military types of leaders.

Other definitions of leaders in the Q.E.D. included a leader of musicians or dancers, the presiding member of a "class" in the Methodist Church, the first in a file, the first player in a card game, one who leads a conversation, the shoots of a tree at the apex of a branch, a tendon, an agricultural drainage way, a main drain or tributary, a piece of fishing line, the first article in a newspaper, the fuse of fireworks, the three dots or periods printed in succession prior to text, (and the most interesting to me), the considerable usage of the terms to define the handling of water.

A main drain and a ditch have definite derivational references to leader. A plumber was once referred to as a

leader. A pipe to conduct water is also known as a leader. There is homonymic coincidence in that plumbing pipe was made from lead, a heavy mineral with the shared spelling. The water that runs downhill finding its own course is a lead. The watercourse artificially built leading to a mill is something that leads. The lead pipe to the leader (i.e., the plumber), once installed, leads the water on its course.

A leader is the direction of the running ropes on a boat or ship, and if laid out true, they will lead fair, not be tangled or fouled.

Leader[Ship]

Interest with the terminology of leadership has been stimulated by the suffix "ship." Ship, of course, has traditional meanings that apply and define the objects that are or are conceived to be navigated on water. A ship is a vessel that is bigger than a boat. The word navigation is from the root "navigo." The nave refers both to a wheel, perhaps a ship's wheel, and also to a church and is the main part or body of the church, extending from the inner door to the choir, chancel, or altar, and is usually separated on either side by pillars. In a sense, it is the area that leads one through from the back to the front of the main worship area. A nave is also the connecting piece that accepts the axle-tree on a wheel. From the axle-tree, the

spokes radiate either forward or backward and turn the wheel. A ship requires a relationship with water. Ship also means the passage of a person on board, to have gone aboard, or embarked. The O.E.D. used this quote to give examples of this meaning, "This is the way wherein Christ must be followed by as manie as desire to be shipped with him, to be of the number of his people" (p. 275). On the other hand, "He that is shipped with the devil must sail with the devil" (p. 275).

Ship as a suffix is derived from Germanic uses and forms the second element of compound and assumes the function and meaning of a suffix equivalent to "skapiz": These forms are also represented in old Scottish, middle Dutch, and old high German. Each of these versions is intended to show the condition of being. Few of these versions extend beyond the 15th century; for instance, druncinscipe = drunkenship, lapscipe = hardship, wodscipe = madness, weorpscipe = worship. A second usage denotes the state or condition of being that is expressed by the substantive such as; fe'ondscipe = friendship, freondscipe = friendship as well as authorship, fellowship, knightship, and partnership. It is the condition of being a leader that forms the reference to leadership. The next usage is added to the substantives in order to designate an official, person of rank, position or dignity. Examples of this would include ambassadorship,

captainship, professorship, followership, and leadership. Another usage denotes a state of life, occupation or behaviors, examples include: beorscipe = feast (literally a beer-feast), byrdscipe = child-bearing and werscipe = married state. Finally, the usage is a way to form compounds having a collective sense like burgscipe = municipality, foliscipe = nation, peodscipe = people and wæterscipe = a piece of water. These usages show a function of being. They raise additional questions about uses of suffixes not commonly used with leader, such as (acy) as in bureaucr[acy] or (ness) as in happi[ness].

Leader[ness]

The suffix "ness" added to adjectives and past participles forms substantives that express a state or condition as in Old English uses like "beterness," "deorcness," or "heardness." Some have survived to modern English and are applied to form any compound adjective. Some common uses are "selfconceitedness," "kindheartedness," "square-toedness," "water-tightness," and "tonguetiedness." Adjectival phrases are common: "up-to-dateness," "a-la-modeness," and "little-boyishness" are but a few actually used. Pronouns and adverbs form compounds with ness as in "I-ness," "nowness," and "everydayness." I possess a dislike-to-get-up-in-the-morningness. Can someone have a leadershipness

or a leaderness about them? If cheerfulness, kindness, cleverness, and contentedness are traits, why not leaderliness?

The suffix "acy" also creates compounds of condition. Note that these compounds are entirely of English formation. Examples are fallacy, optimacy, diplomacy, supremacy, confederacy, magistracy, accuracy, delicacy, conspiracy, celibacy, lunacy, and legacy. The suffix "cracy," a form of "acy," is used much the same as in aristocracy and democracy. Can leaders possess "leadacy" or could they be of the "leaderocracy" in society? Does language limit or enhance the ability to understand the terms? It is logical and understandable to possess these conditions in leading and leaders. Other words possess similar qualities and are only used with certain acceptable suffixes.

It is possible to draw metaphorical interpretations from the variety of different derivative meanings. Why does water play such an important part in the words lead and leader? Why is lead pipe, the residential plumbing pipe of choice in the early and mid 1900's, spelled L-E-A-D? The helmsman is typically thought to be leading the journey or voyage. The wind, as a lead, propels the sailing ship. The ship, as a suffix, denotes the condition or state of something's being. Does this language give us a better or worse understanding of leadership? Or does it cloud the issue? Through the

understanding of the language, is there an ontology that could enable a different sense of reality about leadership? Why is the root word of education derived from the Latin "ducere" which means to lead? From this discussion, can a consensus on the definition of leadership be formed? Will the consensus render law-like generalizations, or is leadership something different to everybody all the time? If so, does it direct us toward methodologies for studying leadership? If not, does it make the study of leadership impossible, or at best problematic? Is language a good starting point in the study of leadership?

Hiedegger suggests that it is the language itself that allows for thought (Steiner, 1978). This suggests that struggling with the language of leadership is a struggle with the thinking about leadership. Is leadership a universally accepted phenomenon? If so, are there similarities of knowing leadership, at the very least, within subgroups of men, women, race, etc.? Is leadership recognizable by status, power, wealth or the ability to cause, to bring out or to support growth or bring up? The latter, it would seem, has to do with the concept of caring.

Assuming that there is a predictable or given (inherent) relationship between leaders and leadership, can leaders affect followers using very different techniques, language or norms of leadership? Must there be traditionally accepted

ways for leadership to occur? Must leadership occur because of some set of hierarchical, positional relationship that automatically positions the follower metaphorically below, under, or behind the leader in the relationship? Does this relationship represent the language and the epistemology of leadership? Is leadership based on hierarchy and positional authority, and through metaphorical language becomes a culturally invented and maintained concept? If so, has the metaphorical concept aptly stated the intended meaning implied in the derivation of the words used to communicate the concept to the self and others?

Leadership and Essentialist Thought

Is the concept of leadership oriented around an essentialist educational ideology? The metaphor for essentialism as an educational ideology is, simply, education, schools and schooling are established and maintained similar to an industrial model of input and output. Those educated, especially children, are taught to become and are fashioned into what our society needs. In an essentialist ideologically fashioned system, the process of education is to produce the normative byproducts of education. Within this educational ideology exists a parallel concept of the necessity to create the leadership that can actually accomplish the stated agenda. Leaders,

meaning those labeled as leaders, are themselves products of this ideology. They have been condemned or created into essentialist beings by virtue of their environments, i.e., cultural upbringing and education. They are held in bondage by the ideology because it is the only ideological paradigm they know. Does leadership owe its current [philosophy of] creation and existence to the essentialists? In a problematic society, the point raises two questions: If society has so many problems, why cannot leaders fix them? Or, why do leaders create so many problems in society? The essentialist asks: If society has so many problems, why cannot leaders fix them? Education and subsequently those making the decisions about education, the educational leaders, seem convinced that the role of education is to support the essentialist agenda, that education is intended to maintain the society. When is the cycle guided onto a different course?

In response to the question, "Why is it that leaders create so many of the problems of society?" the focus of the critic may rest on those able to make decisions and have a vision of solutions. The essentialist paradigm limits the ability to create or reconstruct solutions. If leaders understand the question, "Why is it that leaders create so many of the problems of society?" they may recognize a valid suspicion between leaders and followers.

In the United States, the essentialist paradigm operates in a democracy, a form of government that provides the opportunity for equality to all people. The known cure for autocracy, socialism, fascism, and communism is, of course, just another "ism." One of these is democracy. If autocracy, socialism, fascism, and communism can fail, can democracy fail, too? If so, what then is the cure for democracy? More democracy? A democracy attempts to make people's lives freer and more equal by creating more democracy through more rules, policies, and guidelines. The more rules, the more opportunities for breaking more rules, so better rules evolve. To utilize the Q.E.D. language further, let it attempt to answer the question, "Is leadership inducing or educing, leading people into or out of problems, enslaving or liberating, and, how it is known?" As people are better educated (acquire knowledge) with new and faster means of knowledge acquisition - or sharing ways, e.g., technology communication then should leadership change? Should there be fewer rules?

These questions could help to formulate an epistemological discourse on leadership. How is it known when the act of leading or being led, inducing or educing is occurring? How can a philosophical or theoretical springboard enable the leader to practice leadership knowingly? Does previous experience provide the best

understanding about the dilemmas of leadership if language is skewed by both definitional disagreement and by misrepresentation and/or clouded by essentialism's complacency with the status quo?

An alternative method to consider the metaphor of essentialism is through society's attempt to manage people. The production line of the factory must be closely monitored to produce products with the lowest failure rate and the highest yield. Has this essentialist language of management been translated into the current language of leadership? This discussion argues that pragmatism has made the language of management functional for leadership. One of the most obvious examples is the hierarchical (spatial and temporal) language of management. Supervisor, subordinate, increments of time management, the "okay" came from the top down, he is at the bottom of the career ladder, the glass ceiling, are examples of this language. These show how language describes leadership as hierarchical and positional. The language of leadership has come to be confused with the language of management. This makes it difficult to separate the teaching of leadership from the teaching of management.

The Definitions of Leadership

Warren Bennis commented during a keynote address at the 1990 ACPA convention in Atlanta, GA, that he has heard over

650 definitions of the term, "leadership." The American Eskimo language has seven terms for the word "snow." Day-to-day language can be challenging to the less linguistically literate. For instance, it could be difficult to bat one's eyes while attempting to hit a bat with a bat. To a child that sentence would require some explaining. To one untrained in the languages of the Eskimos, a lot of explaining would be needed to recognize the types of snow that Native Eskimos see. The seeming ambiguity of 650 definitions of leadership seems unusual and also could use some explaining. Why so many definitions for one word?

This question seems particularly appropriate since many of the assumptions encountered about the notions of leadership are similar. Allen (1991) pointed out that many authors have studied leadership from a similar assumption base. Leaders, or people in positional authority, CEOs, ministers, presidents, political leaders, and managers are typically studied (Barnard, 1938; Bass, 1981; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Cohen & March, 1984; Fielder, 1967; Huff, 1985; Iacocca, 1984; Kotter, 1988; Levinson & Rosenthal, 1984; Loden, 1985; Macoby, 1981; Nanus, 1989; Peters, 1987; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 1981). Whether stated or not, the underlying assumptions of these researchers were that leaders were found at the top of the hierarchy, in formal positions, and were recognized by others as leaders. Why

then 650 definitions? One answer may lie in the fact that all of the leaders identified and studied share similarities in position. But are they similar? Were these leaders guaranteed their positions from birth or were they preprogrammed for the position? Was the context and environment of their leadership similar? Equally questionable is whether they had different goals for what they were trying to accomplish. Therefore, is the concept of the "stranger" true for leadership? The "stranger" means that even though it is possible to identify leadership and name leadership, it is impossible to know leadership (Mengert, 1992). Therein lies one concept or reason for 650 definitions of leadership.

Another aspect of this discussion lies in the United States' roots in capitalism and the technological advances that have moved us through agrarianism and industrialism into the information era. For this tremendous change to occur, detailed management also had to occur. The management had to mirror the needs of the society at the time and place. For instance, schools operate on an agrarian calendar in an industrial environment with industrial schedules and in industrial mode. Yet, schools are information places that now span all three paradigms and because of this appear to be a mess (Achilles, 1992). Leadership suffers a similar fate. With business and politics hogging the spotlight in day-to-

day news, media have reinforced the perception that the managers of successful industry and campaigns were practicing excellent leadership. But were they managing or leading, and is this a dangerous assumption about leadership? A form of this current great economic leadership could be called "greed." IBM, savings and loans, banking, General Motors, etc., have all had to rely on government to bail them out. In the meantime, the business community is offering free advice to education about becoming more like business: "Get with it," follow the business model. Have pragmatists basically developed a language of management to substitute for or actually become the language of leadership?

The Language of Management

Given this argument about the apparent use of the language of management as a substitute for the language of leadership, it seems appropriate to examine the Q.E.D. and lay the foundation for thinking about the transference of the language of management to leadership.

The industrialized world has needed to control or manage the society and its growth. Management is a result of a pragmatic need to make things predictable. From this pragmatic approach, systematic development becomes essential. In so doing it becomes pragmatic to borrow the language of management to explain the phenomenon. In this transfer of

language, leadership has been confused with management. The stress associated with the messiness of trying to know and understand leadership is eased by borrowing the tidy terminology of management.

Manage

The French derive the first context of the usage of the term "management" around 1611. The English were confused about the French usage which the French define: "menage," used as the meaning of the act of leading. This follows from the French, "menar," to lead. However, the French also had the word, "ménage," or household. The earliest uses come from the training of horses in their pacing. Specifically, it is the regimentation and training necessary to teach the various gaits a horse needs in order to perform a variety of tasks, as well as to ease the gaits for the rider's comfort. "I on my horse, he hath made me to his hand so right, that in the manage my selfe takes delight" (O.E.D.).

This equestrian derivation means the control necessary to manage the steed. Typically, the horse is broken and confined in a saddle and harness in order to accomplish the riding. Another usage refers to the action and paces trained or taught at a riding school such as a canter, trot, and gallop, which is regimented and signals a sense of

synchronization and meter. An enclosed space for training is the ring or corral and is also called the manage.

Manage expanded the equestrian derivation to mean the act of handling things. From the Latin "maneo," to stay with one's hand. A reference to a militaristic usage is found in the Iliad II. "For the manage of his lance he general praise did win" (O.E.D.). "Mando" in Latin is to chew or chomp at the bit, like a horse. The action or manner of managing is implied through management - conduct of affairs, administration, direction, and control, as well as to operate and maneuver. "Administratio" in Latin is the operation, handling, and working, also a means of carrying out. Administrator in Latin is the one who is in charge. "Administra" is a female assistant, hence hand maiden. To conduct business, especially in the operation of laws, management and government were given as the precise notion, as in manage the battle or war. To control or manage the course of affairs echoes that notion. Fulfilling one's duties is also considered a form of manage as in a literary treatment, manage to work it out. To plot and scheme intrigue was also once used as the meaning of manage. To control and direct the affairs of the household, institution, and state, in a way that takes charge and attends, to them is to manage. To regulate or administer expenditure of the finances or provisions, was included as part of the meaning.

Therefore, to use, deal with, treat carefully, use sparingly, or with judgement; in other words, to husband one's health, life, money, and animals were given as definitions of manage. To treat other people who suffer from indulgences by altering one's conduct was also considered managing.

Controlling or causing animals or someone to submit to a rule was a form of managing. Forcefully causing consent with one's wishes by artifice, by flattery or judicious suggestion or motives would mean to manage. To operate upon or manipulate as in the cultivation of land would be the manage of agriculture. To convey by mechanism or contrivance, or in a nautical sense to equip and send out by boat (ship) is to manage. In a survival sense, to get by with what one has, to make shift, to cope with difficulties, or be able to, is managing.

The purpose here is to provide specific examples of the types of meaning the term manage has come to represent. The metaphorical connotation will be developed for the purpose of studying the epistemological issues related to metaphor and language and the way people make meaning in the context of experience about managing.

Management

Management is the action or manner of managing, the skill necessary to manage, the cultivation of land.

Management is listed as a manner of proceeding and the administration of a commercial enterprise or business. From this definition come expressions such as MBO or management by objectives and MBE or management by exception. The power of management has significant connotation in the everyday world. Collectively among people this word describes a governing body, e.g., a committee, board of directors or management team. "The management," is an often heard term in defiance and often confused with "the leadership."

Manager

The manager is one who manages. Manageress specifies the gender and the O.E.D. further qualifies the environment, e.g., of a theater or hotel. A managerial position is characteristic of a manager's positional authority, especially within a theater setting. To hold a managership one must be a manager. Managery refers to the ability to manage domestic (husbandry of animals) and agricultural affairs. As well the art of managing weapons and instruments requires a certain level of managing skills. In this way gender and environment have also contributed to the derivation of the term manager.

A 1611 French usage is cited to define the word "manage" coming from a reference given to man-age which means man-coming-of-age or man with the ability afforded with age.

However, it is considered obsolete. Exactly when man arrives at this age is uncertain; the gender reference is obvious as well as historically and metaphorically meaningful.

Leadership: Meaning and Metaphors

Three points are worth reflection, one as a way of analyzing the exploration of Q.E.D., another to make meaning of the Q.E.D. definitions used here, and third, to justify the methodology employed.

The metaphors of leadership and management are worth developing to display the use of metaphorical language as a way of making meaning. The display will start with the derivative meaning of leadership associated with water and wind. These two natural elements represent leads. The wind blowing with power and purpose. The wind cannot be seen, but it can be felt. Wind comes from somewhere and is going somewhere carrying and propelling, occasionally undetectable, but always omnipresent. The flap of a butterfly sustains the breeze. With the properties of buoyancy, resistance, and direction, the wind is wise in that it can navigate a course and has the same invisible quality of wisdom. Wind can be good and beneficial but also raging. Wind can change easily and does not have many obstacles. Is there one wind or many winds? The wind in the North Pole seems to rely on the wind in the south, east, and west. All wind masterfully works

together like a choreographed dance. Wind can fuel fire and extinguish the candles of a birthday cake, mysteriously bringing change. What does this have to do with leadership?

Based on the definitional and metaphorical concept, the term leadership is mysterious, too. Good leadership brings change through the wisdom and movement of choreographed precision and often with power and purpose. Leadership is natural and not forced, both gentle and destructive, and leadership can fuel and extinguish, diminish or radiate. Leadership is the workhorse of prosperity just as the windmill can help sustain survival.

Water as a metaphor for leadership is unlike the traditional hierarchal language of leadership. This language states that leaders are at the top of the organization; water runs downhill propelled by gravity toward the lowest spot seeking whatever else is in the low land. It pools with other water to form a community based in a common place. One drip is pulled by gravity toward a lower place. Many drips can erode a piece of granite and, eventually, the many drips prevail and wash the granite away. Marion Mazurchiewitz is an engineering professor who has developed hydrotechnology, a high-tech use of water. His uses for water include ground drilling, extinguishing underground fires, deboning chicken, recycling Minuteman weapons charges, and slicing bread. He thinks the physical properties and uses for water are

endless. Water is a life-sustaining element our bodies need; every living thing needs it. Like the wind, we cannot see the humidity in the air. Often, unseen properties are taken for granted, but what if they did not exist? If water is a metaphor for leadership, and human beings cannot survive without water, then can human beings survive without leadership?

The buoyancy of water allows a ship to float. The ship as a metaphor for leadership floats buoyed by the water and is at the water's mercy. The self-contained vessel with the community of people on board may have a purpose, but, without the compelling need to be propelled, they are aimless. The tide and the Gulf Stream may both have an influence, but the most influential propulsion is the wind. The boat relies on both the water and the wind to give it life and purpose. Then, with all hands on deck working together to utilize and maximize their inherent resources, they can manipulate and live with the water and wind. It is a collective and synergistic action, largely unseen or understood that creates the phenomenon of the successful journey where navigation occurs. In this way, each individual not only sacrifices for the community's success, the individuals rely on and are sustained by the larger group's effort. Specificity of function gives the group a gestalt.

Management provides equally rich metaphors because the language of management is obsessively based in control and domination, as reflected in the tone of the "man-age" usage from the French. As a man comes of age, he has arrived at the point whereby his ability to manage his life occurs. He has executive control over his dominion and being. "Man-age" incorporates the larger surrounding area because his domain is over self and property. Examples of this type of control and search for power fill the history books. A specific example is the domination over and husbandry of animals and agriculture. The term management is rooted in the cultivation of land and the training of horses. Horses are trained in their paces, regimented, regulated, synchronized, and metered. They are broken in order to be controlled. In their unmanaged condition they have little other than aesthetic utility. Managed horses and agriculture become valuable for their usefulness. Agriculture is managed in order to produce food. Gardens grow if untended, but if the garden is tended and operated (husbanded) in an orderly way production is increased. Rows are created, planted, tilled, and harvested, and this system uses space efficiently. Even with all of this work there is still one essential ingredient that is missing that enables growth to occur. Management, that is agricultural cultivation, is wanting for that one life-giving ingredient. That ingredient is water. Without

water, the management, or growth and cultivation of agriculture, could not happen. The synergism of water and cultivation cannot be separated. Like the mystery of cultivation and water, management and leadership have visible and invisible qualities. The wind plays a significant role in the propulagation of this metaphorical community. These metaphors are drawn from natural agents; their causes and outcomes can be understood by what they do together. If the metaphors are developed further, perhaps management (the cultivation of land) must have leadership (wind and water) in order to produce.

Gender-based metaphors of the manageress exist in the feminine form of management that is restricted in the Q.E.D. to the theater or household. This is a metaphor that will not please all readers. Conversely though, there are not leaderesses or leaderial positions, or managerships. Management as administration is disproportionately male, as is the "ministry" which throughout history has been a male dominated occupation.

The Management/Leadership Dichotomy

What purpose has this discussion of the Q.E.D.'s definitions of management and leadership, and subsequent metaphorical indulgence, accomplished? I have shown that meaning is constructed and given coherence in the world by

utilizing language and metaphors. Spiritualness and consciousness development depend on metaphor for meaning. The Q.E.D. defined leadership and management in co-dependent and similar terminology to one another; likewise, metaphor accomplished the same. The explanation of derivational and metaphorical information was given to establish the foundation for understanding the association between language and epistemology. With this in mind I can attack the problem of understanding leadership. One more point on language and the explanation will be more complete.

Differentiating Leadership and Management

Leadership and management have traditionally been interchangeable descriptors. Hersey and Blanchard's well-known "situational leadership" theory may be exemplary of the leadership/management confusion. While it is a viable management theory closely linked to four-stage theories of group development, it is increasingly being criticized and discounted as a theory of leadership (Allen, 1990a; Bolman & Deal, 1991).

One theme permeating discussions, theories and studies of leadership is that leadership has at least two dimensions (Blake and Mouton, 1964; Halpin, 1966; Getzels and Guba, 1957). A leader is faced with both the human and the output dimensions of leading. Some leaders seem to be more personal-centered or considerate; others are more product-centered and initiate structure; some emphasize process while others focus on product. The leadership literature contains

other dualities. By whatever name, two dimensions pervade studies of leadership (e.g., Halpin, 1986; Blake and Mouton, 1964). (Achilles, 1992, p. 60)

Some have chosen to describe what leadership is not, rather than what it is. One of the fundamental distinctions that has been accepted among many leadership theoreticians and practitioners is that leadership is not management; the two are qualitatively different (Clark & Clark, 1990; Gardner, 1990; Rost, 1991; Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Unfortunately, the term leadership has, by connotation, come to be something good, great, and even grandiose while management has fallen into disrepute, not unlike some shady characters of the night. Is the person in charge a leader or a manager? Although this may seem like an exercise in semantics, our language use greatly influences how we think about something and, in fact, how we actually treat the subject of that word. . . . Nowhere is this need for language clarity clearer than in the disagreement about whether someone is a leader or a manager. This dichotomous battle, although fairly long-lived, has not solved many problems nor has it advanced the theory and practice of leadership/ management very far (Achilles, 1992, p. 60).

From the work of Burns (1978), Peters and Waterman (1982), Bennis and Nanus (1985), and Kouzes and Posner (1989), Rost (1991) developed the following list of dichotomous descriptors about differences between leadership and management as shown in figure 1.

This dichotomy begins to show a paradigm shift in understanding leadership and management. Rather than understanding the technical rationality of skill development

MANAGEMENT

Organization/profession motivates action
 Authority relationships with employees/
 subordinates
 Wedded to problem-solving
 Production-driven
 Limited competition with other managers

Maintenance/incremental goals
 Objectives achieved by conflict control/
 resolution
 Rational decision-making

Predictability
 Here and now
 Regulates
 Culture maintaining
 Literal
 People developed by fulfilling the
 needs and wants of the organization

Organizational goals must be achieved

LEADERSHIP

Visions motivate actions
 Influence relationship
 with followers
 Wedded to purpose/cause
 Values-driven
 Accepts, even invites
 competition with
 other leaders

Change/innovative goals
 Conflict used to achieve
 objectives
 Intuitive decision-
 making

Ambiguity
 Futuristic
 Creates
 Culture shaping
 Symbolic
 People developed by
 transforming their
 needs and wants to
 higher levels

Mutual leaders-follower
 goals must be
 achieved

Figure 1. Rost (1991) Dichotomous Management Leadership Descriptors

of the management column, the leadership column develops more on the consciousness/transformational aspects of human endeavor. Most of these thoughts are supported by Allen (1990) when she cites Bolman and Deal, Clark and Clark, Gardner, Rost, Burns, Peters and Waterman, Bennis and Nanus, Kouzer and Ponzer, Komives, and others.

The following dichotomy taken from class notes in "Critical Issues in Education" (Shapiro, Fall, 1991) will contribute to and complicate the leadership/management paradigm clash as shown in figure 2.

If I operationalize the dichotomy into leadership/management positions, theories stand to one side or the other of the dichotomy. The use of dichotomous language has been an attempt to focus the portrayals of current leadership models as models that ignore and omit the spiritual and consciousness development of humanness. The models do not concentrate on what comes from within; they concentrate on what comes from outside the self. They do this by teaching only the technical rationality of management in an essentialist ideological pragmatic culture. Leadership needs to be examined through an epistemological, ontological, and axiological lens that is focused on personal inward meaning-making in order to determine what can be known about leadership; what can be real about leadership; and what is good, right, and noble about leadership.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| MALE | FEMALE |
| Agenetic (productive worker) | Communal/Spiritual (reproductive work) |
| Private | Public |
| Masculine (strong) | Caring |
| Rational (neck up thinking) | Emotion (hugging thinking) |
| HAVING | BEING |
| Acquiring | Experiencing |
| Linear progression | Multilevel progression |
| Time driven | Joy of each movement |
| Winning | Togetherness |
| Individual | Solidarity |
| CAPITALISM | DEMOCRACY |
| Distribution | Egalitarian |
| Competition | Community |
| Consumption | Sharing |
| Capturing | Minimal needs met |
| Cheating | Fairness/justice |
| Hierarchy | Empowering |
| Exploitation | Utilization |
| CONSUMPTION CULTURE | TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES |
| Rugged individualism | Protestant work ethic culture |
| Metropolitan | Small town |
| Whatever it takes | Hard work |
| Hedonism | Self-control |
| Spontaneity | Impulse restraint |
| CONSUMPTION CULTURE | TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES |
| Instant gratification | Delayed gratification |
| Credit/debt | Thrift frugality |
| Play | Discipline |
| Inebriation Excess | Sobriety Moderation |
| Guilt reduction | Guilt |
| Fantasy | Sticking to itness |
| Amoral | God |
| Me | Patriotism (duty) |
| Individualism | Community |
| Promiscuity | Family |
| Novelty, planned obsolescence | Quality products |

Figure 2. Shapiro Dichotomous Cultural Descriptors

Both the metaphorical study of the derivation of the terms leadership and management, and the dichotomy of the terms, has established two distinctly different models for examining the meanings of the terms. It has operationalized language in order to argue the relationship between language and thought. By applying the concepts of Belth (1977), Lakoff (1980), Steiner (1978), Bredeson (1991), and Palmer (1990), the issues of language, thought, metaphor, spirituality and consciousness can be focused to establish the philosophical foundation of the study of leadership. Then, by establishing the hermeneutic methodology necessary to study social phenomena, the issues of leadership and relationship will come into focus. The social phenomenon of individual experience in context with the socially constructed nature of culture will define the theory of the individual in community that the moderate neoclassical deontological and Bubarian paradigms support. The methodological concepts of Van Manen (1990) support the study of leadership through the use of hermeneutic methodology because hermeneutics is interpretation of social phenomenon.

Management and Essentialist Thought

Management represents the acquisition, process, and control of husbanding and cultivation. Managers are given the opportunities to organize and control a process for the

purpose of production and outcome. Every step of the production phase is crucial to the outcome. Each phase must be closely monitored and, if needed, adjusted. Efficiency, organization, order, upsizing, downsizing, and yield are the jargon of managing. A hands-on approach is productive. Analysis is required at each step of the process in order to tweak it back into alignment. Deming's unpopularity in U.S. corporate industry and management was based on maximizing the process at every step along the production line.

Deming was sent packing by General Motors in the early 1960's. The business corporations of America sent him away by refusing to consider his ideas. Japan recognized Deming's management strategies as effective. Indeed, Deming's ideas were effective! Japan has seen the most impressive industrial growth over the last 30 years unlike anything in history.

Deming was turned away by chief executive officers in the United States because his ideas threatened to erode the power empire created by heads of corporations. Shared decision making was seen as a lack of control resembling a mutiny. The metaphor of warden and prisoner could reflect the control that the chief executive officers maintained. Shared decision making was eventually attempted little by little. Now pundits of Deming are everywhere in corporate America; they have seen the light (Rhodes, 1990).

Followers of Deming further obfuscate the management/ leadership language misunderstanding and have brought both the theory and the misunderstanding into educational reform discussions. To achieve a higher success rate and a lower failure rate is desirable on the production line. Each part of the widget must be perfect to produce the perfect widget. Total Quality Management (TQM) is based on this principle. From an educational perspective this is a dangerous model to base educational decisions upon. Why? Because there are perfect children going into a less than perfect system, and because of this, it is difficult for them to come out of the system perfect.

In manufacturing, perfect raw material is used to make a more complex product. A perfect part is needed to build a perfect product. In education, the raw material, i.e. a child or person, is worked with to make him or her better. The factory and production metaphors are still embedded in education as a refinery metaphor where the raw material is refined into better raw material. In oil production refinement is used to remove the crude elements. Does education and, hence, leadership also do this?

Leadership: More Meaning and Metaphor

A Bible notes that a strong wind is needed to move a ship, but a tiny rudder can keep it on course. What does

this say about leadership? Unlike management that is obsessed with product, leadership has much to do with process. Leadership seems invisible in its process if one agrees with the metaphorical and derivation terminology developed earlier. Leadership is not the visible act but the outcome -- an outcome that lets us see that leadership has occurred. The wind in the Bible verse is invisible. It comes and goes not by human command, but nature ensures that it will happen. We believe that the rudder is under the ship, and there is evidence of the rudder because the ship stays on course. It is an act of faith that assures the presence of wind and rudder. The action of faith metaphorically represented by the rudder and wind is not seen. However, the wind and rudder have very profound effects on the outcome of the ship.

Mysteriously, the technical rationality attempts to quantify leadership by requiring identification and acquisition of skills that can be measured, numbered, and acquired. It is a mystery because it is a stranger and cannot always be easily pointed to, described, shown, or explained, and for my purposes, understood and known. Leadership is assumed to happen because followership occurs, and the outcomes of leadership, either good or bad, happen and definitely can be seen. The faith in the rudder helps to cope with the mystery, although the rudder is obscured from

view, it is believed to be present. One will know quickly if the ship does not have a rudder to guide it because the ship will lose direction, purpose, and attitude.

Faith, wind, and gravity are alike in some ways. They are invisible, strong, and compelling forces. Faith, wind, and gravity are recognizable by what they do and the outcome they produce. Hope and love are examples of invisible forces that produce great things. If you can think it, feel it, or sense it, then it, indeed, has a reality. Why are metaphors important, asks Achilles (1989). Schon (1979) sees

metaphors as central to the task of accounting for our perspectives on the world; how we think about things, make sense of reality, and set the problems we later try to solve. (p. 254)

It is the acknowledgement of the reflection upon the language of the reality, thinking, feeling, or sensing that allows for consciousness. The ability to be conscious argues that "to be" requires consciousness or that consciousness precedes being (Palmer, 1991, p. 2).

This language of consciousness provides a distinctiveness about the metaphors of leadership. To accomplish consciousness of consciousness, or epiphenomenal qualia, a person must be able to commune with him/herself. A person must be able to use the reflection of the field out there by bringing the reflection into the self through reflexing. By internalizing the outside world, consciousness

precedes being. By understanding reflective and reflexive relationships of the self, one can begin to understand and approach the language, metaphors, and reality of his/her being. By creating a reflective/reflexive community in oneself, the first steps toward understanding leadership are taken. Forming this relationship with the self will establish a shared reflective/reflexive vision that enables the leadership and followership of self.

By *thinking*, as distinct from processes that appear to be thinking but are actually something else, I shall mean the 'act of following out, and examining at the same time, a path, pattern, mapping, form, or formula until what has been called for in that map, path, pattern, form, or formula has been concluded and the whole of it has been considered for its inner and outer consistencies and its warrantable circumstances.' It is, therefore, an act that includes a reflection upon itself. (Belth, 1977, p. xvii)

A leader will do best to establish the relational formation of community which in turn will create the opportunities for followership both within and outside the self. Self-examination has been described as intrapersonal intelligence because the core capacity at work here is access to one's own feeling life (Achilles, 1989; Gardner, 1983). This is supported in the value of writing one's autobiography (Achilles, 1989). If cognitive understanding of the invisible language of the heart can be accomplished, then understanding of the mystery of the heart can begin. The synergism of the cognitive and affective is a spirituality or

consciousness of self that is also invisible and mysterious.

William James (1902) characterized this concept in the following:

I cannot but think that the most important step forward that has occurred in psychology since I have been a student of that science is the discovery, first made in 1898, that, in certain subjects at least, there is not only the consciousness of the ordinary field, with its usual centre and margin, but an addition thereto in the shape of a set of memories, thoughts, and feelings which are extra-marginal and outside of the primary consciousness altogether, but yet must be classified as conscious facts of some sort, able to reveal their presence by unmistakable signs. I call this the most important step forward because, unlike the other advances which psychology has made, this discovery has revealed to us an entirely unsuspected peculiarity in the constitution of human nature. No other step forward which psychology has made can proffer any such claim as this. (p. 233)

. . . The most important consequence of having a strongly developed ultra-marginal life of this sort is that one's ordinary fields of consciousness are liable to incursions from it of which the subject does not guess the source, and which, therefore, take for him the form of unaccountable impulses to act, or inhibitions of action, of obsessive ideas, or even of hallucinations of sight or hearing. (p. 234) . . . These clinical records [of Binet, Freud, and others] sound like fairy tales when one first reads them, yet it is impossible to doubt their accuracy. . . . They throw . . . a wholly new light upon our natural constitution. (p. 235)

And it seems to me that they make a farther step inevitable. Interpreting the unknown after the analogy of the known, it seems to me that hereafter, wherever we meet with a phenomenon of automatism, be it motor impulses, or obsessive idea, or unaccountable caprice, or delusion, or hallucination, we are bound first of all to make search whether it be not an explosion, into the fields of ordinary consciousness, of ideas elaborated outside of those fields in subliminal regions of the mind. We should look, therefore, for its source in the Subject's subconscious life. (p. 235) . . . There lies the mechanism logically to be assumed, -- but the assumption involves a vast program of work to be done in

the way of verification, in which the religious experiences of man must play their part. (p. 236)

Looking inward to understand the self looking outward will refocus the self in the world, thereby adding the self into the world. Understanding the perception of self and the perceived self is leadership of the community of the self. The ability to reflect on the self allows someone to have the opportunities to make and create change in the self. These changes are imperative to being's existence and survival.

What is common about community? It is the commune, the sense of commonality whether by the cause, the color, the class or the consciousness. Martin Buber discusses the I/it and I/thou relationships; community is the I/thou relationship. The two garner commonality because of the process and the outcome of the relationship. Much of the sense of community is invisible, but because of the knowing or sensing of the I/thou relationship within community, the outcomes of community are more visible than the process. Many people are too busy to see the process, but at the end of the day their reflection allows the product to be seen and the product is the accomplishment of community. Community processing happens during the binding commonality of doing together and the negotiation of being together. The product of community is the process. This represents the exclusivity inherent in the commonality of community. The other-centered

aspect of being is known when one is not part of the community just as it is known when one is a part of the community. To the individual this is when the I/it and I/thou of community are manifested. Often the commonality is the social imperative, the metaphorical wind and the rudder of community. When community creates social imperative that is acted upon, the praxis of community leadership occurs.

I've asked epistemological questions about how leadership becomes known to those engaged in the phenomena of leader or follower. These ways of knowing in a theoretical sense may be based on learning theories or teaching techniques. Certainly language and metaphor are capable of assisting in both the examination and understanding of the concepts of leadership, thereby adding to the knowing of leadership. What elements in language and metaphors provide the clues to a reification, consciousness, and epistemology of leadership? The phenomenon of leadership is an influencing relationship process that does not often afford the luxury of time for the leader or follower to formulate or choose one learning theory suitable for the student (follower), or teacher (leader) and is equally limited in time to match a technique to a specific learning style.

The writer is not a specialist in cognition or learning theory. This paper presents some points of view, particularly through the eyes of a generalist who has spent considerable time in education. The writer has not conducted major research in ways of knowing in any

quantitative sense. This may best be called a synthesis or a collage. (Achilles, 1989, p. 27)

Chapter II
LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN LITERATURE

Ways of Knowing

The metaphor provides a tangible method for making enriched meaning out of the world. Metaphors give form to concepts. Metaphor sometimes enables the relanguaging, thinking of understanding in a manner that is suitable and comfortable.

The story "The Kingdom of Auschwitz" by Otto Friedrich (1981) could simply be considered a historical record about the atrocities that occurred during those wicked days of Nazi persecution. Metaphorically it can also signal the continued existence of inhumanity. Describing people as the gatekeepers who tacitly allow human suffering to continue is the metaphor. By not desperately attempting to stop the atrocities of unnecessary human suffering we as a society are condoning our unwillingness to solve the problems that create desperate human conditions.

In earlier discussion of the essentialist ideology of how education is structured, and of how educational decisions are made and schools are operated, "the factory image of schools has dominated these thoughts of schools and have included for quite some time (management, "cult of

efficiency," get your assignment done), including even teachers as managers" (Achilles, 1989, p. 36).

Why these metaphors? To reiterate, Schon (1979) sees "metaphor as central to the task of accounting for our perspective on the world; how we think about things, make sense of reality, and set the problems we later try to solve" (p. 254). So developing common understanding of society's metaphors will allow individuals in society to decide whether their understanding of the metaphors agree.

Achilles (1989) notes that metaphor is a figure of speech, "a trope," or a "turning" (p. 34). In this sense a metaphor transfers or turns our thinking or ideas (Latin, tropus; Greek, tropos) from one way of thinking or perceiving to another way. Only recently have educators begun to explore the rich potential of metaphor to help us see and frame our problems (Bredeson, 1985; Hanson, 1984; Norris & Achilles, 1988).

Metaphor helps in the attempt to perceive or make meaning by bringing the perceived world into a person's consciousness. The world is reflected and absorbed by the person, and the person turns the reflection into their own meaning. Belth (1977) reminds us that "the dreadful fact about thinking is that it takes time, and it demands action" (p. xxi). Belth notes that we must bring the world and the

thinking process to a level of consciousness to make it more capable of being learned in deliberation.

Thinking has many metaphorical descriptions. Seeing is often a metaphor for thinking. "I see what you mean" is a common phrase. "I can't think clearly" gives a spatial sense with a window or view finder that must be clear to function properly. Belth (1977) points out that John Locke used the term "perception" as a cognate of vision. The mind "observes" because impressions linger long enough so that the observer can make comparisons between or among the observations. Locke's "envisioning" is what he calls thinking (pp. 10-11).

A summary of Belth's (1977) work on thinking includes the following: thinking is the recognition of a model, an analogy and a metaphor in use. The metaphor is the most immediate manifestation of one kind of condition made to apply to another. The analogue is the level of conceptual transference. The model comes to serve as the basic context, or format, for the development and the telling. "Thus, MODEL is a class name (e.g., organic things), ANALOGY is a genus of model (e.g., tree), and METAPHOR is a species of analogy (e.g., an oak)" (p. 7).

Belth (1977) holds that this is what Montaigne must have been thinking when he wrote, "he who follows another follows nothing" (p. 26). Because discipleship is the surrendering

of thinking in the disciple, his actions are directed by the thoughts of others that have not been reified into dogmas no longer open to the challenges of the curious and reflective (Belth, 1977).

The Aristotelian definition of metaphor is that of giving something a name that conventionally belongs to something else (Belth, 1977). The examples of giving names to leadership are rampant in the common use of the term. For instance: the leadership has spoken, this team lacks leadership, dreams are the lighthouse that leadership can follow, leaders must have vision, leaders make meaning rather than rules, leadership must model the way, leadership is riding the tide, are a few examples.

What then are the functions of metaphors, and how does leadership function as a metaphor? Metaphors turn concepts into meaning for the individual. In this way metaphor gives meaning and information. Belth (1977) argues that metaphoric expressions make possible new information and knowledge. They allow for re-description, (emphasis added) which is a Heideggerian concept as well. Belth further contends that this re-description plays a role in explanation, and in making new definitions. If these are the functions of metaphor, and leadership is to be considered a metaphor, then it would serve a significant purpose to understand the metaphors of leadership to find knowledge of leadership. By

re-describing leadership, Heideggerian epistemology will support the relanguaging of the knowledge and meaning of leadership. The re-described and re-languaged explanation of leadership will enable new definitions to occur leading to new understanding, knowing and criticism. This suggests that if one wants to understand the thinking of leadership then one must learn the metaphors of leadership and the metaphorizations of leadership.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) in Metaphors We Live By provide an excellent synthesis of how metaphor plays an important, if not solely fundamental, role in how most people make meaning in their lives. They argue that not only do we play with metaphor as a source of poetic imagination in language, but also that metaphor is in fact pervasive in language, thought and action. This argument suggests that the power of metaphor is as strong a meaning maker for people as their senses of sight, touch, hearing, smell and taste. Further, they suggest the necessity of developing an understanding of metaphor because it not only governs thought but also action to a large degree.

Primary to these concepts are Martin Heidegger's writings on language and thought. Heidegger would argue that, in fact, thought and language are one in the same and cannot exist separately. The basic construct is thought is language. With this construct in mind, language enables the

understanding and creation of our reality. Experience, in the Heideggerian sense, is based on our available language. Polanyi takes this concept a step further when discussing the tacit dimension, that dimension where knowledge exists and, although it is unexplainable, it is known. If Heidegger is to be trusted on the concept of language and thought, then there is excellent logic to study metaphor as a way of making meaning, naming experience and developing a conceptual system about what we do in everyday life.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) provide exceptional examples of the linguistic evidence that the conceptualization of the world occurs through metaphorical techniques. For purposes of this research an example of a conceptual system will show how structured the everyday meaning of leadership can be. Consider Morgan's (1986) position:

the image of a ladder toward the sky. The image of a rope, a chain, a ladder, or a stairway is one of the widespread images in human history. The fairy tale *Jack and the Beanstalk* is a well-known variation on the theme: Jack climbed the beanstalk in search of wealth and happiness. Religious literature, including the Bible, is especially rich with this image. The Tower of Babel in the eleventh chapter of the Book of Genesis was to be "a tower with its top reaching heaven." And in Genesis 28, Jacob had a dream: "A ladder was there standing on the ground with its top reaching heaven." Both passages speak of contacting heaven, although the image carries different meanings. In the first passage, humans try building a tower to the sky; in the second, the ladder is *from* the sky, with angels of God ascending and descending the ladder.

The modern age and its thinkers dismiss this image of tower or ladder as a childish dream from the distant past. Surely, in the age of spaceships no one is trying

to build a tower up to heaven. But fairy tales and religious myths should not be taken lightly; they often embody some profound truth that our rationalistic culture should hear. However, it is questionable whether our contemporaries have even the *capacity* to listen.

My claim is that the modern Western world is tied to the image of a ladder to the sky. Modern Western thought is based on the hope of ascending above the earthly conditions of human life. Religious versions of the stairway or ladder often include the gods descending from the sky. Although modern thinkers see no gods coming down, the image of the ladder has remained. It invites us to climb upward, and in business, government, sport, or war we continue trying to climb the ladder of success in search of the good life. (p. 332)

Consider that the term leadership could be, in fact, a metaphor for hierarchy:

Leadership Is Hierarchical

The top brass sent this down.

To be top dog you must climb the ladder of success.

The leadership is sitting at the head table.

I am at the bottom of the totem pole.

Let leadership do the thinking.

You'll need to go up the chain of command.

These examples are common but show the hierarchical terminology of leadership. In actuality there is a vertical sense to the placement of leadership through language. Leadership becomes the head of the metaphorical body, the brains -- the smarts where the decisions are made. Therefore language and metaphors structure the actions by which the culture responds to leadership.

The hierarchical languages are examples of how a metaphorical concept is structured to provide language that defines the traditional thinking and concept of leadership as hierarchical. "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5). This could mean that culturally, leadership has been structured by the capitalist and industrial models of business. The president or CEO of a company is known as the leader. Because of this language, leadership is understood only in terms of the bureaucratic structure of managed organizations where the hierarchy is based on who in the organization has authority over others (metaphorical emphasis added). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point to the systematicity of metaphorical concept by listing many metaphorical phrases much like the previous text. They argue that

since metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way, we can use metaphorical linguistics expressions to study the nature of metaphorical concepts and to gain an understanding of the metaphorical nature of our activities. (p. 7)

This appears to be a very logical and acceptable methodological course to follow. To get an idea of how this systematic metaphorical concept is pervasive, look at the metaphorical concept of a methodology as a course to follow. To study through the utilization of methodology is a journey

of discovery. A course needs to be determined and followed. Along the way ideas will be examined. If one loses the path of inquiry, then one must get back on the right track. You may try to change directions of a course of inquiry or method. Travel in our culture is a highly prized activity, which in most cases takes the resources of time, money and goal orientation. Traveling is extremely imbedded in American culture. People no longer live next door to their parents. The culture has created this phenomenon of physical travel, but does travel also include metaphysical journey?.

Metaphor and Culture: Conflict vs. Cooperation

In their chapter "Metaphor and Cultural Coherence," Lakoff and Johnson (1980) make a point that to understand the culture and its fundamental values, one needs to study the culture's most fundamental metaphorical concepts. American culture promoted the idea that more is better and that the acquisition of more is perceived to be what inevitably happens as one moves up the career ladder. In this culture people think that the future holds the answers to problems, and it will be better. A leader must have vision to see into the future to foresee the solutions. Furthermore, leaders have more status, and status is better, so it is important to be a leader in order to have more and be better than others.

These examples represent the traditional ways of thinking about leadership.

Paul Bredeson (1989) describes the purpose of this dissertation as well as anyone: it is to describe how metaphors are useful constructs for understanding how people exercise and respond to the illusive yet persuasive influences of leadership. Arthur S. Ward, Jr. argues that leaders have the ability to stir the consciousness, emotions and energies of others to move in a similar direction. The metaphors of leadership are much like Tom (1984) suggests about metaphors of teaching which stress

the moral as well as the empirical aspects of teaching issues, the importance of reflecting on what purposes education ought to serve, and the need to remember the limitations of current knowledge. (p. 144)

So, too, leaders must suffer with the moral and empirical aspects of leadership. Metaphors create a symbolic language that expresses leadership. Morgan (1986) states that "there is a close relationship between the way we think and the way we act, and that many organizational problems are embedded in our way of thinking" (p. 334). Metaphors define the reality that we know. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that "metaphor is not merely the word we use - it is our very concept" (pp. 4-12). Metaphor is the conceptual basis for our value system. The concepts of our cultural biographies, education

and environment establish the concepts we heuristically build the metaphors upon.

Leadership could be a metaphor for leading one's self out, from within, causing one's self to bring or to go. Leadership from within identifies the motives, impulses and values that cause action. If new metaphors can be created to relanguage the discourse on leadership then Morgan (1986) will have been correct in noting that new metaphors have the power to define and create new social realities. If leadership is a metaphor, then leaders need to communicate through the metaphor to explain the phenomenon of their own leadership to make it understandable. This will be the vehicle that leaders utilize in creating the conceptions, values, images, and vision that is necessary so the followers may determine where they want to be guided.

Leaders have styles that have to be metaphorical to be understood. Like the educational ideologies of perennialism, essentialism, experimentalism, existentialism, and reconstructionism, which are understood through the vernacular of metaphor, so too are leadership styles such as authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire, and existential. Metaphors get us from the fact about leadership to the value of leadership because they add beliefs, opinion, and philosophy to the picture that is used as the metaphor to describe something different. Metaphors create hypotheses;

focus concepts through different lenses; they add music; fragrance, bouquet, flavor and sensuality to concepts that help test for fit and comfort level the understanding for each individual. Metaphors are the spirit of leadership. The spirit is composed of the core values of the leader. Spirituality is an essential element to leadership because the spirit asks several questions. Do the metaphors promote the same ethic and morality for the leader and followers? Will they maximize potential for both? Are the metaphors realistic for everyone? Do they create equity and freedom for all in the schema of coexistence? Do they take into consideration the core values of everyone affected by the leader's decisions? Should they? Thomas (1981) states this about educational leadership which is also true for any form of leadership: Core values are the ethos of leadership. The core values of all promote a sense of commitment and devotion to the cause of leadership in democracy, an understanding of leadership in a moral context, a clear understanding of leadership as a public service, and a commitment to fairness and equity. To accomplish this, the leader is going to be required to know one's self and followers intimately. Unfortunately, the dilemma that Bateson (1972) identifies is that language is thing oriented and is impoverished when it comes to naming, describing, and talking about relationships.

We seem unable to define leadership because we are so unfamiliar with it.

This unfamiliarity with intimacy as part of human relations could be very problematic for leadership. Because leadership theories attempt to define leadership very narrowly, the definition ignores what spirituality creates anew in us continually. Leadership can not abide within a strict set of rules or boundaries. The spirit is unbounded, and leadership is unbounded. Since social phenomena and relationships are unbounded, traditional theories of leadership limit leadership to a bounded set of traits which I think is the fundamental flaw of traditional theories of leadership. The leader must be able to articulate a dream, a vision of the leader or of the followers. The leader must give the dream meaning by the ability to interpret his consciousness or spirituality. Interpretation must be done to simplify profound meaning. An excellent example of this style of communication is the Old Testament. The genre of the Old Testament is one of story telling to nomadic communities. They did not write these stories on paper, they stored them in their heads, passing them from group to group. The stories had to be very simple while the morality was very profound. The stories had to capture the imagination, hold the attention, and make meaning. Over time, the stories adapted new metaphors to get the same moral meaning

communicated in order to accentuate the nuances between cultures. Leaders must be able to adapt to nuances and cultural change, another requirement for flexibility, creativity, unboundedness and spirituality from the leader.

Spirituality and Leadership

Often in everyday life we hear a negative comment about an inspiring idea: It just will not work. In the technologically advanced 20th century, we still hear the words, "it just will not work." It is technology that creates the illusion that an idea will not work. Reasons given to not pursue an idea are that we do not have the resources, time, energy, or money. These external forces impose limitations on our reality. The ideas were not stifled, but as Palmer (1990) reminds us, we have a long and crippling legacy in our own system of thought of believing in the external world much more deeply than we believe in the internal world. I argued earlier that if we can feel it, smell it, sense it, think it, it has a reality. Man "never perceives anything fully. . . . He can see, hear, touch, and taste but how far he sees [etc.] . . . depends upon the number and quality of his senses" (Jung, 1964, p. 61). We are so attached to the external world that we ignore the internal world, the spiritual world and its reality. Palmer (1990) describes our co-creation existence with the external

world. We live in and through a complex interaction of spirit and matter, a complex interaction of what is inside of us and what is out there.

This powerful insight reminds us that our spirituality may have become pragmatic and essentialist, and that we make the world the way that it seems to us. In this way, spirituality is about internalizing the external world, deciding what it is and interpreting it for ourselves. Palmer points out that this type of spirituality is not primarily about values and ethics or the exhortation to do right and to live well. Spirituality is about interpreting reality. Once we interpret the reality we can decide if it meets our moral and ethical standard to which we apply it. Leadership and leaders must both understand the reality (spirituality) and be able to apply the core values of the social realm of their interpretation. Leaders must know what is going on inside themselves, they must have a centered-selfness. The leader may then be able to project him or herself onto the external world. Traditional leadership models teach how to manipulate the external world rather than project one's self into the external world.

Palmer (1990) quotes Annie Dillard who writes about the spiritual journey this way:

In the deeps are the violence and terror of which psychology has warned us. But if you ride these monsters deeper down, if you drop with them farther over

the world's rim, you find what our science cannot locate or name, the substrata, the ocean or matrix of either which buoys the rest, which gives goodness its power for good, and evil its power for evil, the unified field: our complex and inexplicable caring for each other, and for our life together here. This is given. It is not learned. (p. 7)

Dillard is saying that spirituality moves downward and inward, not upward toward abstraction. It moves downward toward the hardest concrete realities of our lives (Palmer, 1990).

Spirituality takes its journey to our innermost home, where we will meet the basic and often scary aspects of our being. The movement-of-water metaphor presented earlier represents the movement of the spirit. Water is propelled by gravity, the spirit by the inner gravity of the being. The gravity will pull the spirit inward past the disguises of external prejudices to where we come to know the commonality of all people and the spiritual commune we share with them. Leadership could be about taking other people past the monsters of prejudice, like a guide through a primieval forest, with care. Spirituality is like the journey of direction similar to the guide's admonitions to move on, look ahead.

Issues of the Human Condition

"The neoclassical paradigm is a utilitarian, rationalist, and individualist paradigm. It sees individuals

as seeking to maximize their utility, rationally choosing the best means to serve their goals" (Etzioni, 1988, p. 1). Etzioni (1988) argues that the neoclassical stimuli are rooted in neoclassical economics. This is a logical correlate with the essentialist industrial and pragmatic paradigm described in this paper. Etzioni would have us believe that people in our society will maximize their own goals at the expense (figuratively and literally) of others. Industry and economics create an environment where money is power and power is brokered through the accumulation of money. Monetary bankruptcy is considered embarrassing and humiliating. These two points, that essentialism is economically based and driven and is inseparable from the human neoclassical paradigm that psychologically and sociologically causes a self-centeredness, are formidable challenges to leaders attempting to make all human conditions better. Almost with opposite purpose, leaders traditionally are attempting to manipulate followers while follower/people desire to be doing their own thing. A shift away from the neoclassical paradigm is difficult because the power brokerage in its prevailing authoritarianism preserves the status quo which keeps the authority in power. Leadership, it seems, has become a material thing, an "it" to be hoarded similarly to money. Renouncing or giving away material wealth is the antineoclassical paradigm. If the material

wealth of leadership was bankrupt or exhausted then it would cease to exist. So intensely traditional is the positional authoritarian hierarchical model of leadership that once a leader "steps down," or "steps aside" or out of the material "it" of leadership (s)he is no longer considered a leader.

The core assumptions of the neoclassical paradigm are important to understand as a way to look at how the society values the concept of leadership and what leadership looks like within the paradigm. These core assumptions are stated very clearly. People exist individually with their own best interests as their goal, decisions are based on rational cognition, and the rational decisions about individual goals are based on both the utilitarian nature of the decision to achieve the goals and the utilitarian value of the individual. Etzioni augments these core assumptions and changes them to include: concern about what people are after, how they choose their ways, and who is doing the choosing. The basic neoclassical theory holds that people choose to maximize a utility (whether it is pleasure, happiness, consumption); he augments this by suggesting that people have two sources of utility and valuation: pleasure and morality (1988). The concept of competition for available resources is an essentialist paradigm issue that echoes the neoclassical theory.

As individuals we do not exist in a vacuum. We have a history; we exist in our time often sharing identity, values and involvement in community (neoclassicists would call this surrender of sovereignty) (Etzioni, 1988). Baldwin (1902) says "we are members of one another" (p. 3). The conflict of individual in community creates a tension and competition. Etzioni (1988) calls this I & We relationship a deontological paradigm. This concept is a way to view the conflicting personal and social forces that leaders need to understand in order to enable people to be defined amid new parameters of social paradigmatic forces.

This new set of paradigm forces advances the theory of the responsive community where individuals and shared union of individuals are accorded full status. Etzioni (1988) contends that leaders beget community and community begets leaders when he says "the individual and the community make each other and require each other" (p. 9).

A conflict stated earlier in another way is the commune with the self or the centered-selfness that is in conflict and continually attempting to cohabituate within the shared union of the collective community. Our commune "spirituality" or epistemological self is continually negotiating with the spirituality of the collective. Often these two value systems do not agree. This disagreement

creates the tension and competition inherent to the concept of "influence."

Etzioni provides evidence of the basic core assumptions about the human condition based in philosophical discourse. It is just this discourse that subsequently provides a different lens through which the study of leadership can proceed. Whether of a business, church, school, army or team, leadership is a corporate endeavor that requires a relationship between leadership and followership. This organized behavior is intended to influence the behavior of either leader or follower in an organized manner. To combine metaphorical meaning of leadership within organizations Morgan (1986) has taken the understanding of organizations, i.e., group endeavors, into metaphorical coherence. This coherence bridges the use of language to the meaning of group endeavor and extensively taxonomizes the metaphors of organizational behavior.

Methodology

Included in this methodological approach is an analysis of language and metaphor in the creation of individual and socially constructed reality and an attempt at meaning making for understanding of a species of collective behavior in the industrial essentialist paradigm known as leadership. It

will also examine the traditionally accepted hierarchical paradigm of leadership.

To apply this method of analysis in practice, two steps are necessary. The first is to produce a *diagnostic reading* of the situation being investigated, using different metaphors to identify or highlight key aspects of the situation. The second step is to make a *critical evaluation* of the significance of the different interpretations thus produced. Through these two steps it is possible to explore the complexity of organizations in both a descriptive and prescriptive manner. (Morgan, 1986, p. 322)

Metaphors are a personal ability to name and make meaning, and thereby know and understand the world. Each individual accomplishes this differently. There is no one metaphor that is better than the other if it provides coherence for the individual. This complicates the condition of knowing and understanding but also gives multiple perspectives to see the same situation, condition, or phenomenon. It informs through multiplication of meaning and it creates stories, stories that can be painted on a canvas or printed in a book. It is the metaphor that gives us systematic ways of thinking about how we can or should act in a given situation - what Morgan (1986) calls "*the injunction of metaphor*" (p. 331). Morgan also encourages exploring how many organizational problems rest in our ways of thinking. We have failed to do this with the metaphor "leadership."

A Methodology for the Study of Leadership

Leadership is encountered in our everyday experience. Interpretation of the everyday phenomenon is accomplished by the researcher by applying what he knows about everyday experience and what he sees in the phenomenon studied. The description of the phenomenon is personal and laden with personal values and interpretive biases. These interpretive biases, as has been stated earlier, rely on the interpreter's ability to use metaphorical language to describe values. Van Manen (1990) argues that "interpretive phenomenological research and theorizing cannot be separated from the textual piece of writing" (p. ix). Research cannot be separated from the researcher.

Smith (1991) points out that "empiricists have argued that social reality is independent of our interest in it, facts are separate from values, the goals of inquiry are ultimately prediction and control, and so on" (p. 9). However, German neo-romantics have advocated hermeneutics. They have held that social reality is socially constructed, that facts are not separate from values, that the goals of inquiry are interpretation of meanings and intentions, and so on. This supports an empirical notion about leadership, quantifying the technical rationality of skills, traits, and even personality.

Smith (1991) offers two reasons why empirical approaches to the study of leadership fall short.

First, the empiricists approach to inquiry has not made good its promise for an intellectual and practical mastery of the social world. Social inquirers have not discovered law-like generalizations. Second, at the philosophical level, the assaults by post-empiricists and hermeneuticists on the traditional empiricist theory of knowledge have led to the break-up of the latter as a coherent school of thought. (p. 7)

Smith contends that to approach the study of leadership through "philosophical hermeneutics. . . . Our thinking might well reconceptualize both the research in, and the practice of leadership as an activity" (p. 11). This may create new and relanguaged terminology and metaphors, which in turn will provide new ways of understanding and knowing the metaphors of leadership and leadership as a metaphor.

A multitude of literature has been written about empiricism and leadership. We should review and reflect upon this literature as a start on our path to meaning. Included in this literature are two ideas:

- 1) a "technological or instrumental rationality, combined with subjectivism about goals and values in the social and political realm, and
- 2) the usurpation of all realms of private and public life by experts, e.g., in terms of technique, the latest scientific doctrine, cost benefit analysis" (Hollinger, 1985, pp. x-xi). These ideas assume that the leader is a

technically skilled expert, that objectivity determines decisions, and that means can be manipulated or adjusted to accomplish a variety of ends. The presumed objectivity of the leader is fundamental to these ideas. Having acknowledged the empiricists point of view of leadership's relationship to social reality and phenomenon being independent and separate from each other, the claim may be made that this is a limited point of view which attempts to make leadership understandable and knowable through law-like generalizations which are predictable.

Hermeneutics will be presented as a methodology that can no longer be overlooked as an equally appropriate methodology for understanding leadership. Fundamental to hermeneutic methodology is the argument that social phenomena are not predictable. It happens between people, not objects, and is not value free. Hesse (1980) summarizes this: various conditions in the social domain such as complexity, instability, indeterminacy, irreducible experimental interference with data preclude law-like generalizations from being discovered and that, as a consequence, we cannot expect to have increasingly successful prediction and control in the social domain. The significance of this concept is to understand that it is increasingly difficult if not impossible to predict social phenomenon. To hermeneutically interpret the phenomenon leadership is an attempt to

interpret and develop a model of leadership, and aiding in the understanding of leadership. The interpretation may reconceptualize and relanguage the epistemology of leadership.

Bernstein (1983) claims "hermeneutics poses a model of practical rationality that focuses on imagination, interpretation, the weighing of alternatives and the application of criteria that are essentially open" (p. 5). Hermeneutics helps us agree on what is knowledge rather than dictating reality or knowledge. It also explains how we are involved, intimately, in our every day lived experience, unable to divorce or be independent from it. ". . . values, interests, and purposes of the researcher are inextricably a part of the research process and inevitably the basis for how to define the reality of our social and educational worlds" (Smith, 1991, p. 11). Hermeneutics is a consciousness of consciousness, or spirituality, connected to the interpretation of reality. Individuals provide the meanings to their existence, hermeneutics attempts to understand the existence through interpretation. It does not attempt to predict the existence. Different interpretations and indeterminate procedures are inherent to hermeneutics.

Another way to frame these ideas is through the work of Max Van Manen (1990). Simply stated, "hermeneutic phenomenology is a human science which studies persons"

(p. 6). This concept was developed from W. H. Auden who said, "person, refers to the uniqueness of each human being, as persons we are incomparable, unclassifiable, uncontrollable, irreplaceable" (cited in Van Manen, 1990, p. 6). Goethe (1963) states it this way: "One learns to know what one loves, and the deeper and fuller the knowledge is to be, the more powerful and vivid must be the love, indeed the passion" (p. 83). Fredrick Buytendijk said in 1947 "Love is the foundation for all knowing of human existence" (cited in Van Manen, 1990, p. 6). Hermeneutic phenomenological research edifies the personal insight contributing to one's thoughtfulness and one's ability to act toward others (Rorty, 1979). These ideas have powerful meaning for leaders and leadership. Technical rationality, law-like empiricism applied to the concepts of leadership or attempt to make the concepts predictive. Persons and leaders who bleed, have feelings, emotions, and love, with spirituality and souls and a consciousness of these realities is what hermeneutics can begin to interpret. Hermeneutic interpretation is an exceptional tool to employ and embody in our every day lived world and leaders and researchers on leadership can benefit from utilizing this method of inquiry.

Spirituality Lost

People in traditional hierarchical positional authority are exacerbated by a critique of a concept of leadership that strays from the mainstream of beliefs that they represent. Typically these predominantly white males prefer to deny that other languages or voices of leadership exist. Cast this drone upon an already deeply hurting society, a society that can neither express or show its hurt adequately, and the problems persist. We must recognize "the enormity of our present cultural, political, and economic crisis and with it the incipient possibility of catastrophe" (Purpel, 1989, p. ix). That statement should frighten even the strong willed person into a clamoring for change. Who will have the nerve and courage to stand against the traditional authoritarians? Purpel (1989) asserts, through the voice of Christopher Lasch, that what is motivating the "do nothing, acknowledge nothing" attitude of those unoppressed as arising from "a need to forget" (p. xv). The history of exploitation, inequality and oppression is a

history without language of moral responsibility, a history characterized by an impoverished civic discourse that celebrates freedom as a form of possessive individualism and treats the concept of democracy as if it were at odds with the notion of community and the call for collective social possibilities that enhance rather than demean civic and public culture. (Giroux, Friere in Purpel, 1989, p. xv)

As stated earlier, language is central to social meaning making. Understanding language in order to make meaning is where the difficult work must be concentrated. By beginning a relanguaging of social reality, reality may be reconstructed into a moral language based perspective, perspective that acknowledges individual and collective spirituality. Giroux's (1989) support of this begs that the task of reform (of leadership) is not a technicolor mechanical rationality (skills), rather it is an ethical, social, and cultural enterprise. This enterprise cannot be only that of the subject/object myopic traditionally hierarchical positional authorities.

Purpel's (1989) languages of critique, hope, risk, and human connectedness enact the role of social and moral agents of change through the spirituality of humanness. This has been a dangerous enterprise in history because it is reminiscent of the language of Gandhi, Jesus, Martin Luther King, and Rosa Luxembourg. Purpel (1978) quotes Brueggeman, "The prophet is engaged in a battle for language, in an effort to create a different epistemology out of which another community might emerge" (p. 1). The crisis is upon us, our culture creates losers and ignores them. Kozol and Bellah say this in different ways but the message is the same. We have created a generation of underprivileged who will remain that way until the culturally correct

individualism is refocused on the spirituality of collective concern for each other. Purpel (1989) uses Freire's example that goes so far as to say that "this treatment of others is a 'violation' of the human spirit and tantamount to acts of violence" (p. 20). Bellah (1985), in Habits of the Heart, captures this cultural individualism and anonymity about possessing values that go beyond self-serving consciousness in the following:

. . . all the classic polarities of American individualism are still operating: the deep desire for autonomy and self-reliance combined with an equally deep conviction that life has no meaning unless shared with others in the context of community; a commitment to the equal right to dignity of every individual combined with an effort to justify inequality of reward, which when extreme, may deprive people of dignity; an insistence that life requires practical effectiveness and "realism" combined with the feeling that compromise is ethically fatal. The inner tensions of American individualism add up to a classic case of ambivalence. We strongly assert the value of our self-reliance and autonomy. We deeply feel the emptiness of a life without sustaining social commitments. Yet we are hesitant to articulate our sense that we need one another as much as we need to stand alone, for fear that if we did we would lose our independence altogether. The tensions of our lives would be even greater if we did not, in fact, engage in practices that constantly limit the effects of an isolating individualism, even though we cannot articulate those practices nearly as well as we can the quest for autonomy. (p. 150)

The anonymity in society today is very prevalent. It is easy to accomplish. It does not require thinking, guts, or sticking one's neck out. People do not have to reveal themselves. Being anonymous is easy and adaptable and

spiritless. Fox (1979) uses the term "compassion" to express the interconnectedness of the collective human experience. This is a connectedness that directs action toward and for others. It defines a socially moral reality for care and nurture for others and is literally defined as "suffering with" (Purpel, 1989, p. 42). This apparently missing piece of humanness concerns me about the meaninglessness of the current language of leadership. Has this language been lost? Can it be found again?

During a recent conversation with a student I posed the question, "Why do you want to run for president of the Student Government?" The response was, "Because I know I can win." This answer was troubling because it represented total egocentrism toward his purpose for being a leader. His focus was on the personal benefit rather than the benefit he could generate for himself and others.

When Napoleon said that he looked out his window each morning to see which way the people were going in order to get in front of them, and when Voltaire said, "I lead therefore I follow," they were asking the question: Where is the spirit of the people going, what is their consciousness today, and how can I follow that consciousness and guide them with their own spirit and conscious?

The Democracy of Leadership

In a differently eloquent fashion Bennis and Slater (1964) in their book, The Temporary Society elaborate on the egalitarianism of a relationship by explaining the concept of the democratic family. If the leader is autocratic, then he or she is interested in power to take and get something from community. If a leader is democratic, then he is interested in creating and giving power to community. Adlai Stevenson pointed this out when he said in a New York Times article on November 4, 1962, that "the goals of the Communists are different from ours. They are interested in power," he said, "we are in community" (Bennis & Slater, 1964, p. 2). Stevenson is implying that the Communist leaders want something from the people and if need be they will use power to take it. Democracy, he argues, is concerned with giving and the power to create community, not taking it away. This clearly egalitarian relationship nurtured and maintained through democracy strongly suggests that leadership must be based on egalitarian and democratic principles.

Bennis and Slater (1964) argue that it is the inherent egalitarian nature of family that sustains democracy. Several Bennis and Slater concepts reinforce the argument. The first is that democracy is not to be confused with permissiveness; it is instead a value system.

These values include:

1. Full and free *communication*, regardless of rank and power.

2. A reliance on *consensus*, rather than the more customary forms of coercion or compromise to manage conflict.

3. The idea that *influence* is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on the vagaries of personal whims or prerogatives of power.

4. An atmosphere that permits and even encourages emotional expression as well as task-oriented acts.

5. A basically human bias, one that accepts the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual, but that is willing to cope with and mediate this conflict on rational grounds. (p. 4)

If one agrees with Bennis and Slater's democratic value system, then one must agree with their arguments about the impending failure of any authoritarian value system. Bennis and Slater noted that a centralized decision maker, or non-democratic decision maker, is "apt to discard an idea on the grounds that he is too busy or the idea is too impractical" (Bennis, 1962, p. 5). The decentralized shared decision making process of a democracy is the relationship that is given to people and allowed to flourish. Taking it away destroys the relationship. One more concept is fundamental to Bennis and Slater's democracy/egalitarian concept, "democracy becomes a functional necessity whenever a social system is competing for survival under conditions of chronic change" (1964, p. 4). Change is the key element that forces democracy to be true to the democratic. Bennis and Slater developed this point by examining the democratization of the family.

The democratization of the family occurs under conditions of change. Children develop and establish an egalitarian relationship with their parents because the children adapt to change that both parent and child encounter. Accounts of these adaptations to broad social change have occurred during colonization of the United States, western expansion on the frontier, mass immigration, and technology (Bennis & Slater, 1964). I would like to add civil rights (i.e., cultural pluralism or multiculturalism and gender equality) and the information era to this list of broad social change.

According to Bennis and Slater (1964), the colonialists were mystified and frightened of the wilderness. Their children, however, knew the forest as their own backyard. On the frontier during western expansion, children had an egalitarian relationship with their parents because they were able to help them cope with the newness brought on by adaptation to the frontier. Children grew up with change. The change that the parents had to adapt to was simply what the children knew firsthand and as normal.

Rather than resist the changes, the parents were able to learn from the children about the changing conditions. The children, on the other hand, learned from the parents that a safe, secure environment would play a part in creating the atmosphere where learning could flourish.

During the period of mass immigration, people entered the United States from all over the world. The adults who were already in the country had to cope with very different people who had infiltrated their day to day negotiations of life. The children simply had new playmates. The language barrier encountered by adults was not conducive to communication and understanding each other. The language of children's play was easy to understand by the young ones. Eventually a new generation of children did not know the immigrants as different and therefore, cohabitation, communication, and understanding became firsthand to the children. To the parents and grandparents it represented change.

Democratic environments go beyond the family and, in fact, because of the democratic family permeates society. Bennis and Slater (1964) say:

And here we come to the point. In order for the spirit of inquiry, the foundation of science to grow and flourish, a democratic environment is a necessity. Science encourages a political view that is egalitarian, pluralistic, liberal. It accentuates freedom of opinion and dissent. It is against all forms of totalitarianism, dogma, mechanization and blind obedience. (p. 6)

As Bennis and Slater point out, technology, and as I will argue, the information era, makes the democratic environment equally vital to society today. Issues of multiculturalism or cultural pluralism have intensified since

Bennis and Slater wrote The Temporary Society in 1964. Each of the issues will sustain and continue to define the Bennis and Slater concept of the democratization of family.

The lesson learned from the democratic family focuses at least two issues concerning leadership. The first is the ultimate truth regarding creation and relationships. There is a sacredness to creating a relationship and a morality about the leader's ability to only give to it and not take from it. Secondly, the family teaches us about the inherent nature of democracy, which is that the family and democracy are one and the same and can only exist together.

The argument that is unfolding is about the relationship between leadership and community. I will argue now, that leadership cannot exist without community and vice versa. Leadership begets community and community begets leaders. Leaders must find ways to create community. (S)he must develop relationships. Community must have leadership in order to enable the community to create purpose. It is the leader's ability to give the community the opportunities to find shared values and purpose that will make leadership and community successful.

The explanation of community is rooted in an analysis of the neoclassical paradigm of being, which provides further evidence of the autobiographically communal (centered-selfness) and biographical community (other-centeredness) that are explained by the neoclassical paradigm.

Chapter III

LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN CULTURE

The Hermeneutics and Phenomenology of Leadership

The act of researching - questioning - theorizing is the intentional act of attaching ourselves to the world . . . to become more fully part of it, or better to become the world. (Van Manen, 1990, p. 5)

What is the act of researching? This is a question causing much debate in today's research communities between the quantifier and the qualifier methodologists. What is the purpose of research, to produce a dissertation, a diary, a journal, or a report of research data? These questions have implications about the nature of data collection and the purpose of the findings and results. How questions are posed may elicit varied responses. Often when gathering data about leadership the researcher chooses "a leader" to observe. These researchers assume that observing the leader will provide the data that will define leadership.

The purpose of this research is to contribute my perspective to a debate among leadership educators about the nature of leadership. Is it an act, a position, or a cultural experience that is acted out in a microcosm? Some contend that the debate is organized as follows: Leadership is a set of skills that are countable, correlated

statistically, predictable, and generalizable while others argue that leadership is a set of qualities reflecting the human condition, filled with passion, emotion, and which raise questions about values and morality.

Is there an analogous relationship between the researched and researcher as well as between leader and led? In other words, is research meant to be for other people or for the researcher, and is leadership meant to be for other people or for the leader? One approach has been widely held to be better, more useful and the acceptable scientific method, the quantitative. This traditional approach is considered better because it is objective and "scientific." The scientific method attempts to remove the personal bias of the researcher by supposedly eliminating value-based collection and interpretation of data. Cartesian dualism suggests that there is a separate relationship between observer and the observed and that empirical interpretation of truth reveals itself to the observer through observation. The assumption is that researcher's manipulation of specific outcomes can be avoided, and, therefore, have no impact on the observable facts. Cartesian methods in fact attempt to remove the research from the researcher. Qualitative methodologies have been criticized for being too subjective, interpretive and, therefore, detract from a true (empirical) understanding of the outcomes because methodologies

acknowledge personal values as a part of understanding. As the debate over which method to employ for the study of leadership continues, I will suggest that each method in its own right is acceptable for studying the debatable and elusively defined notions of leadership.

Much of the scholarly endeavor to study leadership has been quantifiable and has produced quantitative results. The quantifiable elements of leadership-oriented research incline researchers to look to leaders to see what they did to cause leadership to occur. Assuming, too, that since they are leaders, then skills, traits, or something preceding leadership caused the leadership. To break from tradition, the direction of this study will search for indices that may ground leadership research in the practice of the humane. The aim of this approach is to subjectify rather than objectify the concept of leadership.

Hermeneutics

If the "I" is looking at a given phenomenon, the researcher needs to acknowledge the involvement of "I" itself. Both the researcher and the consumer reading the research need to know about the grounding of the researcher. This agrees with Professor Dale Brubaker's amplification of the importance of autobiography. Since leadership is about people, and leaders are people, then Van Manen's (1987)

argument can be understood when he suggests "hermeneutic phenomenology is a human science which studies persons" (p. 6). Van Manen (1987) developed this concept from ideas generated by W. H. Auden who said "person, refers to the uniqueness of each human being, as persons (researchers, leaders) we are incomparable, unclassifiable, uncontrollable, irreplaceable" (cited in Van Manen, 1987, p. 6).

Leaders are people possessing all of the uniqueness of human qualities; some lead by changing the status quo, others by maintaining it. The act of leadership has been defined many different ways, and we search for that common classification so that "leadership" can be an "it" that leaders and nonleaders alike acquire. Hermeneutically, leadership is defined by language, and as suggested by Kant, symbols give, and they are the gift of language. Symbols cause us to think and interpret language's meaning. Upon rendering an interpretation, hermeneutics prods the researcher to reflect philosophically for meaning. We are limited by the semantic values each interpreter places in the meaning of words and must engage a discourse about meaning. Writing language requires the author to attempt to find the ground of language, the bottom of meaning inherent in language is where interpretation and meaning reside. It is this hermeneutic journey back to the derivation of terms where this study is searching. The hermeneutic journey is a

human endeavor among human beings with all of the incomparability, unclassifiability, uncontrollability, and irreplaceability of people.

Autobiography of a Researcher: Hermeneutical and Phenomenological

To do autobiography is both frightening and comforting. More importantly, autobiography, in a thrilling way, allowed me to get in touch with, speak to, and listen to the mediation of voices inside me. It reminded me that my soul is still alive and plays a major role in enabling the fundamental act of community with myself. Communing with the self is the first act necessary in the hermeneutic process. Self-discovery is a process that could be the foundation of leadership development if leadership is to be subjectified. Subjectivication will ground the discussion of leadership in the person as leader rather than in leadership as an object, or an "it." Autobiographical methodology teaches the researcher that leaders and leadership will not reveal the "itself" to the researcher by a subject/object Cartesian methodology. Moreover, the revelation could occur within the self and to the self through careful examination of how the individual responds to their own leading-following relationship. This raises the question: Am I to others who they think I am or who I think I am? Does a person look

inside to find the mystery of self or does the person look at his reflection cast by the environment, society or culture of which the person is a part? Merleau Ponty conceptualizes that the deeper one looks inside people the closer one gets to what is outside them. This suggests that we are merely products of our externalized environmental and cultural phenomena as opposed to the product of an internalized production of self. As human beings there is only one quantity of life yet infinite qualities of life as we know it.

In this way quantity and quality of life are hermeneutic, expansive, and autobiographical. Life is a constant series of interpretations of multiple experiences and externalized conditions that happen to us in the present tense. So, too, is leadership and research. We simply cannot script our self out of our understanding of the world, whether the world of education, autobiography, leadership, or research. Scholars of leadership cannot remove the subjective leader from the study of leadership. Leadership is not an "it;" it is a person engaging in an act, of "ducere." The values of the leader are crucial to the act, "ducere," and are inexplicably tied to the person ("dux") who leads. Quantifying the skills or the "its" to define leadership and leaders objectifies them and seems to remove them from the realm of the humane.

Hermeneutic Methodology

A brief description of what I call hermeneutic methodology is important. Although I have limited experience with hermeneutic interpretation, through brief encounters with professors experienced at expressing it, in attempting to understand our world, the subject has profoundly influenced my understanding that interpretation is what everyone does in the day-to-day business of making meaning in the world. Professor David Purpel provided the best description for me in order to understand the concepts of hermeneutics.

The term "hermeneutics" is taken from the name of the Greek god Hermes. Hermes was the messenger to the gods. Hermes was known as the messenger, so the term hermes came to mean "communication and deceit." The upper case "H" was used as a result of the use of Hermeneutics as it was employed in seminary to interpret the Bible. Exegesis is the critical explanation or analysis of a text, especially if it is the interpretation of the Bible (American Heritage Dictionary, 1981). The word "exegesis" is derived from the Greek, "exegeisthai," to expound, which is a combination of ex - out of and hegeisthai - to lead (1981). The distinction between H hermeneutic and exegesis is that exegesis is to get out of the Bible, while hermeneutic is to interpret the Bible, which means to interpret the "book." The Bible as the only text to

interpret for life's meaning is now included among other texts of equal significance which need equal and thorough examination, e.g., The Koran, The Odyssey, The Aeneid, The Mahabharata, the works of Shakespeare, Milton, and the U.S. Constitution. Paul Ricoeur (1966) explains individual human beings metaphorically as texts needing interpretation. Both the individual's conscious and unconscious being are in need of interpretation to find meaning.

Autonomous acts of understanding are not the foundations of free choices; they are abstractions from concrete acts of stating, wishing, ordering, or deciding. What males have thought to be formed truths are grounded, in their cases as well as females', in the concreteness of experience and of encounters in the temporal world.
(p. 226)

If there is to be a reality and truth, each individual will perceive it through a lens that has been molded and mediated (Purpel, 1993). The reality is the lens. When you look at the world you see something that is both real and different from what I see. Your reality is good for you, and mine is good for me. More importantly, we may begin to compare our realities to determine if there is a truth to the lens of reality for both of us.

Hermeneutic explanation can begin when a book is read for the first time. While reading the printed page an interpretation or picture is rendered. So, too, after subsequent readings an interpretation or picture is rendered,

and after each reading the interpretation may be very different from the first interpretation. Or, did the book change between the first and second reading or did the reader change? When leadership is encountered for the first time and interpreted, then encountered again and interpreted differently, what changed, the leader or the interpreter? Hermeneutics depicts the relationship between knowledge and interpretation as constantly changing and constantly being interpreted. Interpretations that lead to further interpretation are heuristic, and language is used to paint pictures using metaphor and language. Using this as a base, one may argue that all interpretation of research is qualitative and hermeneutic. Through the use of Hermeneutic methodology one can begin to utilize linguistics, metaphor, poetry and language to interpret, understand and know leadership.

Purpel explains the Hermeneutic Circle as the process by which interpretation and the search for understanding occur. He uses the metaphor of traveling through day and night and the various stages of that journey as a constantly repeated spiraling process that through the use of language drives us to capture the next stage of understanding. It is a linear model in that it does not distinguish between which is first, day or night. But he does clarify that it is not linear like the chicken and the egg question. The metaphor of light and

dark is the crucial temporal concept. The light is a metaphor for conscious life while the darkness is unconscious life, each helping to explain the other.

Hermeneutics is a conscious attempt to interpret and understand the world and our life in it. At the same time it brings interpretation into the subconscious where preunderstandings and tacit knowledge are applied. Next, it is brought back to the conscious, and through language it is indexed and expressed. Sometimes language does not exist to explain the interpretation, and often the translation is lacking because of inability to complete the language process. Through the continual process and reprocessing, interpretation is taken through the Hermeneutic Circle time and time again. Language can only at best be mildly elusive, metaphorical and suggestive in its contribution to interpretation, understanding, and knowing. Yet, by acknowledging that language combines all the senses with the unconscious, it can be useful if we interpret through the use of language our reality and truth.

To gain qualitative understanding of leadership as a text, book, or language makes it ripe for hermeneutic interpretation. To this end, if the "I" is studying something, i.e., researching, then the one reading the research needs to know about the "I" conducting the research. This will provide the reader with an idea of the lens that

the "I" used to interpret reality and truth. It will allow the reader an opportunity to compare their lens of reality with the researcher's, thus rendering a comparative view of the world's and interpretations of truth.

Autobiographical Methodology

What does it mean to be autobiographical? Janet Gunn (1982) in her book Autobiography: Toward a Poetics of Experience provides a detailed account of the technical and historical aspects of the autobiographical literary genre. She draws upon the work of James Olney, Georges Gusdorf, Michael Sprinker, Jacques Lacan, Michael Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and others, to argue that autobiography is a very technical and mechanical process utilizing language to describe the phenomena of the self. James Olney expands on this theme: It is a "shift of attention from bios to autos - from the life to the self" (cited in Gunn, 1982, p. 3). This is to say that autobiography is not to be confused with history; rather, it is a hermeneutic and phenomenological research methodology employed to interpret the self.

History, on the other hand, is simply what historians write, which is their account of an event. Interpretation brings autobiography into the present so the self is made real. Autobiography is about the inner world of the self rather than the external world. Hermeneutic, in this sense,

the "I" is the significant and indispensable element of autobiography. Some argue that the quality of language is either advantageous or disadvantageous to autobiography because language is both limited or apt in its ability to explain the "I." Gunn uses an Elizabeth Bruss expression that helps the autobiographer and the reader understand both the limited and apt qualities of language as a tool for autobiography when she defines autobiography as "transcendental voyeurism" (1982, p. 7), as though the reader obtains a second-hand account of what the self, watching and overhearing itself, has seen and heard.

This implies that there are both a hermeneutics of hermeneutics as well as a phenomenology of phenomenology. This means that both hermeneutics and phenomenology are not linear but cyclical in that there can be interpretation of interpretation and layer upon layer of understanding within the self that can only exist within the self. Bringing this understanding to language contaminates the privacy of the self-understanding of the self. At best, Gunn acknowledges that "when the autobiographer brings a life 'to language,' he or she always adumbrates a perspective from somewhere - namely, from a world whose meanings and codes and even whose burden of unintelligibility serve to locate and ground that perspective" (1982, p. 9).

Language is advantageous in that it fulfills Louis Renza's law of the gravity of writing -- the reduction of reality, interpretation and autobiography through written language. By reducing time and space with language, it is pulled to its gravity or fundamental level of understanding and grounds autobiography to the present.

Gunn (1982) discusses the hermeneutics of restoration or of autobiographical situation as having three angles or interrelated moments from which to think about autobiography. These are the autobiographical impulse, the autobiographical perspective, and the autobiographical response.

The impulse arises out of the effort to confront the problem of temporality and can be assumed operative in any attempt to make sense of experience. The perspective shapes autobiographical impulse by bringing it to language and displaying it as narrative surface; it is informed by problems of locating and gaining access to the past. The response has to do with the problem of appropriation and the reader's relation to the autobiographical text. All of these moments or (angles) are levels of interpretation and part of a world characterized by finitude and historicity. Only within such a world can understanding take place. As the principal mode of experiencing the world, finitude and temporality do not stand in the way of our understanding but make way for it. (pp. 12-13)

Students of leadership need to understand the principle of autobiography to ground their understanding in what Hannah Arendt calls the "senses communis" or "commune of the senses," or what we call common sense and everyday experience (cited in Gunn, 1982). Autobiography calls for the many

senses to create common sense to remember the history of self which will heuristically point toward the future whereby the present, where autobiography resides, may be realized. Again the use of the word "commune" has appeared but in a different context, a context that expresses the existence of a community of senses within each of us that enables languaging of the cognitive act of communing spiritually with the self.

For Gunn (1982), the autobiographical impulse is much like Michael Polanyi's tacit dimension: We have had in our past more experience than we know how to say or give language to. She quotes Jose' Ortega y Gasset's "creencia" or that "zone of stability" which has to do with the ideas we are, not the ideas we have (p. 13). Her example is that "just because all of the past cannot be presented does not mean that it is therefore absent from the autobiographical text" (p. 14). This understanding leads the autobiographical impulse to the autobiographical perspective because it points out that the impulse comes from somewhere; to call this place something by giving it language the autobiographical situation moves from the moment of impulse to the moment of perspective.

At this moment, the autobiographical perspective is where "autobiography is a presencing" (Gunn, 1982, p. 17). By utilizing the past, the present is interpreted in autobiography. The present is where reality and

autobiography reside and make the self "fierce with reality" (p. 17). If autobiography uses the past to place us in the present, this act becomes a heuristic use of future by pulling one's self into it because, as Gunn reminds us, time is in the future. This is what I call the "'ducere' of the self toward interpretation of the self," which leads to the self-education of the self.

The autobiographical response is what the reader brings to the experience of reading the autobiography. The reader also has a cultural dictionary and autobiography that cannot be separated from the reader. This is another hermeneutical display of context; for when the reader reads and rereads, the interpretation changes and discovery occurs. This act integrates the autobiographical text into the reader's self interpretation. Gunn (1982) makes an important distinction about the reader. This is to her a phenomenological place, not necessarily a person, to understand. The reader as a place explains the autobiographical self's question, Where do I belong? in regard to the self's location in the world rather than Who am I?

These examples will provide a foundation for the argument that the fundamental community that the leader needs to develop a relationship with is the community of the self, both hermeneutically and phenomenologically. Leaders must know where they are in the world (their cultural context and

surrounding microcosm) and their groundedness in order to be the educator of the self.

Phenomenological Methodology of Autobiography

Autobiography is not just a historical account of the events of one's life. Although history, or as the American Heritage Dictionary refers, herstory, is important to autobiography, it is not sufficient to define who one is at this moment by looking at selected pictures from one's past. History helps the autobiographer understand the events, decisions, conditions, stages, and developments that add up or comprise the elements that contribute to understand the various paths that led the person to here. Phenomena from life history help provide some answers to the question "How did I get here, to today and why?"

Autobiography asks the questions not of history but of phenomena. Both the questions, Who am I? and Why am I? are equally important to phenomenology. Interpreting personal history enables the autobiographer to go beyond the obvious or taken-for-granted historical perspective. Phenomenology employs the tools of language to aid interpretation through the persistent posing of questions. Roger Porter and H. R. Wolf (1973) go so far as to define autobiography as language. Norman Denzin (1989) defines autobiography this way: "Our

humanness and selfness lie in the words we speak and attach to ourselves" (p. 78).

Phenomenology utilizes language to manifest itself. In fact, the word "phenomenology" is taken from the Greek phenomenon, which Kant took to mean the appearance of reality in consciousness versus 'noumenon' and interpreted to mean being in reality (Spiegelberg, 1975). Hegel approached phenomenology this way: Absolute spirit is all reality - to be fully conscious of self is to be fully conscious of all reality (cited in Spiegelberg, 1975). Essence is a word significant to the understanding of phenomenology because it gives the quality of thingness to nature and reality. The Greek "logos" means reason or word; therefore, using word ("logos") to describe appearances ("phenomen") is how we arrive at this meaning of phenomenology.

David Stewart (1974) defines appearance as anything of which one is conscious. This agrees with the tacit dimension postulated by Polanyi which, as a language-based epistemology, suggested that there are things happening or known that we are "unaware" because of our lack of sufficient language to describe them. Appearances are self-defined. To the phenomenologist, they need to be described rather than explained. By describing appearances, others can bring their self to the explanation. Since the appearance will be different to each individual, the explanation deserves this

individuality because we all know that each will explain the appearance differently.

The consideration of consciousness, I am arguing, plays a major role in the philosophy, reality, appearance, and essence of the condition of leadership. Through autobiographical and phenomenological process the search for the self, the conscious and essence may be educed, brought out, led out, and revealed to the self. Only the self can accomplish this task. To this end, the study of leadership as an act of the self must begin with a self-examination of the self. James Olney (1972) argues that the study of self will reveal what the self created. More emphatically, his claim is that to conduct the study honestly, one can only study the self that one is only capable of knowing which is self.

Olney (1972) quotes Heraclitus on cosmology by saying that "as the cosmologist is so will be the cosmology" (p. 4). I stretch this concept to make my point, as the leaderologist is, so will be the leaderology. The words of the leader define the leader. The essence of those words comes from the self. The knowledge that those words are as accurate as possible come from the studied self. Olney notes that he can know what existence is like not by watching others but by watching his own person. By this watching-of-self method leaders can know leadership.

James Edie (1967), in his introduction to Pierre Thevenaz's book What is Phenomenology? postulates that "phenomenology is neither science of objects nor science of the subject: It is a science of experience" (p. 19). This means that it focuses on the point at which being and consciousness meet. It is transcendental in that it is the study of consciousness or the consciousness of consciousness and experience of experience. In his most fundamental language, Edie explains phenomenology as the study of phenomenon, therefore, conscious phenomenon.

Marvin Farber (1966) agrees, "Phenomenology begins with the individual and his stream of experience, to do this and achieve certainty of knowledge, examine dogmatic and naive beliefs one must begin with his own conscious experience" (p. 13).

The phenomena we call leadership, the act of leading, occur in persons. If leadership has a phenomenology, then the person experiencing the leadership phenomena must begin with his own conscious experience to achieve certainty of knowledge about the leadership phenomena. By examining one's autobiography phenomenologically, the conscious experience of understanding the self will begin. By examining the phenomenology of the conscious experience of understanding the self as leader, will the leader begin to know leadership.

Leaders lead a perceived reality, a reality perceived by themselves and by others. Leaders may attempt to change the perceived reality of followers by choosing which reality of their leadership perception they show to the followers. Autobiography allows a person to discreetly choose which elements of the autobiography will be revealed. When an autobiography is explained, certain parts of it are shared while others are kept hidden. There are things that even the self may not be able to get in touch with to add to the autobiography. The leader is faced with the same type of decision: What elements of the leader autobiography will he tell and which will he hide. To help the autobiographical leader understand and analyze this point is critical, enabling leaders to understand themselves as phenomenologists. Autobiography and leadership are more than what is perceived.

Four principles guide the interpretation of phenomenological methodology of the autobiographer that may aid in the analyzation of the phenomenon of leadership; they are: (1) What is my view of myself and where did it come from? (2) What is my concept of others? (3) What are my concepts of how things are? What is my reality? and (4) What is my concept of how things ought to be?

To exhibit my concept of others begins with the following. At this concept's very premise is a belief that,

in general, other people are concerned about little other than self. Society is competitive, often corrupt, even dangerous; people want only for themselves. In business and personal life, our vulnerabilities are capitalized upon by those who prey on others' vulnerabilities. People are taught to feel that if I have more material things, then I am better than the rest, and I win. Leaders will understand the phenomenology of leadership if they ask the four basic phenomenological questions: (1) What is my view of myself as a leader and where did it come from? (2) What is my concept of other leaders? (3) What are my concepts of how leaders are? What is the reality of leadership? and (4) What is my concept of how leaders ought to be?

The use of language will unlock insights into these questions and describe them for you. The following represents an example of what I argue is the fundamental exercise in leadership development, the phenomenological autobiography. I will warn you about this section with the concept of Husserel as noted by Quentin Lauer (1958); phenomenology as Husserel conceived it is at its persuasive best in the realm of values.

Autobiography: An Example of the Method

[We] also need as much as anything else language adequate to the times we live in. We need to see how we live now and we can only see with words and in ages

which leave us no escape into nostalgia for another time and place. (Ignatieff, 1984, p. 141)

Who am I? This section poses the question and answers to: What is my view of myself? Where did it come from? Why does that seem like such a difficult concept to contemplate? I recall values clarification exercises where, in dyads, two of us would give perceptions of the other person to each other to compare with our own perceptions of self, and the recollection explains a lot to me about my unwillingness for self disclosure. These games revealed positive and interesting things about me and reflecting on all those good "positive" traits others saw in me boosted my ego. It was easy to hide behind others' perceptions of traits even if they were not true, and in some cases I did just this. Likewise self-perceptual cognition was unnecessary, either about myself or about the other person or the believability of sincerity. It was unnecessary to define for myself who I was. By not deciding on those definitions, I could avoid and ignore autobiography which made my values invisible, and I liked that feeling of not taking risks.

Being anonymous meant that I could be whomever I wanted when the mood struck or when it was practical. Anonymity rendered the ability to vacillate and change who I was on the spur of the moment. But somehow even the disguise of

anonymity could not hide the traits that people cited repeatedly. Being like others had become boring, and to some degree, I perceived this as a disadvantage to me. I look at my family, white, middle-class, role models in the community, and family centered. These traditionally are wonderful traits to have yet there was something that I did not have; I was not different. I gauged my sameness as bland, so I developed an avoidance technique. Being characterized as friendly, fun-loving and fun to be with, or sociable was common and true. Caring and sincere were traits others often cited in me. In graduate school, surprisingly, others considered me to be intellectual and smart.

An explanation of how these perceptions could have been formed lies in how I was nurtured and educated. I am the third sibling of four and the second male in the sibling order. My father was the oldest of seven, a true patriarch. His father, having been institutionalized for alcoholism, bestowed him with the patriarch honor of both his immediate families. I do not know what caused him to choose to become a Protestant minister, although his spirituality was magnificent. Unfortunately, the opportunity to discuss this subject with him prior to his death never occurred. By today's standards, he was a successful ordained minister. Depicting this success are pictures in the family scrapbook

that would show, Today's Attendance 302. These pictures were taken of him in the pulpit with the common attendance sign behind him. I did not know it at the time, but the sense of community and the spiritual homing influence he had on me were significant. A Sunday never passed when Dad did not take the opportunity to let the church family into the closet of my immediate family by recounting an anecdote from the past week about life in the Watson household. Perhaps it was this ceremonial embarrassment and subsequent cheek pinching that began the quest for anonymity.

My mother wrote a biographical piece about me for one of my college class projects. She described in some detail how caring and obedient I was; translation: Do not bring everybody in and trash the place. So, the story goes that when I had to get something from my house or we all had to take a bathroom break, I would take charge. Everyone would enter, and I would explain, quite convincingly, "do not touch the walls, the fresh paint; be sure to wipe your feet on the mat."

My parental models were the measuring stick that I used in my early years. Could I uphold the rigorous standards that my father held for himself. The need to do good was pervasive, so pervasive that he drilled it into me at home and at church. He was a strong caretaker of me and the

church community which both immunized and irritated. It irritated me that I had to share so much of my Dad's time with the church community. Even though I knew what he was doing was right because I saw the faces of the people he helped. The face of desperation turned to deep gratitude. When I finally realized my ethic of concern and desire to help others' lives become better, I was more irritated because he was gone from my life and unretrievable. I was unable to thank him for teaching and leading me toward the core values I hold today. The same values motivated this writing. I did not want to write just a dissertation, I wanted to express my values and learn to support them with scholarship. These values are weapons that I will use to wage a war against a dispassionate, spiritlessness, and disintegrating sense of family and community in today's society. The values are to have strong morality, family, and community support for one another. They also include the value of having important, meaningful, full relationships with all others.

Irritated because I knew I was hiding these values was an obvious contradiction which I think I have since solved. The phenomenon is not simply that I am now a thirty-something story, or that I fear the shortened opportunity to make something of my life. The revelation itself is that my

father immunized me to the need to struggle with developing values and learning to express values; he held the values and expressed them for me. More importantly, he immunized me against the plagues of indifference, inequality, hopelessness, defeatism, and racism. He stood against all the plagues so I neglected to engage in the struggle for myself. I now realize that I must carry on his struggle and vision, and like leadership itself, the struggle will be brutal.

These values are simple ones and account for why I like the seemingly simple things in life, the warmth of a friend, the need for family, a story of love and compassion, helping someone with a problem, being a good neighbor, singing hymns in church, playing baseball with my son. But these are not simple things. Having "traditional" values is not simple in 1993. People poke fun at these values because they perceive them as old fashioned. I remind them that I have these values in 1993 and that makes them modern. I also argue that many people do not have these values, so as a society we are on the verge of losing the battle against drug abuse, violence, poor health, teen pregnancy, unemployment, disintegration of the family, and spiritual poverty.

My mother raised the money for many of the projects of the church. She did most of the fund raising for the

educational addition to one of my father's churches. After my father entered politics and preached only in rural churches, she became chairman of the large church's Board of Directors where we attended. I often saw her in action through heated debates and long budget sessions keeping the group moving, nurturing the process. All the while she raised the family, fed the community, prepared the church bulletin, or whatever it took to get the job done, even if it called for a miracle.

I experienced the lust to take from the world and others and often struggled with desires for property, wealth, and power. It was probably at this time that the external and internal worlds were coming to bear on me. Internally, reconciliation with God was very important while externally the world offered a lot to enjoy and to take. The internal "spiritual" world became very focused and powerful yet remained less tangible than the external; the external world was something to win and to take from. It never occurred to me that a stronger spiritual life could allow one to have it "better." As I tried to deny the influence of my parents' value system, it shaped every decision I made, both then and now.

A few years after turning 25, getting married and starting my career, I lost my Dad. I never had a chance to

be a man with him, to need by asking, man-to-man, for his advice, to find out what made him tick. When I was finally able to pose the questions, he was gone.

This taught me the urgency of life. We have little precious time to give or get from this world. I knew that my father's work would be rewarded after his death because he gave more than he received. He showed me how things ought to be and what reality ought to be.

He thought that reality ought to be about giving to others rather than getting from others. "Ducere" is the gift of guidance. My father guided his and other's lives in a giving manner, and everyone benefitted.

Although we are white middle-class people, I was the one exhibiting the typical middle-class syndrome, not my father. Being middle-class is a lot about avoidance. We grew up with comfort and enjoyment. I avoided the despair of poverty and the concern for those in it. Some people never recognize or acknowledge that it exists. My value system was beginning to feel, look, and taste bland. I had struggled with my values to some degree and was certainly comfortable with them. But the rest of the world seemed uncomfortable with those types of values: white, middle-class, strongly moral, family-based, community sensed values. The subsequent struggle has been to defend blandness, to defend traditional values with a

white middle-class cultural perspective. Many of these values women and people of color agree are acceptable and may be the most appropriate for the times. I cannot deny who I am, and these values have and will play an important role in who I become. My values are humane, basic, consistent, timeless, fundamental, and nourishing. They are the foundation of many other values. They are my essence. My values are their own essence, possessing a core and exposing itself.

I now am in a position to interpret who I am and take a stand as a white male middle-class person who lives mostly among white middle-class people. This could be considered a kind of "witnessing." I can take a stand that can enable others in this population to see that being middle-class is about avoidance of struggling with the problems of the world. Struggling with the problems teaches that we can be about solutions to the problems rather than contributors to the problems. Leaders need to recognize that as human beings we cannot tolerate the inhumane and undignified unnecessary human suffering to continue.

Each individual and each generation of people are shaped by personal and social values. Often, without the experience of phenomenological autobiography, a person never has the opportunity or ability to understand and know one's own

biography. Generations of people are characterized by the phenomenological outcome of the value-based decisions that they make. If my phenomenological and autobiographical argument about the nature of leadership is to be trusted, students of leadership theory will need to understand the basis for the argument, which is the purpose of this chapter.

I have attempted to establish examples of the phenomenological aspects of autobiography and the rationally technical nature of autobiography to create the definition of leadership as a relationship with the self and others. Next, I will point to examples of interpretations of the generation of young people and the forces that have influenced the phenomena of what their autobiographies have become. By compiling this next set of interpretations about this generation, I will begin to lay the framework for understanding how my arguments about the language of leadership may be applied within this interpretation.

To describe the phenomena experienced by college students, Howe and Strauss (1992) describe the thirteeners, the people born from 1960 to 1980. Thirteeners are the thirteenth generation since the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Among the many examples given in The New Generation Gap in the December 1992 Atlantic Monthly is this:

The countermood is popping up in college towns, in big cities, on Fox and cable TV, and in various ethnic side currents. It's a tone of physical frenzy and spiritual numbness, a revelry of pop, a pursuit of high-tech, guiltless fun. It's a carnival culture featuring the tangible bottom lines in life - money, bodies, and brains - and the wordless deals with which one can be traded for another. A generation weaned on minimum expectations and gifted in the game of life is now avoiding meaning in a cumbersome society that, as they see it, offers them little. (p. 86)

And why are they reacting this way? Because they were promised a lot and given little.

When they look into the future, they see a much bleaker vision than any of today's older generations ever saw in their youth. Polls show that thirteeners believe it will be much harder for them to get ahead than it was for their parents - and that they are overwhelmingly pessimistic about the long-term fate of their generation and nation. They sense that they're the clean-up crew, and their role in history will be sacrificial - that whatever comeuppance America has to face, they'll bear more than their share of the burden. It's a new twist, and not a happy one on the American Dream. (p. 75)

What can leaders begin to understand and know about this type of follower or community that can enable the leader to provide the "ducere" and the "educere" of support this type of community needs?

Recalling Detouqueville's concern with rugged individualism in a democratic society is similar to the thoughts of Daniel Yankelovich (1982) as expressed in his book New Rules Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World

Turned Upside Down. Self-fulfillment is a core human instinct, but, as Yankelovich points out, has become skewed into secular humanism or political pluralism to mean:

Where strict norms had prevailed in the fifties and sixties, now all was pluralism and freedom of choice: to marry or live together; to have children early or postpone them, perhaps forever; to come out of the closet or stay in; to keep the old job or return to school; to make commitment or hang loose; to change careers, spouses, houses, states of residence, states of mind. (p. 3)

The seventies spawned the "me generation." Amitai Etzioni (1989) reminds us of the neoclassical paradigm that explains our self-fulfillment obsessions. In so doing everything is objectified into an instrumental good. Earlier the discussion focused on my experience of the difficulty in finding spirituality because it lacked tangible substance. Furthermore, dignity has come to be equated with equity. Just as major global and societal problems have spawned a new sense of morality (Purpel & Ryan, 1985), so too societal problems have spawned a new sense of greed.

On the other hand, Yankelovich (1982) points to the domain of the expressive. This domain is opposed to the instrumental in that the value of life "is the moral intuition that the very meaning of life resides in its sacred/expressive aspects, and that one must, therefore, fight to give these the importance they deserve" (p. 6).

This expresses the inner conflict that vanquished the spiritual, sacred and expressive (creative) language in the epistemology of leadership.

Autobiography that employs careful interpretation and insight, not just the telling of a story, can enable a person to explore the instrumental and the spiritual aspects of self-fulfillment, which, in turn, may give new and comforting understanding about the commune with the self. That will lead to what I call the sacred expression of who each of us is and the celebration of that sacredness and spirituality and the combination of head, heart, body and soul. The phenomenologically autobiographical concept is the first conceptual building block to my argument about leadership development.

Leadership, Relationship, and Family

A different understanding of the development of the commune is through understanding community as the relationship of the family. As an exemplary stage of the epistemology of leadership as relationship, I will use the act of creation of new life to explain a type of relationship that is certain and tangible. This example is intended to show one type of relationship; there are many others. The concept of family is particularly helpful because of its

spiritualness and sacredness which add to the notion of the utilization of prophetic language to distinguish the language of leadership from the language of management.

Another aspect of community that must enter the discourse is that which is held in the epistemological concept of family. The most immediate relationship that occurs is the one among mother, father, and child. The act of creation depends on the mother and the father. The interdependence and relationship that establish this type of community are permanent, and the creation of a child by two people is an example of this permanent community. Life-giving and life-sustaining acts form the foundation of this type of relationship. Leaders can learn many lessons from the principles and truths of creation of a life and the concept of family as the ultimate ontology of relationship and community. The lesson is that the act of creation is the gift two people give to the process of creating new life. It is the act of giving that defines this type of relationship, for without the two gifts each brings to the act of creation, creation will not occur.

Family in the very traditional sense, as it is known to me, requires a mother, a father and the creation of a child. With the creation of the child the ultimate ontology of family and relationship is formed. The metaphor in our

culture for this phenomenon is to "start a family." This seems odd since we all come from parents, i.e., the traditional concept of family. Subtopics of family are created by forming different types of people into different types of relationships. However, one thing still holds as ultimately true; one sperm and one egg are gifts from two contributors that create a new being. Whether or not the sperm is from one side of the world and the egg from the other, the two together create a new being. Whether they do this in a womb or a room, they ultimately form a relationship that creates another human being. When this occurs the "giving" essence of family/relationship is caused to be. There is a powerful locus of control embedded in this discussion. Certainly someone other than the person being created has the control to create that person. What these individuals control, in most cases, is the choice to engage in the act that can create the proper circumstance for the creation to occur through the act of the relationship. Leadership as a relationship has similar elements of control when choosing to create a relationship. This is the most sacred and ultimately true essence of relationship and community.

Leaders can benefit from understanding this concept for both themselves and others: Both figuratively and literally,

in the power of creation a man and a woman share a sacredness of relationship and relationship's ultimate truth. Although this concept is not necessarily about moral or religious imperative, it is about the consciousness to act, the spirituality to create, and the epistemology of relationship. The concept of relationship is about understanding the magnitude of potential for the imperative of creation through a relationship that two people hold. The concept of family is an understanding about the power and magnitude of relationship and the power and magnitude of creation. It is about understanding that leadership is fundamentally about relationships with self and others.

In this way, an imperative for leaders to understand the hermeneutics of relationships and of social phenomena occurs. The imperative is that anytime two people engage in a relationship the inherent act is that a person brings themselves to the relationship. A person cannot only get from a relationship. After two people have brought themselves to an encounter may the act of getting occur. The argument being framed is that the language of leadership currently used to define leadership defines leadership as a getting relationship rather than a giving relationship. Through the act of giving one makes a sacrifice, whether it is temporal or spatial. The sacrifice of giving defines the sacred

quality of giving rather than one of getting. If the leader is more focused on leadership as a giving relationship to the follower, the gift includes getting the follower to where the leader is, a type of ducere. The concept of family as a paradigm for understanding relationships and their epistemological phenomenon is the second crucial element in understanding the concept of leadership.

If leadership is a relationship, and relationship is based on giving self to the relationship, then leadership, it may be argued, is about giving through the sacrificial expression of relationship. If a relationship is the act of giving and creation, then it is also about consequences and purpose. The responsibility for the consequences and purpose must be maintained and controlled by the giver. There is a ramification for creating a relationship as well as the act of leadership.

"Ducere", "Educere," Educator

The Q.E.D. helped define and give meaning to the term "lead" derived from the Latin "ducere" and "educere." Both terms were derived to explain the action of lead. This derivation was intended to form the basis for the understanding and knowing of the action "lead." The action of lead as in the Latin "ducere" and "educere" created the

meaning for the action of bringing up and supporting children, which is expressed by the word "educator." In a very literal sense, the act of leading requires the relationship and community of adult and child. The magic or mystery of the creation of a human being is the preeminent action of educator. A child must be created in order to be supported or led. Implied are a directionally hierarchical physical movement of supporting and bringing up or raising the child. The language of relationships and family is everyday language that we use to persuade and to describe. So, too, is the language of leadership. The spirituality of creation and the language used to describe and persuade others about the mystery of creation constitute my language for leadership. The spirituality of leadership is formed through language, and the language gives new voice to the concept of leadership.

If leadership is a relationship, and family is a fundamental relationship, then the language of leadership and the language of family should hold some similarities that may enable a better understanding of both concepts. I turn now to the language of family as a way to give more language to relationship, thus leadership. The analysis of leadership as a socially constructed phenomenon may be supported by what

Gubrium and Holstein (1990) consider to be a socially constructed phenomenon, What is family?

In their book What is Family, Gubrium and Holstein (1990) ask the question contained in the title. By overtly omitting the article "the" from the title What is Family, they attempt to ensure that family is not construed as a "thing" that is concrete and set. To Gubrium and Holstein, the focus of attention is on the process by which the concept of family is construed and is as much a way of thinking and talking about relationships as it is a concrete set of social ties and sentiments. So, too, is the argument that leadership is a way of thinking and using language to understand and know for the self and not for others. As one knows what is family for himself, one knows leadership in much the same way. To that end, Gubrium and Holstein introduce the concept of "process thinking" about meaning, language, and interpersonal relations; it is hermeneutic, and unafraid to acknowledge the ultimacy of hermeneutics. Their book is forthcoming in its presentation of our everyday lived experience and the commentary on the discourse and interpretation of family.

What then is family and in what context? Language, meaning, and process are crucial to the definitions of family and social reality as a whole (Gubrium & Holstein, 1990).

What follows is an example of interpretation of the socially constructed concept of family, analogous to the argument presented earlier about leadership. Of equal conceptual agreement is the interpretation of the thing known as a relationship. They are objects because as Durkheim said, "we experience them as things" (cited in Gubrium & Holstein, 1990, p. 6). Family is something different to everyone and many different things to everybody, a lot like what Bennis says about leadership. The gift created through a relationship is different with each encounter and cannot be taken away after it has happened. The encounter changes each person engaged in the encounter and through that each person is never again the same. People refer to family and leadership equally by constructing a reality of the concepts through language. In both cases, the concepts refer to community and relationships and are described as feelings, attitudes, places or a spirituality. Gubrium and Holstein (1990) establish a discourse on family and create a theory and method they call a social constructionist perspective on family. "It will be a description of description -- our description of people's descriptions" (p. 10). They analyze the focus of family discourse, and trace the process by which people actually assign familial terms. This, too, needs to

be done with the term leadership. They also talk about the way people practice family and construct family.

Gubrium and Holstein (1990) utilize metaphor as a way to encourage meaning. Leadership is a relationship; family is a relationship; family is community and has spiritual qualities, similar to the argument for leadership. Family is a socially constructed reality utilizing language to persuade, describe, and define; the language of leadership attempts this too. There is a public discourse and understanding about the concepts of leadership, so, too, family. Understanding how we assign our understandings, how we construct the language to describe the understanding and how we live out the understanding in everyday life are important questions to raise about the concepts of family and leadership. The methodology for understanding family could provide insight when applied to the study of leadership. Family and leadership are intertwined, socially constructed processes that can be understood by studying them individually and together.

Disintegration of Family, Spirituality, and Leadership

The breakup of the two-parent home is increasing and the divorce rate hovers at the 50% mark. Recent literature leads us to understand the high divorce rate as a myth about the

decline in family values, that rapid social change causes traditional family values to adjust accordingly. Unfortunately, "accordingly" only means to change rapidly. New research indicates that what Yankelovich, Strauss, and Howe were talking about can be traced to the lack of parenting and support by parents in child rearing. Two points are crucial to the argument about the analogous conceptualization of family and leadership. First, if marriage breakup leaves a child with one biological parent, usually the mother, the child is only able to receive partial "ducere," "educere," and "educator." Without one parent, the child is not fully supported in the relationship that created the child, the sacred expression of relationship, nor does the child benefit from the fundamental biological "educator," "ducere" or action of lead. The parent who is not there for the child cannot give the outstretched hand of guidance implied in the derivational meaning of the term "ducere," lead. Second, the breakup of the relationship is a breakup of community, which is a disintegration of family. The disintegration of family or community will inevitably lead to the disintegration of the underlying concepts of family and "ducere" causing disintegration of the commune or "spirituality," the relationship, and the leading or "community."

To support this position, Gubrium and Holstein (1990) call on David Popenoe who argues that the child-centered two-parent family shows growing signs of disintegration, reflected most clearly in the continued high rate of divorce and steady growth in the numbers of unwed parents. Because of this, the children suffer from the lack of contact with parents. Less time with parents is presented as the major cause of the decline of the well-being of children.

David Broder (1993) brings the significance of the disintegration of family more clearly in focus in the following:

In a week when the future of Russia is hanging in the balance and the fate of President Clinton's first budget is being debated, it may seem frivolous to write about anything else. But believe me, the topic of this column is not frivolous.

It is the American family, whose condition, according to three reports that appeared within days of each other, is alarming.

William J. Bennett, the always provocative former secretary of education and drug czar, now working at the Hudson Institute, introduced an "Index of Leading Cultural Indicators" at a Heritage Foundation press conference. The 19 indicators, he said, show that "over the last three decades, we have experienced substantial social regression," particularly in matters related to families and children.

Since 1960, he reported, "there has been a 560 percent increase in violent crime; more than a 400 percent increase in illegitimate births; a quadrupling of divorce rates; a tripling of the percentage of children living in single-parent homes; more than a 200 percent increase in the teenage suicide rate; and a drop of almost 80 points in the SAT (pre-college scholastic aptitude test) scores."

No sooner had that bleak message been absorbed than I picked up the latest issue of the Aspen Institute Quarterly, also devoted to children and families. David Gergen, the estimable editor-at-large of U.S. News & World Report, wrote the introductory essay for a volume based on papers prepared for an Aspen "domestic strategy group," co-chaired by conservative Bennett and liberal Sen. Bill Bradley, D-N.J.

The main points of agreement are that "our children are in worse shape than generally thought," and that they have been victimized by cultural trends (particularly the rise in divorce and illegitimacy), the abandonment of traditional values and the worsening economic conditions of many poor and middle-class parents.

Whatever their particular agenda, Gergen said, the participants agreed that "the best anti-poverty program for children is a stable, intact family." The person whose words Gergen is quoting is William A. Galston, a University of Maryland political analyst who has been brought onto the White House staff by President Clinton specifically to work on family policy.

In his essay, Galston acknowledges the relevance of both economic and cultural factors. He says that "the two most important forces affecting children for the worse in the past generation have been declining economic prospects for young, poorly educated male workers and the accelerated movement toward single-parent households."

Reflecting on what government can and cannot do, Galston says, "Returning to a higher-wage, higher-productivity growth track is not just an issue for the American economy, but for America's children and families as well. Reversing the trends of the past generation towards non-marriage and divorce poses even more complex challenges, But I am pessimistic that we can do more than scratch the surface of our social ills without real movement in that direction."

The policy debate is not new. Rival advocacy groups such as the liberal Children's Defense Fund and the conservative Family Research Council have been arguing for their favorite policies for years. But it is significant, I think, that conservatives now embrace some government economic policies, like the earned income tax credit or higher personal exemptions for dependents, while liberals now acknowledge the

centrality of values like family stability, personal responsibility and work.

That is why the third of the week's reports is so significant. In last year's campaign, what could have been an important debate on family policy took on a disastrous turn when a speech writer for Dan Quayle inserted into a serious and sensible speech on that subject a paragraph criticizing television character Murphy Brown for her single motherhood.

The press went crazy, and thereafter, any real discussion was buried in hoo-haws over Quayle and Murphy Brown.

Now, Atlantic magazine has taken almost half its April issue to bring the topic back into serious public debate, in an article by Barbara Dafoe Whitehead summarizing much of the current research on the topic. But the real value is its cover, which will be seen on newsstands by millions of non-subscribers. In billboard size type, it says:

"DAN QUAYLE WAS RIGHT. After decades of public dispute about so-called family diversity, the evidence from social-science research is coming in: The dissolution of the two-parent families, though it may benefit the adults involved, is harmful to many children, and dramatically undermines our society."

That's the point. (p. A11)

Whitehead (1993) cites many disturbing facts about the break up of family and the effects on children in her article Dan Quayle Was Right:

. . . children in single-parent families are six times as likely to be poor. . . . Twenty-two percent of children in one-parent families will experience poverty during childhood for seven years or more as compared with only two percent of children in two-parent families. . . . A 1988 survey by the National Center for Health Statistics found that children in single-parent families are two to three times as likely as children in two-parent families to have emotional and behavioral problems. . . . more likely to drop out of high school, to get pregnant as teenagers, to abuse drugs, and to be in trouble with the law. . . . Compared with children in

intact families, children from disrupted families are at a much higher risk for physical or sexual abuse. . . . Contrary to popular belief, many children do not 'bounce back' after divorce or remarriage. . . . Children who grow up in single-parent or stepparent families are less successful as adults, particularly in two domains of life - love and work - that are most essential to happiness. (pp. 65-68)

Where is the educere, educatio, educator? If children do not learn community, relationship or leadership in the first community of the family, how can we expect them as adults to recognize the components or language of leadership, i.e., "educator?" What qualities of community become important to leadership to understand about the commune, first community, i.e., family and other communities that will benefit the leader and enable better leadership? Disintegration is the opposite of integration, a powerful concept that is crucial to relationship and, therefore, leadership. Integration is the act of relating, relating the act of leadership. Disintegration of community whether family, self or with others is the opposing force to leadership.

The Other Communities

"The deepest wellspring of our desire to know is the passion to recreate the organic community in which the world was first created" (Palmer, 1983, p. 8). What is community? I have constructed and argued that epistemological leadership

is based on language which socially constructs the possibility of understanding reality. The logic supports a definition of community as that which is common among people. The definition could end with that statement but would be insufficient. Moreover, the commonality must be defined broader than geography. Both the tacit dimension of Polanyi, and the "I" "Thou" of Buber, are important concepts to the epistemology of community. Within those two concepts are the formations of the spirit of community. Two definitions of community, one by Parker Palmer another by Seymour Sarason will help elaborate these conceptualizations of spirituality and community. A concept that says, if leadership is to be understood as relational, then the ability to lead the community within the context of the environment must be understood as crucial to the ability to lead.

When we move toward community the direction is toward an inward closer sense to others. If a circle is a community, often the sense of the core is at the center of the circle. Nancy Schlossberg (1989) discusses how a person is marginalized toward the margin, i.e., boundary of community, and in this way alienated from community. She discusses how community creates a sense of mattering for people metaphorically moving them toward the core, i.e., a place where they matter, certainly within the boundaries of

community. Parker Palmer (1990) discusses how the spirit moves downward, not upward. "It is not a movement toward abstract generalizations but toward those common (emphasis added) ground experiences that make us human" (p. 148). To be human is to experience self in one of the other communities. Palmer discusses this concept earlier when he made reference to Annie Dillard and her description of going all the way down into the depths of the spirit.

Implicit in these words are several insights into the inward and personal spiritual journey - and its relation to outward and corporate community life. The first has to do with the route toward community toward what Dillard calls "our complex and inexplicable caring for one another." Where we often image community as an external social structure, Dillard sees it as an interior reality. (p. 149)

This concept of community is very different from what most would claim - that community is an external, social, and political reality. Through her description, it is a spiritual "I Thou" relationship to the act of communing and the commonality of community. In this way we must re-member ourself into community and its original essence; if we do not re-member to put ourself into community we dis-member ourself from it. In Schlossberg's (1989) words, we marginalize ourself from community rather than matter ourself into community or are marginalized or mattered by the community. The context of community described here is one of exclusive

parameter or set of boundaries of which not everyone is allowed to be a part. Community is defined by what its members hold in common with each other; those who do not share the commonality are excluded. The dual meaning of the word matter also suggests physically that we become a piece of matter in community or part of the wholeness of community,

At the bottom, the spiritual journey offers us the chance to remember where we came from and who we really are - beings bound to each other by common caring (Palmer, 1990, p. 150).

Any journey, whether spiritual, up, or down changes us as individuals. We see new sights, hear new sounds, and experience new things. The spiritual journey is no different in its ability to change people. Community, if spiritual, will change on its journey too. Sarason (1974) argues that: "A community has changed, is changing, and will change again" (p. 131).

The complexity of a community will in large part determine the fate of efforts to change that community in any respect. The fact that individuals or groups in a community desire to effect a change is saying something about that community. What happens to the effort will in large measure be determined by the degree to which it is based on a realistic conception of the complexity and distinctiveness of that community. (pp. 131-132)

The degree of change, the static or dynamic conditions of community are extremely important to our understanding and subsequent leadership in community. It is the ability to understand the psychology of community, as Sarason (1974) calls it, i.e., the changing nature of community that gives the community its mattering or marginalizing qualities. "You know when you have it (community) and when you don't. . . . The psychological sense of community is not a mystery to the person who experiences it. It is a mystery to those who do not experience it but hunger for it" (p. 157).

The movement within and out of the mattering and margins of community coupled with community's static and dynamic dimensions suggest the boundaries do exist to define community. Certainly the boundary of the community of the self exists both locking you out and me in. Jacqueline Sherer (1972) gives a sociological perspective on community and the concepts of marginality and mattering. "Communities are defined in terms of the solidarity shared by their numbers which forms the basis of their mutual orientation to social action" (p. 4). When community is defined by boundaries the members can see each other and look out for each other because they recognize who is inside and outside of the boundaries. Some people are included and excluded from community; in fact, community is inherently exclusive

rather than inclusive. Sherer (1972) supports the qualitative aspects of community and its epistemology like the analogy I argue for leadership: This makes social science more difficult, but it also means that boundaries will be based upon human desires, goals, and purposes - not walls. This is important for leaders to understand. It defines a microcosm for leaders to be prepared to function in and enables the leader to understand the context and the environment for the leadership to occur.

The understanding of contextual and environmental forces playing on leadership is the discussion of the static and dynamic qualities of community and the leader's ability to understand, stimulate, and know these qualities.

Leadership and the Struggle for Static Truth and Dynamic Truth

Static truth and values equate to stability while dynamic truth and values allow for and promote change. Humans cannot live without change, although they often attempt to accomplish complete sameness throughout life. This is to say that the routineness of day and night occurring over and over appears to be that of a static truth. It is mistaken as everydayness particularly when the day-to-day change of life is unrecognizable or hidden in the

drudgery of routine. It is when we do not reflect upon the everyday life that static truth will prevail because the nonreflection is the action of the static condition. Nonreflection or the lack of interpretation and learning contributes most to the maintenance of static truth. Until we see ourselves as learners of the interpretation of our own phenomenon, dynamic truth will be stagnated.

Examples that Little (1990) uses of two people who have been able to describe the condition of dynamic truth come first from Aaron Wildavsky's The Nursing Father: Moses as a Political Leader, the second from James McGregor Burns' Leadership and his explanation of the difference between transactional and transformational leadership.

Wildavsky explains Moses' ability to become a leader through interrogation of experience, past and present. This method made Moses become a participant in his own education. In this method, he moved with his people because he understood the shared and collective values of the different ways people lived. As the people changed or were shaped, so, too, Moses changed and reshaped. This taught the people that their future was in their hands. Moses simply helped articulate that the intentions of God would help transform the culture thereby changing the understanding and behavior. Underpinning Wildavsky's argument is the close relationship

between learning, especially through failure and leadership and is a key (cited in Little, 1990).

Moses' interrogation of his own experience as a leader and as a teacher leaves us with the challenge of learning for ourselves. In learning how to make sense of the past as part of an effort to create an intelligible present, past instances and present problems merge to become a common body of evidence. As a rabbinic legend tells it . . . Moses himself goes on learning about the teaching he first imparted. The tradition has become autonomous. Once it is out of his hands, once his teaching becomes Torah, Moses has to learn from it like everyone else. (p. 160)

Burns turns his attention from Moses to the models he advocates known as transformative leadership and transactional leadership. According to Little (1990), at the heart of James M. Burns' discussion is his concern for moral leadership and the relationship (emphasis added) between leaders and followers. This moral leadership "emerges from, and always returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers" (pp. 168-169).

Little (1990) explains this as a type of leadership that "is not a wielding of power or control but an authentic achievement of morally acceptable purpose" (p. 169). Burns explains it in the following passage:

The relations of most leaders and followers are *transactional* -- leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions

comprise the bulk of the relationship among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties. *Transforming* leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. (cited in Little, 1990, p. 169)

Transactional may be seen as static truth where the leader is in a "getting" relationship with the followers. The only dynamic quality is that which will create change for the leader. A type of change for the leader that enables the leader to have things remain the same, particularly the act of "getting." This is to say that in a constantly changing world the existence of no change is a dynamic quality.

Transformative leadership, on the other hand, seeks through the leader's relationship with the followers to find the dynamic qualities that do exist in order to implement those qualities for the benefit of the followers. Little (1990) describes transforming leadership as a teaching role, i.e., educator. Little explains Burns to mean "that the leader is so tuned to followers that separate interests are united in a collective pursuit of higher goals, which they come to understand as related to human purpose on the deepest possible level (p. 169). Little goes on to equate

transformative as end-values or liberty, justice, equality, and transactional as honesty, responsibility, and fairness. Arguably, transformative is a dynamic truth while transaction is a static truth and without congruency between the two, leadership will fail. By utilizing the static truth to encourage means and the dynamic truth to encourage ends, Burns' claims can engage persons with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality.

Sara Little (1990) uses David Loye's examples from his book The Leadership Passion which calls the congruency of static truth and dynamic truth a "middle-position" which focuses on conservation and on change (p. 169). "The functioning of leadership has always fluctuated between those who viewed their role as norm changing" (p. 170). This can be understood with examples of leaders who want to take risks whether liberal or conservative. If a society is aimless and valueless, and a leader strives to put purpose and value even morality into the society, then that is dynamic truth. If order is so imposed in society, and rule breaking is necessary, then that can be considered dynamic truth. Loye's middle-position helps us understand and respect the differences and need for static truth and dynamic truth. He cites the Declaration of Independence as a good example of a

middle-position: "What emerges (from an understanding of the middle-position) is a view of leadership as 'a functionally interrelated right and left,' a style used for thousands of years in childrearing as well as in all ages and cultures" (cited in Little, 1990, p. 170).

Community must change in order for its members to comprehend the relationship of Schlossberg's concepts of mattering, marginality, and the understanding of the need for static and dynamic conditions to occur. The more committed to the static truth of a community, the more mattering will occur in the community because the response is to the commonality of that community. The less committed to the static truth, the more the response moves toward the uncommonality of community. Community is challenged by the people who ask the questions about the status quo of community because they are on the edge of community or the "margin" where those closer to the core commonalities are farther from the boundary. Take, for example, a church. Typically the minister, deacon, deaconesses are the adherents or disciples, and they strongly believe in the tenets of the church and work toward their doctrine. The believers become part of the static structure of the community. Those who exhibit the dynamic behavior like teenagers are the ones the believers are attempting to make static. By this action the

teenagers are defined as dynamic. The static members do not question, they simply adhere. The dynamic members question, disagree, and cause apparent turmoil and change in the community because they do not adhere as readily or frequently.

What is an acceptable amount of dynamic behavior or where is Loye's middle-position? How much change can be tolerated and how threatening does it become? What change destroys the concept of community? If a community is established and built to encourage and protect dynamic growth, then a community will be created that can be changed by design. However, if a community is only made up of those on the boundary or margins, the community's existence and tolerants will be constantly in question. Too much dynamic condition could dissolve the boundary. The static qualities in a dynamic community will create conditions allowing for its ability to change constantly, which, in turn, will limit people's ability to matter for any length of time. Membership in a totally dynamic community would be difficult because the boundaries will be blurred. On the other hand, questions in a totally static community would not be allowed; complete commitment is the only value. Static values must be discussed with the apprehension of truth because the truth has been apprehended or held captive, enslaved. Static

communities do not desire questions because the people in static communities have the answers or "the truth." In their minds, this makes ultimate truth uninterrogatable. Dynamic truth works with questions to form answers and creates the ability to come to know or to mix static and dynamic truth. Where is the balance between static truth and dynamic truth? When does a leader need to lead toward the static or dynamic truth? Can the boundary of community be like Gore-tex® fabric which allows air to flow in and out but does not allow water to flow through? The membrane of dynamic and static thought must be flexible and permeable, otherwise the focus will be either entirely on the means, without regard for the ends, or vice-versa. Questions must be allowed if only to check the static truth and its reliability.

Leadership as Static and Dynamic

Three concepts are important for leaders to study when defining leadership as a relationship: (1) autobiography, (2) the concept of family, and (3) other communities, each of which have static and dynamic qualities. The commune of the self or the autobiography, the first community or family, and the other communities are always changing. Leaders must come to understand and know what these static and dynamic conditions mean in order to understand the context and

environment of leadership both psychologically, sociologically, and epistemologically in order to support, guide, and teach as suggested by the derivation of the word, "Ducere."

What in the current state of leadership education makes it seem static? The leadership-followership relationship of motivation, utility and position dictate order and management while being sterile of purpose. Are they intended to carry out the ends of the leader through a neoclassical manipulation of others? Belth (1977) pointed out earlier that in Montaigne's opinion discipleship, i.e., followership relinquishes personal freedom to the leader. From this opinion, the conclusion could be drawn that our current understanding of leadership is about making people dependent on the leader. When the leader accomplishes follower dependency his position becomes secure. Suppose leadership is about making people freer, enabling them to accomplish for themselves what the leader accomplished for them previously like a guiding to where the leader has gone. Does this secure the leader's position? Static leadership, in a perverse way, manages to keep people dependent on the leader in order to maintain the leadership position. Creating follower independence is a threat to positional leadership and the traditional style of leadership, which I contend is not leadership at all.

CHAPTER IV
LEADERSHIP METAPHORS IN SPIRITUALITY

This chapter will summarize the definitions, concepts, theories, and philosophies presented in the preceding chapters in a set of assertions. The preceding chapters have presented questions in which to engage a struggle to provide reflective analysis of the definition and meaning of the terminology, metaphors, and phenomena utilized in analyzing and understanding the concepts of leaders and leadership. The outcome of the discussion is to posit and encourage philosophers to study leadership, and leadership scholars to study philosophy. The intent of this paper was not to "solve" the question, "What is leadership?" Such outcomes are not essential. There has been an attempt to integrate distinguishable thoughts about the concept of leadership, metaphorical language, phenomenology, and the methodology to the study and rethinking the concepts of leadership.

Both considerations and assertions important to the integration of the information will be presented. It is presented with an embodied eye which acknowledges a phenomenological bias which speaks personal truth, pointing out the cultural underpinnings of who the "I" of this research is. An important element will be to criticize both the specificity and ambiguity of the text. The contention

here is that considerations and assertions are to provide ways for the reader to draw conclusions as to whether they are generally in agreement or adversely in opposition. A further contention is that these statements are a cultural marker of the values of the human condition. At the premise of these assertions is the belief that, fundamentally, leadership is about social and cultural happenings.

The uses of language provide a frame in which the assignment of truth or reality to the subject may begin. Two people using the same language will each render a quite different meaning, depending on the framework. More important, however, is the notion that language focuses the lens and is critical to the overall concept of reality. In this sense, leadership is language and community. Recognition, definition, understanding, and knowing of leadership occur through the use of language. This is a rethinking, an attempt to re-language (emphasis added) the study of leadership.

This text acknowledges a cultural contextualization and an understanding that the reader brings a cultural bias to the text. The juxtaposition of the text to those contexts is important to both the assertions and the conclusions. This is an ethnocentric study which perhaps tells us more about self and culture than it reveals about leadership. An important feature of this study has been the nonhegemonic and

non-quantifiable methodological approach of this dissertation.

Joseph Rost, author of Leadership for the 21st Century, made a comment at the University of Richmond, Jepson School of Leadership Studies' 1993 Leadership Education Conference that his research about the congruency of leadership literature concluded that the post-industrial definition of leadership could be summed up in two words, "good management" (1993). This dissertation has vigorously attempted to avoid discussing leadership as management in language, premise, and technical rationality. Management, it has been argued, is something quite different from leadership, which is a subject for yet another dissertation. This research has compared the language of management and leadership in order to see what language is similar and dissimilar and to rethink the appropriateness of the language. This could be useful for the re-linguaging of the study, practice, and understanding of leadership. If my assertions about the language of leadership reflect the language of management, it is because the concepts have similar properties, but it does not recognize the concepts of management and leadership as identical. It supports the claim that the concepts of management and leadership are distinctly different, but, because of the inability to give adequate language to the concept of leadership, the language of management is

substituted for the language of leadership and the concepts of management and leadership are named similarly.

This work has also been nonhegemonic by design by refraining from studying the history of people and events. This is to avoid classifying events as the causes of a "great man theory." The biographies of great men and the history of man-made events are not germane to the research of language and derivation meaning whereby phenomenology and hermeneutics may render evidence for researchers to draw conclusions different from those consequential to supposed leaders. This is not to discredit people who have made the "right" decision or who have been at the "right" place at the "right" time. No one can ever know for certain if it was the person or the circumstance that manipulated one or the other.

Leadership: The Reality of Language and of Knowing

The use of language ultimately determines the meaning given to any concept or reality, not the least of which are the arguably confusing and dissenting definitions of leadership. Language is a vehicle for thought and communication which lead to understanding and knowing. It provides the mechanism for our own thought processes. Because an individual's concepts of reality are based on language, the more language the individual has, the more reality the individual will experience. The ability to explain this reality is how the person comes to the

understanding and knowing of phenomena. In addition to the self-understanding and knowing of phenomena, language explains one's reality to another person at which point both comparison of meaning and judgement of validity of the language occur.

Heidegger suggested that if we can ask the question, then we already know the answer. Because Heidegger implies that language precedes thought, it must also precede consciousness, understanding, and knowing. Heidegger has said, in fact, that we do not speak the language, but the language speaks us. Hence, experience is limited to our ability to find a language. The more language which is available to think about any concept, the more of that concept can be experienced.

This acknowledges that the concept of leadership is a process of the subject being. Eugene Webb's (1988) perspective includes, "experience may be noticed and attended to, but only where it is interpreted and the interpretation is verified does it constitute the substratum of knowledge in the proper or critical sense" (p. 55). Leadership is not an object, rather it is the subjective process of language and multiple interpretation of the self.

Scholars of leadership need to be careful to avoid nostalgia, imagination, events, circumstances, visual cues, and sensations to define leadership without looking for the real. Bernard Lonergan claims that "what is known in a

strict sense is known through an act of critical intelligence rather than through sensation and imagination" (cited in Webb, 1988, p. 58). What is real is consciousness or the internal experience of self through the rudimentary use of language. Leadership is the critical intelligence gained by the sense of reality provided through language.

Admittedly, the language of leadership is broad; Bennis' (1990) reference to 650 definitions is evidence of that. Regardless of how broad the language is, if the communication of the language is limited, then the understanding will also be limited. Communication and dialogue about the language used to form the definition of leadership need to be broad and based on multiple perspectives. Leaders and followers need to be engaged in broad dialogue about leadership and the act of leading. Analysis of the language will enable consensus about meaning of the language. Without this, communication will not occur or will fail. The broad nature of language and communication that will permit different understandings, information, and conclusions.

Leadership: The Act of Guiding and Directing

To lead, "ducere," means to guide. Guidance is something that one gives or takes. Leadership is an act of giving, and giving something is to sacrifice it from the self. Following is the act of taking guidance or getting something. The acts of leading and following are acts of

giving guidance and getting guidance. It is a sacred trust in that the guide gives away guidance or sacrifices for the follower. The inherent and ultimate ontology established when a relationship is formed is that each participant brings him or herself to the formation of the relationship.

What occurs during the physical action involved in the relationship is never undone because it becomes committed to time, history. When we give some part of the self, whether it is a physical or a spiritual presence, a common sharing or communion has occurred between two people that cannot be removed from each others' past. If leadership is a relationship, and a relationship is sacrifice, then I assert that leadership is a sacrifice.

Following is not only a getting, but also the act of giving, and thus is sacred. By being supportive or giving to the leader, the follower will also be engaging the sacredness of his action. People need to have the opportunity to give and serve. Leaders and followers need to recognize their ability to give and to serve each other, to make sacrifices to each other. When the focus of the relationship is based on a language of giving rather than on getting from the perspective of either the leader or the follower, the language and the reality of the relationship change dramatically.

The derivation of the term "ducere" was defined as the act of guiding. Guidance is the ability to help another

navigate a course or journey, getting from one place to another either physically, intellectually, emotionally, or spiritually. The training wheels of a bicycle in one way help guide the cyclist on his or her course. Enabling the followers, participants, or recipients of the guidance to get to another location is also intended through guidance. The leader simply acts as one who is able to get others to a location that the leader knows exists. Once the recipients of the guidance, the followers, learn the course of the guide they too should be empowered to lead. Therefore, I assert that leadership is about getting others to where the leader is.

Guidance focuses the concept of leadership on engaging a process with people. Leaders as guides are capable of getting people directed to where leaders and followers want to go. The leader has an opportunity to share direction or vision enabling the follower to go beyond their own limited vision. Martin Luther King, Jr. was able to guide or lead people toward their civil rights because he was capable of a vision that could see where to guide people. This understanding of where people can go is accomplished by a relationship of mutual understanding between follower and leader. Martin Luther King, Jr. shared his vision with the people, and when the people had the vision, they were guided toward the vision. This means everyone is capable of leadership by putting the relationship of shared

understanding and shared vision in action at all levels of social life. The everyday community life of people communing and understanding each others' potential for actualization is the foundation of guidance.

Vision grows in magnitude and clarity when shared. By enabling another to see the vision it grows two-fold. The recipient of shared vision sees with a different lens than before that focuses the new, shared vision toward a different perspective. The perspective adds clarity. Dreamers see with their eyes closed while daydreamers dream with their eyes open. Leaders dream with their eyes open and closed. When the leader shares the vision, it is magnificent and clear, which makes it easy for the follower to see.

Leadership as the act of guidance may be conscious or unconscious; so, too, the act of following. The position of the guide contrasted to the position of the follower may expose the consciousness and unconsciousness of the act. Coercion, power, motivation, emergence, and position may all be qualities that the leader must possess in order to engage the followers into following. The most influential motivation for following will be a leader who can guide people to where together they want to go and are capable of going.

Education can be seen as an act of giving direction and guidance. Educating young people from childhood and supporting them into adulthood is strongly implied in the derivation of

"educator." Language, communication, direction, and guidance are central components to a good education, an education that everyone is entitled to, a vision all can share.

Leadership: An Autobiographical Phenomena

The role of autobiography or self-discovery is education for leadership and is crucial to leader effectiveness. When a person is able to guide the self several prerequisites occur. The person must know where he wants to go, which is the act of knowing how to lead and to follow. A person must learn how to get there, the act of giving and taking direction. A person comes to know that although she has been on a journey through life, her history, it is the present where autobiography and the journeying take place. When one is aware of the presence of self, he is in the phenomenological moment. No one can experience the processing of self other than the self. It is the search for inward discovery and understanding that will direct one toward the realized self. No material wealth will define the self; only what is inside the self will define who each of us is now and who we will become later. The inner being will ultimately define and make decisions about what the outside reality is because the inside is where the decision is made about this reality. Possessing the knowledge of who we are inside is the only possession that will determine the self.

It is not until self-discovery is accomplished that the beginning of the communion with others may commence.

Two lessons about autobiography can be learned from the fourth step of Bill Wilson's Alcoholic Anonymous examples. Step four states: "Made a searching and fearless moral inventory of ourself" (Alcoholics Anonymous, 1976, p. 59). The first lesson is that we all have a special need to inventory who we are as human beings in order to find out what our shortcomings, obsessions, and fears are. What are our assets and liabilities? Do we blame ourself or others for the liabilities? If we are insecure, how do we find security? When alcoholics, as Bill Wilson has shown, are willing to take stock of their lives, they do that with trepidation and confidence. Alcoholics who utilize Alcoholics Anonymous know something is wrong within themselves and desire to change what is wrong. These people are afraid to acknowledge infirmities but are even more afraid not to confront them. Phenomenological autobiography teaches the same message.

C. Gibb (1969) makes a very similar point when he suggests that it is not per se the personalities of leaders and/or followers, or even the characteristics of situations, that enter into the leadership relation, "but rather the perception of the leader by himself and by others, the leader's perception of those others, and the shared perception by leader and others of the group and the

situation" (p. 268). This is to say that followers want the leader to know and say and do what the followers believe they would have the leader do for them. The leader, therefore, cannot have something that the followers attribute to him thus the leader's self-discovery and autobiography needs to be consistent with followers' wants.

The second message for leaders in Step Four of Alcoholics Anonymous Twelve-Step Program is more subtle. When taking inventory of the self, the person must remain humble. Likewise, the leader who places leadership above all else becomes addicted to leadership. Taking too much pride in one's own leadership accomplishments is dangerous.

For pride, leading to self-justification, and always spurred by conscious or unconscious fears, is the basic breeder of most human difficulties, the chief block to true progress. Pride lures us into making demands upon ourselves or upon others which cannot be met without perverting or misusing our God-given instincts.
(Alcoholics Anonymous, 1953, pp. 48-49)

Leadership: An Experience in Community

The concept of community is relevant to the concept of leadership in that it expands the conceptual frame from one of a communal relationship with the self to an other-based communal relationship. Commune, communicate, community, and communion share the same root from the Latin "communis." Language, relationship, community, and leadership all require a common understanding and sharedness. The concept of community has many and varied implications for understanding

leadership in that it is defined by language, relationship, and the common understanding or communication of the act of leadership in commune with another. In this instance, the leader defines the self, and the leader is defined by those who are led. Appropriate patterns of leadership are defined qualitatively by leader and follower as in a process rather than position or hierarchy. Shared and common values or disparate values may define community. Inclusiveness into the shared or disparate nature of the community will contribute considerably to an individual's participation. Perhaps all members of a community must be the leaders of the community.

The community with others is well defined by the participants of the National Leadership Symposium 1992. Their definition states: "Community is the binding together of diverse individuals committed to a just, common good, through shared experience of caring and social responsibility"

(p. 9).

Leaders act to create this type of community every day. D. McGregor (1966) proposes the supposition this way: Leadership consists of a relationship between the leader, his followers, the organization, and the social milieu. McGregor would have us believe that because the enterprise of leadership is conducted among people it is the commonness of the relationship that creates the commonality of the action

of leading and following. George Steiner (1975) refers to this as alternties - the world can be other (than it is).

Every instance of leadership is an instance of being in the world which brings leader and follower into a very special relationship in a unique enterprise . . . Every leader-follower relationship hinges upon a mutually imagined (community based) alterntity. (cited in Thayer, 1985, p. 241)

The leader and follower create each other through community.

Leadership: A Spiritual Journey

To accent the concept of communion with self and others, I utilize the term, spirituality. By verifying spirituality it will become apparent that the conceptual frame of spirituality is fundamental, crucial, and determinant to the conceptual frame of leadership.

It is my belief, my position that spirituality is both metaphysical and physical. The metaphysical definition of spirituality is God. God is a power or force that explains the universe and life. God is truth and all knowledge. God is the place where the physical or nonmetaphysical spirit resides after physical life is exhausted. God is in every human being and is represented by a physical spirituality that is often referred to as a soul. Some have referred to the metaphysical spirituality not only as God but also as Soul, using an upper case "S" as a way to distinguish it from a soul or physical, nonmetaphysical spirituality.

The physical spirituality is the conscious inability to understand God. A continual journey in search for the answer to the question, Why do I believe in metaphysical spirituality? This everyday physical spirituality is a "ducere vitam," or leading of one's life. What gives direction, guidance, or leadership to this life is a consciousness or conscious spirituality. Bill Wilson, founder of Alcoholics Anonymous, could have been referring to a type of spirituality known as G.O.D., or good orderly direction in life. Certainly, Alcoholics Anonymous (1953) was "obey spiritual principles, at first because we must, then because we ought to, and ultimately because we love the kind of life such obedience brings" (p. 174). Cornell West (1993) referred to "positive life-affirming values" in The Chronicle of Higher Education (Coughlin, 1993, pp. 8-10) which aptly states my notion of spirituality for self and others.

I recognized a need to be more definitive about the issue and concept of spirituality. It is central to the thesis that leadership is the act of creating spiritual relationships in self and others. Answers to these questions are implicitly asked of spirituality and leadership. Not in the religious sense of spirituality, but in the sense that spirituality is a quest for the answers of direction, guidance, and vision. This view of spirituality states that spirituality is nonmaterial, inclusive, open, and never

forbidding. Spirituality is humane, compassionate, loving of self and others, and based on humility. The spirit is a relationship or connectedness of the physical self to the collective spirit of community and the communion of body, mind, consciousness, and metaspirtuality. This connectedness enables us to set and live "positive life-affirming values" (West, 1993), and norms while maintaining obedience to those values and norms. Spirituality enables us to become morally and emotionally literate about our experiences. This information or literacy allows us to know ourself, creates self-esteem, builds love of self and others. The building blocks and the spiritual literacy provide a direction or "ducere vitam."

It is the everydayness or breath of life that we require and depend upon for life. The breath is inside us; it represents the ebb and flow, in and out of the inner self as it manifests itself within (reflective) in order to manifest itself without (reflexive). The love of spirit is the communion and companionship of the self with the self and the self with others. The silence of others together in spirit is the process of communal spirituality. This contemplative attention is the recognition that others are just as cognizant of these issues which affirms the togetherness of community in spirituality.

Leadership, in this sense, is the spiritually humane act that holds the organization of followers to the same

standards of guidance and direction of the spiritual self. Spiritual leadership is the ability of the leader to set out and help others achieve what is appropriate for them, to facilitate where they want to go and become, and to help others self-discover and distinguish who they are and what they are thinking, rather than managing the thinking for them.

Leadership is Sharing Vision

The words "leadership" and "vision" are metaphors. The concepts put forth in this dissertation are metaphorical. They nudge at understanding leadership as metaphor. They scream to make the metaphor of leadership "shared vision."

The metaphorical concepts are hierarchical. Spiritual metaphors name a looking inward, down toward the self. These metaphors also point the lens outward toward others and upward toward the metaphysical. The language is of a journey of discovery, seeing things not previously seen, or seeing things again in a new light or with improved vision. The writing is a search for answers, a focusing of the lens.

Focusing a common lens is like removing shades or blinders, making the picture less adumbrated. The lens enables the seers to see farther, sharpening images, locating guide posts, reference points, and directions.

A leader is a person who has an unusual opportunity to give directions based on a vision. People yearn for a vision

showing them the direction toward material wealth, for instance. The direction or amount and type of vision the leader gives and who he gives vision to are at his discretion. The direction can be helpful or harmful. To a person with material wealth the vision is a less fundamental material "thing" than the economics of material things. To a person with no material wealth the vision is the thing to behold. Ideas, beliefs, and values are material possessions to people with nothing else. Sharing a vision among people is what insightful spiritual leaders induce and educe from others.

Parker Palmer (1990) says "we share responsibility for creating the external world by projecting either a spirit of light or a spirit of shadow on that which is other" (p. 5). Leaders have a choice about which metaphor for vision they are going to share. This is to say that the leader must understand and know the values and metaphors of his own inner world. American culture rewards people fixated on the external world. This contradiction between principles makes vision difficult to focus.

When individuals define themselves by the nature of the things they have, then groups of individuals or organizations define themselves as a thing rather than as people. In this way, subjectively, people objectify themselves. The organization becomes the object or thing which people obtain by creating hierarchy because it allows for upward movement

toward more of the organization or material thing, which individuals perceive as good. Leaders make decisions that affect themselves by obtaining the organization rather than affecting everyone's good in the organization.

Key figures in history have understood that autobiography and hermeneutics focus a lens of reality on the inner world in order to see better the outer world. They have been able to understand and give meaning through phenomenological insight that individual experience is actually self-realization of the collective view and social interaction with nature and the human condition. These leader/follower figures acted in the spirit of common good for other people and themselves, making decisions that affected peoples lives in a metaphorically hierarchical "uplifting" and "better" way. By acting in the spirit of shared vision they have provided an example and vision that reflected a direction up toward the language of the common goodness.

Democracy is an example of the vision or metaphor of a principle of morality that is intended to move all people in an upward direction. Based on customs of people, people develop socially moral principles. The core of democracy holds that "all are 'created equal'," which gives expression to a moral ideal. This is a visionary metaphor of the direction people should be going together toward equal worth and participation. It is, indeed, a miraculous idea, and

ideal at the same moment. Because democratic values require constant human affirmation, democrats, unfortunately, violate the principles they set out to affirm.

Why are leaders not blamed for all unnecessary human suffering? Because in our society the middle and upper class worry about those who are not suffering more than those who are suffering. The society has confused and blurred personal achieving with basic human worth. Democracy becomes "everyone is created able to achieve and if one does not achieve, he is unworthy." The leaders who have gone against the grain of that philosophy have attempted to reward and dignify all people based on their worth, not by achievements. When these "everyman" leaders point to the examples of human indignity in societies they give meaningful spirit, vision, and direction to those who are suffering and that makes everyone else uncomfortable, vulnerable, and guilty.

Mahatma Gandhi (1980) said, "If we are nonviolent then we must then [*sic*] not wish for anything on this earth which the meanest or the lowest (metaphorical, hierarchical emphasis added) of human beings cannot have" (p. 83). Gandhi's use of metaphor was powerful yet simple: "True morality consists, not in the beaten track but in finding out the true path for ourselves and in fearlessly following it," (Gandhi, 1980, p. 158).

Direction, vision, and leadership were never more clearly stated. Gandhi also understood and taught the

inherent meaning in "educere," when he said: "Real education consists in drawing the best out of yourself. What better book can there be than the book of humanity" (1980, p. 138).

According to McDermott (1973), John Dewey reiterated the necessity of a vision metaphor, when he called "for articulation of our shared experience" (p. 620). Dewey's critique and description of democracy as shared responsibility for the common good is grounded in the metaphor of shared vision. According to Edman (1955), for Dewey the concepts of democracy

reside not simply in technical expertness and in immense natural wealth, but in the resource of intelligence cooperatively marshaled for the common shared good. . . . That shared good is life in the individual come to its fullness and vividness and in maturity. (p. 33)

Edman (1955) claimed that Dewey chose to express his belief that all people are "agents in common decisions" (p. 33).

Edman emphatically goes on to state that:

Democracy was a moral and indeed religious ideal, that of a shared life, a community and a communion. And it was a [sic] aesthetic ideal, the communication of experience through contagion. (p. 33).

His vision was that moral ideals should be contagious among people, and the shared life was a shared common good.

Jesus had an uncanny knack for providing direction, guidance, and a vision that he commanded be shared. I understand one of His many interpretations of directing

mankind toward the spirit of God this way. In the Christian sense, when man or woman strays from God spiritually, as well as through physical departure from reverence toward God, the person may come to think that this departure was actually by God from man. Yet, Jesus teaches that this is actually suspect. The spirit of God never departs from us. When one comes to blame God for retreating in a time of need, then the person is reminded that he needs to seek God, go toward God, look (find vision) for God. When the person is redirected to look for God, the vision to find God is restored. This vision that Jesus had was shared for many reasons, not the least of which is that Christians should always be directing, guiding themselves toward the vision of God. This vision of God is redemptive; it gives back what is lost.

Martin Luther King, Jr. used metaphor powerfully to share vision and give direction. His "I Have a Dream" speech is a fine example of the metaphor for a shared vision. Over time, metaphors about vision in dreams have been shared by many people. It is mystical that we can see with our eyes closed, providing further evidence that everyone sees with the aid of language. King's use of metaphor was exceptional because his shared vision was phenomenological; it touched our everyday lived experience:

I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed - we hold

these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. (cited in Washington, 1986, p. 219)

Not only did King have a dream, but he had a dream that everyone affirms through democracy, the American Dream. The dream was a metaphor within a metaphor. The dream was to rise up, live out, and it called for hope and truth.

From a transformational perspective, King's speech, "Where Do We Go From Here," was an indication of the sharedness of vision. Transformational, because King asked all followers to share their vision with him. King did not have to listen long to conclude that the common good he had learned from and with Mahatma Gandhi was the vision to share:

Let us be dissatisfied until America will no longer have high blood pressure of creeds and anemia of deeds. Let us be dissatisfied until the tragic walls that separate the outer city of wealth and comfort and the inner city of poverty and despair shall be crushed by the battering rams of the forces of justice. Let us be dissatisfied until those that live on the outskirts of hope are brought into the metropolis of daily security. Let us be dissatisfied until slums are cast into the junk heaps of history, and every family is living in a decent sanitary home. Let us be dissatisfied until the dark yesterdays of segregated schools will be transformed into bright tomorrows of quality, integrated education. . . . Let us be dissatisfied until that day when nobody will shout 'White Power!' - when nobody will shout 'Black Power!' - but everyone will talk about God's power and human power. (King, cited in Washington, 1986, p. 251)

King's metaphor for vision was captured in 1968 in his sermon at the National Cathedral (Episcopal) in Washington, D.C. Entitled "Remaining Awake Through a Great Revolution,"

it exemplifies King's use of vision as sight and not dreams as before. In this speech, King defines what a leader is:

One day a newsman came to me and said, "Dr. King, don't you think you're going to have to stop, now, opposing the war and move more in line with the administration's policy? As I understand it, it has hurt the budget of your organization and people who once respected you, have lost respect for you. Don't you feel that you've really got to change your position?" I looked at him and I had to say, "Sir, I'm sorry you don't know me. I'm not a consensus leader. I do not determine what is right and wrong by looking at the budget of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. I've not taken a sort of Gallup poll of the majority opinion. Ultimately a genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus, but a molder of consensus." (cited in Washington, 1986, p. 276)

King's sharing of vision came to its most apocalyptic moment in the speech, "I See the Promised Land." He continued his visionary direction for nonviolence by teaching people how to redirect themselves toward the vision of freedom for themselves. He directed blacks to remove their money from white-owned banks, to shop only at black-owned businesses, and to buy insurance from the six or seven black insurance companies in Memphis - he called it an "insurance-in." (cited in Washington, 1986). King closed this speech with the language of shared vision:

Well, I don't know what will happen now. We've got some difficult days ahead. But it doesn't matter with me now. Because I've been to the mountaintop. And I don't mind. Like anybody, I would like to live a long life. Longevity has its place. But I'm not concerned about that now. I just want to do God's will. And He's allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I've looked over. And I've seen the promised land. I may not get

there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people will get to the promised land. And I'm happy, tonight. I'm not worried about anything. I'm not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. (cited in Washington, 1986, p. 286)

King's words remind us that we fear what we do not know and cannot see. When vision is possible, it becomes the comforting of the senses. To comfort people, he shared that comforting vision.

Who among us can see or have the vision or language of the conscience of humankind that can be shared with everyone? Who can communicate this vision to unite community as a conscience? The vision of the conscience is shared when the pain and anguish of people suffering unnecessary indignation is exposed to the sighted. Leaders talk of vision, and people talk of injustice. Who takes whom with them? Who guides? Who moves people forward into view and who can guide the leaders into place to see those in view? Who teaches the leaders to see the conscience of the people?

Change language and change reality.

Change minds and change vision.

Change perception and change thinking.

Change the view and change the action.

Change the phenomena and change values.

Change the values and change the spirit.

Change the spirit and everyone breathes anew.

Here is the heartbeat of spiritual leadership!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilles, C. M. (1989). Ways of knowing are as old and diverse as human thought. In S. A. Sharp (Ed.), Proceedings of a noon to noon conference (pp. 27-47). Boone, NC: Appalachian State University.
- Achilles, C. M. (1992). The leadership enigma is more than semantics. Journal of School Leadership, 2, 59-65.
- Alcoholics Anonymous World Service, Inc. (1953). Twelve steps and twelve traditions. New York: Author.
- Alcoholics Anonymous World Service, Inc. (1976). Alcoholics anonymous. New York: Author.
- Allen, K. E. (1990). Diverse voices of leadership: Different rhythms and emerging harmonies (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51-06A, 1838.
- American Heritage Dictionary (2nd ed.). (1992). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Auden, W. H. (1967). A short defense of poetry. Address given at a round-table conference on Tradition and Innovation in Contemporary Literature, The International PEN Conference, October, Budapest.
- Baldwin, J. W. (1902). Social psychology (3rd ed.). London: Macmillan.

- Bellah, R. N. et al. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and communication in American life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Belth, M. (1977). The process of thinking. New York: David McKay.
- Bennis, W. (1990). Keynote Address, American College Personnel Association, Atlanta.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategy for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W. G., & Slater, P. E. (1968). The temporary society. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bernstein, R. (1983). Beyond objectivism and reletivism. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Bredeson, P. R. (1987). Languages of leadership: Metaphor making in educational administration. In M. E. Driscoll (Ed.), Administrator's notebook, 32(6), 1-5.
- Broder, D. (1993, March). Healthy U.S. families are the underpinning of a healthy society. The Greensboro News & Record, p. A11.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. B. (1990). Measures of leadership. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

- Coughlin, E. K. (1993, October). Cornel West matters: The celebrity philosopher. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 8-10.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive biography. London: Sage.
- Etzioni, A. (1988). The moral dimension: Toward a new economics. New York: Free Press.
- Farber, M. (1966). The aims of phenomenology. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Fox, M. (1979). A spirituality named compassion and the healing of the global village. Minneapolis: Winston Press.
- Friedrich, O. (1981, September). The Kingdom of Auschwitz. The Atlantic, pp. 30-60.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.
- Gibb, C. (1969). Leadership. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Goethe, W. (1963). Goethe's world view, presented in his reflections and maxims. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1990). What is family? Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Hanson, M. (1984). Exploration of mixed metaphors in educational administration research. Issues in Education, 2(3), 167-184.

- Hesse, M. (1980). Revolutions and reconstructions in the philosophy of science. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hollinger, R. (1985). Introduction: Hermeneutics and pragmatism. In R. Hollinger (Ed.), Hermeneutics and praxis. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1992, June). The new generation gap. The Atlantic Monthly, pp. 67-89.
- Husserl, E. (1965). Phenomenology and the crisis of philosophy (Q. Lauer, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Ignatieff, M. (1984). The needs of strangers. New York: Viking Penguin.
- James, W. C. (1902). The varieties of religious experience. New York: Langmans, Green.
- Jung, C., et al. (1964). Approaching the unconscious. In C. Jung et al. (Eds.), Man and his symbols. Edited posthumously by M. L. von Franz. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Komives, S. R. (1991). Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving styles. Journal of College Student Personnel, 32, 155-165.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1989). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

- Kripalani, K. (Ed.). (1980). All men are brothers: Autobiographical reflections. New York: Continuum.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Lauer, Q. (1958). Phenomenology: Its genesis and prospect. New York: Fordham University.
- Little, S. (1990). Experiments with truth education and leadership. In P. Palmer (Ed.), Caring for the commonwealth. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- McGregor, D. (1966). In Bennis & E. H. Schein (Eds.), Leadership and motivation. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Mengert, R. F. (1992). Class presentation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. Adventures of the dialect (J. Bien Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Morris, W. (Ed.). (1982). The American heritage dictionary. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- National Leadership Symposium. (1992). Personal, social, and ethical dimensions of leadership. [Summary]. Symposium proceedings. College Park, MD: W. K. Kellogg.
- Norris, C. J., & Achilles, C. M. (1988). Intuitive leadership: A new dimension for education leadership. Planning and Changing, 19(2), 108-117.

- Palmer, P. (1983). To know as we are known: A spirituality of education. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Palmer, P. J. (1990, March). Leading from within: Reflections on spirituality and leadership. Address to the Annual Celebration Dinner of the Indiana Office for Campus Ministries, Indianapolis, IN.
- Palmer, P. J., Wheeler, B. G., & Fowler, J. W. (Eds.). (1990). Caring for the commonwealth: Education for religious and public life. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.
- Popenoe, D. (1988). Disturbing the nest: Family change and decline in modern societies. New York: A. de Gruyter
- Porter, R. J., & Wolf, H. R. (1973). The voice within: Reading and writing autobiography. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Purpel, D. E. (1992). Class presentation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Purpel, D. E., & Ryan, K. (Eds.). (1976). Moral education . . . it comes with the territory. Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Rhodes, L. A. (1990). Beyond your beliefs: Quantum leaps toward quality schools. The School Administrator, 23-26.
- Ricoeur, P. (1966). Freedom and nature: The voluntary and the involuntary (E. V. Kohak Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

- Rorty, R. (1979). Philosophy and the mirror of nature.
Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rost, J. L. (1991). Leadership for the 21st century. New
York: Praeger.
- Sarason, S. B. (1974). The psychological sense of community:
Prospects for a community psychology. San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.
- Scherer, J. (1972). Contemporary community: Sociological
illusion or reality? London: Tavistock.
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key
issues in building community. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.),
Designing campus activities to foster a sense of
community, new directions for student services (p. 48).
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schon, D. A. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on
problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.),
Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How
professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Shapiro, S. (1991). Class presentation. University of North
Carolina at Greensboro.
- Simpson, J. A., & Weiner, E. S. C. (Eds.). (1989). The Oxford
English dictionary (2nd ed.). New York: Clarendon.

- Smith, J. K., & Blase, J. (1991). From empiricism to hermeneutics: Educational leadership as a practical and moral activity. Journal of Educational Administration, 29(1),
- Spiegelberg, H. (1975). Doing phenomenology. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Steiner, G. (1975). After Babel. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Steiner, G. (1989). Martin Heidegger. The University of Chicago Press.
- Stewart, D., Mickunas, A. (1974). Exploring phenomenology. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Thevanaz, P. (1962). What is phenomenology? Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Tom, A. R. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.
- Vandenberg, D. (1982). Hermeneutic phenomenology in the study of educational administration. The Journal of Educational Administration, 20(1), 23-32.
- Van Manen, M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. Albany: State University of New York.
- Washington, J. M. (Ed.). (1986). A testament of hope: The essential writings of Martin Luther King, Jr. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

- Webb, E. (1988). *Philosophers of consciousness*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Wells, R. (1992, January). Profile newsletter for NACA professional members (Available from NACA, 13 Harbison Way, Columbia, SC 29212).
- Wells, R. (1992, February). Profile newsletter for NACA professional members (Available from NACA, 13 Harbison Way, Columbia, SC 29212).
- Whitehead, B. D. (1993, April). Dan Quale was right. The Atlantic Monthly, pp. 47-84.
- Yankelovich, D. (1982). New rules: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down. New York: Bantam.